The Spatial Morality of Tory Satire:
Ned Ward, Tom Brown, and the Politics of Literary Authority

by
Benjamin J. Neudorf

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy
in English

Department of English and Film Studies
University of Alberta

ABSTRACT

This dissertation argues that the political satire of Ned Ward and Thomas Brown uses spatial strategies to make moral arguments in opposition to their political and literary targets. Chapter One focuses on the Tory position that Tom Brown and Ned Ward take. Using as a starting place the Grub Street persona of Jonathan Swift's *A Tale of a Tub*, alongside the figure of the pulpit in seventeenth-century London Chapter One moves to Brown and Ward's representations of Westminster in order to address their Tory politics and the spatial strategies of their satire. In Chapter Two, Tom Brown deploys this "spatial morality" to target John Dryden after his conversion in a series of satires in dialogue form that represent Dryden's surrogate, Mr. Bays, in a conversation on the way from St. James Park to Covent Garden. Brown's satires target Dryden's body, parody Dryden's writing on a formal level, and use the spaces Dryden lives and works in to make a moral argument that undermines his conversion and its defense in *The Hind and the Panther*. Chapter Three analyzes Ned Ward's satire of London, arguing that it targets individualism and the self-interest of Whig trade in a satire of places associated with the public sphere. Ward's satire is indicative of the way Tory writers in Grub Street are critical of print culture and the public sphere but use their position as authors to attack their political opponents. In Chapter Four, Ned Ward's satire of global trade argues the moral problems of the colonies originate in London. This satire of Jamaica and Merchant tradesmen asks how global trade has helped the people of the city, modelling a vision for literary authorship positioned alongside the collective needs of his neighbourhood and against the economic self-interest of global trade.

How Ward and Brown use spaces in their satire to take on political opponents has implications for the history of literary authority: by challenging Dryden's conversion and making a case for the value of the Laureate, Brown's dialogue satire values literary authority that comes

from the state; by targeting the public sphere, Whig merchants, and global trade, Ward's satire makes the case for the role of literary authorship that speaks to the interests and experiences of the places the author writes about. Ward and Brown's satire is so grounded in place, so interested in literary form and in the body, which enables politically engaged and effective writing. Their work is immersed in the places, people, and habits they are familiar with.

DEDICATION

For Laurel and Edward

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This dissertation would not have been possible without the support and guidance of my supervisor, Corrinne Harol. Thank you for working closely with me and helping this argument to form out of conversations and through thoughtful and critical engagement with these arguments. I also benefited from supportive and talented committee members, Katherine Binhammer and Sylvia Brown, who pushed this dissertation to be the best it could be at all stages of its production.

I also want to acknowledge support through funding from the University of Alberta, the Department of English and Film Studies, and the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada. Generous travel funding from the Sarah Nettie Christie Research Travel Fund supported conference papers that formed the foundations of these chapters, and the Michael Smith Foreign Study Supplement supported my research in the British Library in 2017. Markman Ellis, thank you for supervising my summer research and for your companionship in the Reading Room.

My special thanks go to colleagues who have supported me throughout this programme, especially Ana Horvat, Sarah McRae, Chelsie Mya, Will Owen, and Matt Tétreault. This achievement means so much more because of your camaraderie, encouragement, and friendship, and indulgence. I owe extra gratitude and a unique debt to Jordan Kinder, a true ally who carefully read a draft of this dissertation. I am thankful for conversations with Allison Muri while we were editing *The London Spy* together. I also offer my sincere appreciation to Debbie Waldman for editorial guidance that has made my writing much clearer.

I can only begin to account for the support and patience from my family. Laurel, I could not have written this dissertation without your love and encouragement.

Table of Contents

Introduction

Edward (Ned) Ward and Thomas (Tom) Brown were writers in the chaotic landscape of emergent professional writing in the Grub Street of Restoration London. Although they were prolific, influential, and popular writers, they were also impolite, rigid and partisan in their views, and focused on scatological and ephemeral topics. During their careers, Ned Ward and Tom Brown were attacked, physically and in print, and those assaults continue to impact their reputation and legacy. Scholarship has continued to marginalize these authors based on their ephemerality, coarse speech, and popular audience, but also because their tarnished reputations have not been reevaluated. This dissertation argues that the same qualities that have plagued Ward and Brown's reputations are also the reason why their writing is so effective at using spaces and built environments to make a moral case against their political, religious, and literary opponents. Spaces and communities underpin Ward and Brown's writing, and this spatial, communal component of their writing is aided by their impolite and anarchistic speech, descriptive and embodied language, and Pyrrhonistic approaches when they criticize opponents of their placed-based conservatism and community-oriented mindset. Ned Ward and Tom Brown challenge economic, religious, and literary individualism; their writing, however, does not offer a unified alternative to the problems they see in the marketplace, in the church, or in the literary profession. As such, Ned Ward and Tom Brown should not be pigeon-holed into a narrow view of Tory politics or roped in with all Grub Street authors. I argue that their moral politics of space takes them in diverse political directions grounded in the places for which they are writing.

This dissertation intervenes to reframe discussions of Ned Ward and Tom Brown, moving away from positions that have lumped them in with the rest of Grub Street to consider how they are critically and politically positioned against the marketplace and public sphere. Each chapter relates Ward and Brown's work to a well-known contemporary (Jonathan Swift, John

Dryden, and Alexander Pope), and this dissertation uses the relationships between Ward and Brown and these famous literary icons to show how Ward and Brown were influential to these well-known authors and in dialogue with their writing as contemporaries. The main target of Ward and Brown's satire is individualism in religion, the marketplace, and in the literary sphere. By examining their focus on communal, shared identity over individualist perspectives, I make a few critical interventions. First, unlike the balance between polite and impolite forms Edward Said that articulates as part of Swift's early career "tory anarchy," Ward and Brown are impolite throughout their careers and not concerned with forms of civility; thus, they align more closely with what Edward Said observes in the last part of Swift's career, when Swift was writing during a rise in Whig power and became less polite in his writing. Ward and Brown's lack of civility is related to their partisan political allegiance. Their Tory politics is at odds with the individualistic nature of the Grub Street marketplace and the dissenting religious groups the book trade co-exists with; however, they are not concerned with the polite discourse needed to achieve a broader readership. Second, when Brown targets Dryden's conversion as a misguided focus on his individual beliefs, he does so by arguing for the importance and authority of the Laureate over individual conscience. Furthermore, Brown makes his case against Dryden's conversion by paying extraordinary attention to the formal structures and multiple voices in Dryden's writing, which goes against the pattern that Stephen Zwicker has identified in parody of Dryden and contributes to the persistent question of Dryden's identity that has occupied a prominent place in the critical approach to Dryden's career. Third, while Peter Briggs has argued against assertions that Ward's writing is disparate, topical, and has few unifying features by emphasizing the importance of legal matters in Ward's *The London Spy*, I find the most unifying element of Ward's writing is his consistent critique of the City of London's trade and the public sphere. The

benefit to this approach is that it also helps correct the problem of characterizing Ward's writing as participating in a masculine public sphere, as Anthony Pollack suggests, since Ward's writing offers a persistent critique of the public sphere and individualistic trade in London and in global networks of trade. These aspects of Ward and Brown's writing offer an important counterpoint to the Whig literary tradition, and they challenge the veneration of individual literary authorship, personal profits from trade, and individual religious conscience.

Ward wrote during the emergence of writing as a profession, at a time when popular writing was struggling for a position within the wider literary culture. While Ward enjoyed leniency and success during his early career, but his success was later undermined and downplayed by subsequent authors and by modern critics. Because Alexander Pope's attacks at the end of Ward's career remained unchallenged, critics have often followed and accepted Pope's characterization of Ned Ward. The emergent and successful writers of this time were vilified by the literary successes of the following century, and their judgment on these Restoration upstarts is only beginning to be called into question. Brean Hammond writes of the way that Pope's word has been taken at face value:

> Pope's verdicts on such as John Dennis, Ned Ward, Eliza Haywood, Colley Cibber—even the manifestly indefensible pillorying of Lewis Theobald—have been accepted as just and true, rather than as ammunition in an ongoing struggle between a dominant culture and the emergent forms that it seeks to disorganize, reorganize, and finally contain (291-192).

It is important to question Pope's attacks on these authors. Pope built his own reputation and success by discrediting popular writing as degenerative dribble. In this way, Pope undermined Ned Ward's record on his satirical targets —London's trade and the public sphere—by

suggesting that he did business in London. It is equally important to remember that the practice of pitting oneself against the established successes of the profession is already well established by the time Pope makes his attacks on popular writers. Ned Ward, John Dennis, and Colley Cibber also undermine the success of established writers to bolster their fledgling careers; Tom Brown attacked Dryden to establish his early Grub Street position at the expense of a view of Dryden's conversion that sold well to popular readership. Brown's first dialogue on Dryden, beginning in 1688, was reprinted in 1691 after the third dialogue went into a second printing, and the whole series was collected in his Works (1707), which had eight editions by 1779. Like the writers they attack, Pope's *Dunciad*, and Swift's *A Tale of a Tub*, are already embedded in the practice of Grub Street's cut-throat competitive nature and attack the success of established, professional writers to bolster their own positions.

What is worth noting is not that new writers strongly criticized established writers, but that Whig history has continued to devalue contributions of Tory writers attacked at the beginning of the eighteenth century as more polite forms are being developed, and this warrants some careful reconsideration. Abigail Williams' *Poetry and the Creation of Whig Literary Culture 1681-1714* lays out a case for rereading Whig literary culture by framing it through the tradition of Tory critique during the Restoration. Focusing on John Dryden, John Oldham, and Wentworth Dillon, Earl of Roscommon, Williams situates later Scriblerian appropriations of these voices by tracing their roots to a royalist tradition of literary culture with a vehement critique of religious factions (22-26). I share Williams' conviction that the later Scriblerian response and characterization of Grub Street must be viewed in relation to these earlier attacks on Whig literary culture, indeed that "there are numerous elements of Scriblerian satire that are inherited from earlier Royalist and Tory writers" is a motivation that has guided this project (44).

Antony Pollock shares this view that the Scriblereans appropriated earlier Tory writers, but he argues they made their writing more polite, with broader appeal (36-7). My interest in this problem is not to cast blame on Whig writers or the Scribleareans, but to interrogate what particularities are lost in their appropriation of the strategies employed by seventeenth-century Tory writers. If their writing strategies are made polite, what is lost and can be recovered from their vulgarity? If their writing was adapted to have broader appeal, what role did the particular and the local have in their writing? This dissertation argues that these Tory writers' focus on local identities is worth recovering, along with their conservative appeals to the authority of the places they speak from.

This dissertation focuses on the spatiality of popular Tory writing by male authors who write explicitly about the topography of their world: political, literary, and religious groups, along with streets, clubs, and shops. These places are centres for the Whig masculinity, economics, and trade that Ned Ward and Tom Brown satirize. Recognizing the gendered aspect of their experience of the city and the gendered voice of their writing makes it possible to account for the spatial specificity of their accounts of the city. Brown's attack on Dryden's conversion and Ward's attack on trade and the public sphere rely on a satirical tradition of masculine, misogynistic writing that I consider alongside their Tory politics. Chapter One sets up the literary personae Ward and Brown adopt in their writing in relation to Swift's *A Tale of a Tub* (1707). Specifically, as a way to establish their literary reputations, Ward and Brown adopt a Tory position that helps to clarify the ways in which the feud between competing Tory and Whig masculinities informs this dissertation. In Chapter Two, where I look at the way Brown uses space, Dryden's body, and the form of Dryden's writing to subvert his conversion, the dialogues with Dryden as Mr. Bays effeminize him as part of the attack on his Catholic faith. In Ward's

satire of trade within and outside London, misogynistic and violent writing is part of his representation of the problems of London's merchant class and of plantation labour. Even as this satire is critical of trade practices that oppress women and threaten their freedom, there is an underlying misogyny that demonstrates a paternalistic attitude and assumption that the state and the church would be better authorities. This paternalistic attitude applies to Brown's view of Dryden's literary position as much as it applies to Ward's characterization of social and economic problems in London.

This dissertation's focus on space and restoration satire—specifically the position it takes on spatial theory and how it relates to satire and satire's moral aims—requires some explanation. Where satire has a clearly defined persona, it is important to identify the location from which the literary voice is speaking. In other words, this argument considers the satirist's topographical context, and the satirist's spatial context more broadly, as part of his literary voice. Ward and Brown speak from discrete centres of Grub Street outside the walls of the City of London—Fleet Street and Moorfields, for example. Spatial theory has important implications for satire's moral purpose to reform and expose human vices and folly; namely, where the satiric target is a person or group associated with a neighbourhood, satire's moral purpose is carried out with a spatial strategy, which I call "spatial morality." I apply this term in various contexts: to literary reputation-making, where it is used to define boundaries and contexts of literary authorship; to trade, where it is used to insist that morality is defined by local contexts and cannot be exported or imported from the colonies; and finally, to the political stance that community obligations take precedence over individual self-interest. In each of these formulations, satire is used to make moral arguments about these larger social and political positions in ways that rely on the spatial context.

Since our modern sense of the term "morality" is typically connected to religious thought and practice and distinguished from ethics more broadly, its use in this study and in relation to satire also needs some explanation. Moral instruction is a vital component of satire, where the end is often a moral lesson or correction. In this way, I do not use "morality" only in the religious sense of the term as instruction of and conformity to moral norms and laws, or in the higher sense of "moral truth." I also use the term more broadly to refer to moral character and pretenses to moral character, which are equally important for the construction of satiric personae and for the description of targets of satire. In this context, "Spatial morality," refers to the ways in which moral character, moral rhetoric, and moral instruction have spatial associations in satire through the rhetorical use of space and place to further a moral message through the satirists' moralized readings of spaces. The dynamic between space and morality shows the ways in which particular places and activities are contextual and rely on the particularities of the contexts in which they exist. Space and morality are mutually constitutive and the production of one relies on associations with the other; because of this, when satire speaks from specific, local places, its moral intervention is targeted toward problems there, raising questions about who is responsible for its management in a way that would be impossible in more general satire of human vices. This spatial specificity of this writing, in other words, makes it politically relevant to the place from which it is speaking.

This dissertation relies on two arguments about morality and space. The first suggestion, which is not unique to the Restoration, is that morality is contextual within discrete places in society. The morality of the Church, and the Marketplace are quite distinct and rely on the social norms governing activity in those places. It is for these reasons that in literature about the city of London prior to the Restoration the city is depicted as different moral space from that of the

countryside. There are increasingly specific and diverse places in Restoration London, including the Public House, the Coffee House, and the private dissenting Meeting House, with boundaries of well-established jurisdictions governing these contexts. When it went through a period of rebuilding and renewal following the Great Fire in 1666, London also reestablished and redefined these spaces, including the moral boundaries and associations that it socially produced and maintained. The second suggestion is that satire is a perfect genre in which to consider these relationships. Satire negotiates these boundaries between morality and space. While this negotiation often occurs through the conservative production and re-assertion of dominant positions, satire can also disrupt society's moral boundaries. Both sides of the political spectrum use satire to further their ends, and in either case, satire enforces morality outside the legal and religious apparatus of the state. In this disruption, satire is a conservative mode that opens the way for new political and social possibilities outside of traditionalism. In the satire this dissertation discusses, spaces are a form of conservative authority that makes arguments for moral change and new social relations possible.

The populist, masculine approach Ned Ward and Tom Brown both adopt is connected to specific spaces. They are more than willing to dive into the muck of the streets of London and bring the street to life. Although these authors received little attention from the 1690s until the early 20th century, this was the initial draw of their writing; they brought the city and social structure of London to life in a way that is hard to attain in polite forms of writing. But the reputation of these writers has either been disparaged as trivial, crude, and unrecoverable, or they are said to have been overshadowed by the literary masters of the eighteenth century, Addison and Steele, Pope, Richardson, etc. More recently, calls have been made to read late-seventeenth-century Tory writers as influential and genre-defining precedents to the Whig success in the

eighteenth century. This dissertation takes a specific approach to this problem by focusing on the spatial strategies of these two Tory writers, asking in what way the authority of place aided their satire's political and moral interventions.

In Chapter One, I argue that the Grub Street persona adopted by Jonathan Swift's *A Tale of a Tub* draws from representations of the pulpit in popular Grub Street writing, depicting the ad-hoc pulpit as a place of immoral, intemperate behaviour, unauthorized and uninformed speech based on individual readings of scripture, and evidence of physical disease. Through my examination of pulpit satire and the figure of the pulpit in Swift's *Tale,* I articulate the difference between the persona Swift adopts and those used by Ned Ward and Tom Brown; specifically, although Ward and Brown share Swift's Tory politics, their particular neighbourhoods and sect within Grub Street, along with their lower social status and precarious labour, puts them at odds both with Swift's position and the persona he adopts.

This chapter lays the groundwork for the type of Grub Street personae the rest of the dissertation will look at by showing how Grub Street was thought of and talked about at the time; however, Tom Brown and Ned Ward's personae are more specific in their political and literary orientation against dissent, Whig economics, and comes from Grub Street spaces outside the city. This Chapter also begins the conversation about what aspects of Grub Street's reputation are taken from Ward and Brown; here, Swift's language about the pulpit is clearly based on established discourses that Ward and Brown have been part of, and it is worth considering their role as Tory writers in developing rhetorical positions oriented against dissenting priests by building up a store of writing about the tub and dissenting pulpits. The pulpit stands in for the individual, fluid, ad-hoc authority that they oppose in favour of a more communal, conservative, high church position. This opposition is made through spaces, by arguing against itinerant

spaces, in favour of fixed, established churches. Grub Street's boundaries and tensions are also at play in the persona that this Tory satire takes on. Satire does not work without shared morals and values, and these are defined in opposition to those of others outside the local boundaries and communities within which Ward and Brown operate.

In Chapter Two, I look at Tom Brown's attacks on John Dryden in order to argue that Brown's satire of Dryden's conversion uses a spatial strategy premised on the representation of Dryden's body in London. Via Brown's embodied critique, Dryden's body appears in St. James Park and Covent Garden. This representation draws on common sexual tropes about Catholicism, and Brown alludes to these notorious meeting-places for sexual activity instead of directly accusing Dryden of immoral behaviour. Brown's dialogue parodies the form of Dryden's *The Hind and the Panther* to critique its claims about religion. Brown uses the same classical characters from his *Essay of Dramatic Poesie*, who were modeled on Dryden's friends and colleagues, questioning Dryden's status as laureate with Dryden's literary voices.

Building on the first chapter, this account of Brown's attack on Dryden shows how Brown publicly attempts to take down an established literary figure by attacking his politics and religion. Compared to the archetype of Grub Street hack writers, Brown's argument is political by necessity; it politicizes the laureate to build his literary reputation. As he does in his rhetoric about the pulpit, Brown attacks Dryden for being fluid and changeable, and this forms the basis of how he contests the laureate. Brown's representation of Dryden demonstrates the place of authority from which he speaks: He shows Dryden's weakness by placing him in St. James' Park and moving him to Covent Garden to cast him as sexually (and also, religiously) promiscuous. There is a factionalism in this orientation in that Brown does not write for the stage and belongs to a different literary community both spatially and in terms of genre, but there is also an attempt

to make a specific, embodied, topographically grounded contestation to Dryden's spiritual and disembodied allegorical arguments. Satire is an embodied form of writing. Dryden is blamed for his failure to adjust his moral position to where he is. Brown's satire of his conversion represents him in places where the body cannot be ignored—it focuses on sex, consumption, and Dryden's obligations to other writers and the literary community. Brown's argument is like the pulpits in *A Tale of a Tub*; it is against the movable spaces that undermine the authority of the established church. Brown's objection is not only to Dryden's change, but also to the way Dryden's work is dissociated from where he lives and works: he is not allowed to ignore where he is—he must be governed by this spatial context.

In Chapter Three, I argue that Alexander Pope's attack on Ned Ward set out to erode the position on trade that Ned Ward held throughout his career. The topography of Ned Ward's satire is the impetus for his intervention in the morality of trade: Ward is geographically outside of the City of London, and he represents the city as a 'spy' from outside its limits. The aim of Ward's satire of the city throughout his career is to expose the corruption and immoral ends of London's trade. This chapter extends to Ned Ward's satire of the colonies as well, on trade and imperial expansion in *A Trip to Jamaica* (1698) and the presence of the colonies in *The Barbacue Feast* (1707), arguing that there is a persistent criticism of what Ward viewed as an extremely wasteful economic structure. By suggesting that Ward sold beer in London, Pope suggests Ward's firm position against the greed and excess of business and trade is hypocritical. Pope mislead the public about Ward, whose proprietorship of taverns in Moorfields did not at all resemble the way in which Pope portrayed it. By looking at Ward's satire on trade throughout his career, this chapter refocuses the accepted story of his position after Pope. It demonstrates that

the spatial strategies used to mischaracterize Ward are so effective and so insulting because Ward used spatial arguments to attack London's trade throughout his career.

Chapter three is centred on a literary attack from Pope at the start of his career against Ward as an established author. Pope attacks Ward's reputation and career to undermine the way Ward targets London's Whig-dominated trade and imperial expansion. Ward speaks from London as a place of authority. For instance, he looks around the city and asks how global trade has helped its citizens, looking for tangible examples. Ward also uses his own position as a starting point: he asks why there is no support for honest, humble trade at home, yet while money is poured into voyages and conquests abroad, and why there is money for soldiers but not for writers. Later in Ward's career, *The Barbacue Feast* (1707) offers a resolution. The fruits of the colonial project culminate in a grossly excessive barbecue outside of the city, which stands in for imperialism's greed and excess. In this exurban setting is connected to the amalgamation of colonial products from which the feast is made. I conclude by arguing that across this satire of London, the Colonies, and the consumption of exotic products, the unifying goal is to locate the problems and vices of global trade in London's trade centers, with the resulting claim that morality cannot be exported, but is specific to particular places and contexts. At the same time, *A Trip to Jamaica* heightens and exaggerates London's most immoral practices through its description of the colony, and *A Barbacue Feast* examines the colonies' influence on merchants in ex-urban London. The spatial morality that this chapter examines reveals where morality is contained in a specific location and where it can move or spread.

Finally, Chapter Four suggests that Ward and Brown use common spaces and architecture to argue for localized, community-based understandings of what spaces should be; their Tory position is to hold onto mutual obligations and moral checks on economic activities,

against the individual self-interest of Whig economic systems in London, ruled by the Merchant class. At the heart of their critique is a belief in community that is connected to their religious and political positions. Ward's social justice arguments for space are the most explicit form of this community-based social imaginary and in his satire he targets government spending and waste that is the antithesis of his communal ideal. Politically, this position is conservative in that it resists the economic changes aligned with Whig politics. By interpreting, contesting, and reimagining the rhetoric of public spaces, Ward argues for public spaces that directly benefit his community. Building on the arguments in Chapter Three, this chapter focuses on moral positions the authors take about London's trade: resistance to the way that poverty is ignored in favor of private profits and the way greed fuels decisions about the restoration of London after the Great Fire of 1666. This position against London's Whig trade is connected to a conservative appeal to the authority of the High Church and Westminster's political power, but it also speaks from a desire to put the citizens of London and their welfare above those of London's wealthy merchant class.

Where Ward's whole career challenged trade, his position in *The London Spy* is more explicitly about local communities and specific places. It articulates a politics based on community identity and community benefits. Brown's satire of Westminster Abbey is focused on the misuse of that space as a vain and self-serving spectacle, which provides some context for his attacks on Dryden and his vision for the profession. After his attempt to make a name for himself, Brown lived his literary career on the sidelines in many ways, and rather than be something, he preferred to be part of something. This too, articulates part of the political position that Brown and Ward shared, oriented toward values in community: their Tory politics places authority in shared, collective spaces rather than in authority

I. The Tub the Grave: Pulpit Satire and Literary Reputation

This chapter began as a way to work out why the Grub Street authors I study here use the spaces of London so effectively as part of their satiric strategy. To answer this, I look first to an author who knows Grub Street culture best, Jonathan Swift, whose work demonstrates a knowledge of Grub Street and models the Grub Street authors' way of thinking and speaking. But Swift's *A Tale of a Tub* (1704) is not an imitation of all of Grub Street literary production. Instead, its politics and religious positions are aligned with a conservative, High-Church Tory politics Swift shares with Ned Ward and Tom Brown. More specifically, Swift's *A Tale of a Tub* is informed by a profound knowledge of Grub Street culture, and Grub Street has an established practice of ridiculing the Tub as a speaking-place. Ned Ward and Tom Brown are part of this tradition of Tub-mocking, and Swift's *Tale* models a persona shared with Ward and Brown. It is a persona based on knowledge of the city and its immediate and local discourse. This perspective involves the willingness to call on place as an authority: an authority used to build a reputation, shame other writers, insist on moral high ground, and demonstrate allegiance to a particular faction in religion, politics, or trade.

This satiric voice of Swift's *Tale*, and of the pulpit satire from which it stems, draws boundaries in the city, inhabits particular places, and forms a politics tied to place. Swift's work expresses Grub Street culture well, but it does an even better job as a demonstration of its effectiveness and influence. Swift parodies Grub Street and employs its strategies, so I look at examples of the voice he adopts in other satire of the pulpit. I focus on spatial strategies of this pulpit satire, which targets the movable spaces in favour of the fixed pulpits of the established church. Ned Ward and Tom Brown's satire of Westminster explains of how their Tory politics are articulated in those spaces and provides an opportunity to consider their literary reputation

and literary careers. Tom Brown targets the monuments of famous poets, and I argue that his resistance to the model of the individual author is part of a larger Tory resistance to individualism that I discuss in the later chapters.

It may seem as though I am making an argument for Swift's identity by comparing his persona in the *Tale* to the work of Ned Ward and Tom Brown, but my aim is not to claim a direct connection, friendship, or special knowledge between Ward, Brown, and Swift; I will not insist that Swift personally holds their beliefs or that the persona of his *Tale* is definitively aligned with his own beliefs. Instead, I will use the *Tale* to illustrate the personae and conservative politics of Ward and Brown, since their opinions as expressed in the following pamphlets and poems are difficult to interpret on their own terms. Swift's *Tale* provides a great deal of context about the world Ward and Brown operate in; this context is familiar to most readers of the eighteenth-century and aligned with Ward and Brown's political and religious arguments, as opposed to those arguments made by competing factions. Scholarship on Swift's identity and politics is helpful in this regard, so I will review some existing positions to explain where I see Ward and Brown in this history. From this vantage point, Swift's persona in the *Tale* is a specific indication of the type of hackney writer he is imitating, not a persona that encompasses all of Grub Street.

Edward Said expresses concerns with efforts to pin Swift's identity down, a difficult task, but one that has often been attempted. In his well-known essay, "Swift's Tory Anarchy," Said gestures toward the many disciplines that have sought to restore Swift to something concrete, but he argues that Swift's identity and his "resistance to the order in which he will come to be placed" remains left out of the critical accounts of his work (48). Said describes the tension between Swift-the-author, Swift-the-person, "and the tory institutions of literature to which his writing contributes in spite of the writing's individual anarchy" (48). Later, Said suggests a

distinction between Swift's early work and his later work, which he illustrates with a passage from the *Tale* and one from "Memoirs relating to . . . 1710": he suggests that "In the *Tale,* Swift imitated diversion, whereas in the later piece his work really had become a diversion" (56). Importantly, this distinction corresponds with political change: when Swift wrote about Tory policy, it was the prevailing view and had support; but when he wrote after 1714, he was writing as an outsider to a powerful Whig "machine" (56). Thus, Swift will "become the scribbler and projector he impersonated (in *A Tale of a Tub*), and attacked (in *The Examiner* and elsewhere)" (56-7). This political change not only demonstrates why the politics of the *Tale* are possible*,* but also how the political scales of Grub Street are tilted toward a popular late-seventeenth-century Toryism in the late seventeenth century. After 1714, when a Walpole-style bureaucratic government takes over a politics of personality and "the Tory aristocracy of merit" is replaced with the "shifting values of currency, a perpetual national debt, and city mercantilism," Swift's writing becomes explicitly oppositional rather than taking on a participatory role in the greater conversation (57). Said articulates Swift's position as "Tory Anarchy," that is, as a position between "decorum" and "liberty" (65). But while he argues that Ronald Paulson ascribes this to "the technique or genre" of satire, Said argues that "satire for Swift was the mode of his sovereignty and transgression and indeed, finally, of his intelligible existence" (65). While satire gave Swift political agency and a legacy, this voice always existed between a polite discourse and freedom or liberty.

Said's insight into this particular political change through Swift's career can be observed in the career of Ned Ward as well—Ward writes prolifically in support of the Tory cause with little boundaries or concern for himself, even as he faces the pillory for his views, and he targets many of the same Whig political agendas with which Swift was concerned. Swift's targets

concern the rising Whig politics (currency, national debt, and city mercantilism), which are consistently the targets of Ward's satire. At the time the *Tale* was written and published (1694-7), the biggest difference between Swift's satire and that of Ned Ward and Tom Brown as Grub Street hacks is that there was little concern for decorum in Ward and Brown's writing. While Swift's satire shares Addison's view of polite satire, (which "lash'd the vice, but spar'd the Name"), it also speaks with freedom on religion and politics and forestalled his career by limiting his progress through the ranks of the church (66). But even though his political and religious satire cost Swift, the balance between decorum and liberty is where the difference lies between Swift's persona in the *Tale* and Ned Ward and Tom Brown, who did not share this view of polite satire and did not benefit from a social position which would have given them political power. Ned Ward and Tom Brown were always where Said observes Swift to be at the end of his career—writing as diversion, from an oppositional stance, and not concerned with this same balance. In other words, though they were Tories too, their writing leans far more toward "anarchy" and "liberty" and is not concerned with the balance of "decorum." Swift's Grub Street persona and the connection between his "oratorical machines" and popular representations of the pulpit make the stakes and politics of Ned Ward and Tom Brown clear. Ward and Brown are writing from Grub Street and their voices are similarly aligned against Protestant dissenters and Whig politics. On the other hand, Ward and Brown participate in the skepticism of the Royal Society, learning, and philosophy that plays such a large part in Swift's satire of Grub Street.

Swift's Persona and Pulpit Satire

Swift explicitly takes on a Grub Street persona in *A Tale of a Tub* adopting the voice of a self-proclaimed member of the "Grub Street brotherhood" and "a most devoted servant of all modern forms" who has "just come from having the honour conferred upon me to be adopted a

member of that illustrious fraternity" (28, 40). John Clark describes the moderns as those who have "reduced all wit to circumstances of Time Place, and Person" so that "wit is absolutely fettered to the immediate and the local–to Covent Garden and Hyde Park Corner (118). In doing so, he borrows Swift's account, where modern "Wit has its Walks and Purlieus" and has "artfully fixed this Mercury, and reduced it to the circumstances of time, place, and person" (27). The logic of this wit is so particular to place that "such a jest there is that will not pass out of Covent Garden, and such a one that is nowhere intelligible but at Hyde Park Corner" (27). For Clark, "The Modern persona's philosophy endorses the singular and the momentary," which in *A Tale* means they are "native to the England of the Restoration and Age of Queen Anne (131).

In the apology for *A Tale,* the project is said to have been written "above thirteen years since, 1696. Which is eight years before it was published" (5). Harth uses this date to suggest that Swift wrote *A Tale* during his training in seminary (*Swift and Anglican Rationalism* 7). The idea behind this argument is that Grub Street literary production is what influenced the *Tale*; the fact that "The Author was then young, his invention at full Height, and his Reading fresh in his Head" can be understood as an acknowledgement of (and excuse for) exposure to all that Grub Street has to offer on the subject of religion, which is framed in this apology as a way to "Strip himself of as many real Prejudices as he could" (5). As young Swift is immersing himself in Grub Street arguments about religion to "proceed in a manner . . . altogether new," he is not simply emulating Grub Street's discourse of religion, but rather finding in that chaos a voice most consistent with his own religious beliefs and political views. This apology suggests it is exposing fanaticism and superstition in religion, "Errors, Ignorance, Dullness, and Villany" in Grub Street (6). But what the figure of the Pulpit shows is that as Swift immersed himself in Grub Street's religious writing, he found authors closest to his religious and political views and

mobilized their way of railing against religious dissenters. Swift had sympathy for Grub Street and knew its work well. His criticism of Dryden in the *Tale* is familiar with the way Grub Street's literary community had and would continue to criticize Dryden and his conversion. More importantly, the way he uses the language of the pulpit has a lot in common with the way the pulpit was discussed by Tory writers and represents a particular brand of the "Dullness" he describes, not one that encompasses all of Grub Street writing.

The modern persona Swift takes on has at its core a knowledge of particular spaces of London, which it puts to work in its satire and parody to draw boundaries, shame rivals, and establish a "name and reputation" unique to a particular area. The members of Grub Street, Swift says, police themselves by excluding outside groups:

> Upon all which we think it very unbecoming our prudence that the determination should be remitted to the authors themselves, when our adversaries by briguing and caballing have caused so universal a defection from us, that the greatest part of our society has already deserted to them, and our nearest friends begin to stand aloof, as if they were half ashamed to own us. (41)

This self-defined fraternity is identified by forms particular to the "moderns," and threatened by "the continual efforts made by the societies of Gresham and of Will's, to edify a name and reputation upon the ruin of ours" (40). This posturing and exclusion of new "start-up societies," or of factions within the Grub Street hoard, are part of the way reputation is made in this new print culture. Masculine reputation-making by holding a new work above that of another author, trashing others in a preface and claiming to be superior, are part of the dynamic of Restoration Grub Street, the masculine performance of literary authorship, and boundary-setting of regional differences between groups of professional writers. These are the strategies Brown uses to

promote his literary voice and exclude Dryden after his conversion, and Ward and Brown's spatial strategies are informed by this focus on setting boundaries within groups of professional Grub Street writers to insist on and maintain this community of like-minded Tory writers.

The title page of Swift's *Tale* illustrates a barrel being cast overboard to distract a sea monster (Hobbes' *Leviathan*) from the ship (the state and church); however, the idea of the tub has a double meaning because the term is used throughout the seventeenth century to refer to pulpits. The pulpit plays an important role in satire during the seventeenth century. There are historical connections between preaching from the pulpit and the development of English satire—an historical link between the pulpit and the persona of the satirist. Throughout the seventeenth century, the pulpit is also the target of satire, and as this survey of pulpit-satire will show, there is a connection between the figure of the pulpit and Grub Street.

What is spoken from the pulpit is important to understanding Swift's *Tale.* Philip Harth's *Swift and Anglican Rationalism: The Religious Background of A Tale of a Tub* looks for the origins of the *Tale's* religious criticism in Swift's religious education and in his reading of religious controversies and debates (154-164). Edward Nathan's "The Bench and the Pulpit: conflicting Elements in the Augustan Apology for Satire" argues that, in the case of Dryden and Addison's arguments for the goals and aims of satire, their views are described using legal language rather than references to more binary views of the genre such as a distinction between high and low, Juvenalian and Horatian models, or tragic/comic differences. Significantly, Addison's polite view was that satire should have an even split between praise and blame, and that it should be careful not to be too specific in its target. This polite vision of satire was a model for his *Spectator*, which used clergymen to speak the most important arguments about satire (386). By contrast, Dryden's view of the way satire functions is that there should be

specific blame cast, because blame provides an important social function outside the legal system, and outside the sphere of religious guidance: to enforce social norms. The view of the pulpit in Swift's Tory Grub Street persona could be perceived as a bit of a contradiction: it claims to critique the ad-hoc, itinerant speaking place, the Pulpit/Tub, based on the problem that anything can be spoken from that stage; at the same time, as much as his Grub Street voice would favour the established church over these ad-hoc priests, the voice is impolite and eschews all classical authority. As a result, it does not fit neatly into either Dryden or Addison's view of the role of satire. Tory allegiance to the monarchy and the established church was particularly appealing after 1688, when, as Ian McBride has suggested, "the alliance of an hereditary monarchy and a powerful Anglican Church appeared to offer the only security against political and social upheaval" (172). The Tory Grub Street hack is a monarchist and a proponent of collective traditions and local identities; his words claim the authority of the place they are spoken from and they wield this authority against any itinerant voices who come and go through that space.

In *The Spoken Word,* pulpits are said to have a specific oral practice and rhetoric particular to London, which is different from Scottish Gaelic traditions (101-106). Swift's *Tale* references Scottish Protestant practice as part of its satire through his introduction of the Pulpit:

> Now, the first of these Oratorial Machines in Place as well as Dignity, is the *Pulpit*. Of *Pulpits* there are in this Island several sorts; but I esteem only That made of Timber from the Sylva Caledonia, which agrees very well with our Climate (37).

Swift allies his persona with the speaking platform of Scottish Presbyterians in this passage, ostensibly for its physical characteristics: its simplicity, its uncovered state, and its "Resemblance to a Pillory" (37).[1]

The pulpit is central to the theory of Satire, to Swift's persona of a Grub Street "modern," and to the historical development of the satiric persona. Pat Rogers has also shown that Grub Street was physically close to dissenting meeting-houses. In *Grub Street: Studies in a Subculture*, Rogers traces the use of the term "Grub Street" throughout Swift's works and correspondence. One of the most important distinctions he makes is between how the term is used to refer to a *place,* and how the term is used to refer to a *style*. Swift's *Tale* uses both as it establishes its Grub Street persona. Rogers explains that the significance of Grub Street to the *Tale* lies in the way that the *place* of Grub Street was not only a centre for writers and booksellers, but also a centre for dissenters: "it can be shown that dissenting houses were concentrated most thickly in the haunts of Dulness; whilst dissenting academies thronged the Grub Street/Moorfields area" (226). Rogers likewise connects Swift's explanation for the oratorial apparatus to Grub Street:

> Swift goes on to explain the 'Physico-logical' scheme of oratorical machines by conveying an analogy to 'the spacious Commonwealth of Writers, and to those methods by which they must exalt themselves to a certain Eminency about the inferior World.' The pseudo-mysticism of the hack author is thus converted to the ends of direct literary satire. (226)

Swift's introduction to the Pulpit is a description of a Grub Street way of life: the tub stands for reputation-making by gaining a little ground over the rest of the crowd and making yourself

[1]Swift, Jonathan. *A Tale of a Tub and Other Works*. Ed. Marcus Walsh. Cambridge UP, 2010. Print. *The Cambridge Edition of the Works of Jonathan Swift*: 1. (=n. 12, 348). Sylva Caledonia is the reference to Scottish Presbyterians.

heard. It is the central figure of his satire of Grub Street, and in his description of the Pulpit he borrows the language of Grub Street in subtle ways. I will survey the diverse connotations and uses of the figure of the pulpit as represented in satire throughout the seventeenth century to illustrate the role of the pulpit in Swift's persona of Grub Street.

Through description and association with nearby places and known haunts, dissenters are tied to particular places. For example, in Swift's *Tale,* Jack is "troubled by a disease," which makes him "run Dog-mad, at the Noise of Music, especially a Pair of Bag-Pipes . . . But he would cure himself again by taking two or three turns in Westminster-Hall, or Billingsgate, or in a Boarding-School, or the Royal-Exchange, or a State Coffee-House" (127).[2] In Tom Brown's *Amusements Serious and Comical*, a tour of London, his protagonists visit Bedlam, but when he is confused that he does not find every type of character he expected there and asks the keeper about it, he is told Bedlam only takes those who are "tamer":

> The Projectors who are generally Broken citizens, were coop'd up in the *Counters* and *Ludgate.* The Beaux, and Rakes, and Common Mad Jilts, that labour under a *Furor Uterini* in *Bridewell*, and Justice *Long's* Powdering-Tub; and the Virtuosi were confined to Gresham College. Those, continued he, in whose Constitutions Folly has the Ascendant over Frenzy, are permitted to Reside and be Smoaked in Coffee-Houses; and those that by the Governours of this Hospital, are thought utterly Incurable, are shut up with a pair of Foils, a Fiddle, and a Pipe, in the Inns of Court and Chancery; and when their Fire and Spirits are exhausted, and they begin to Dote, they are removed by *Habeas Corpus* into a certain Hospital built for that purpose near *Amen-Corner*. (Works 3:34)

[2] The Cambridge edition notes: "Ehrenpreis (GS Marginalia) suggests these refer to 'litigation, scurrilous pamphlets, dissenters' academies, commercial frauds or usury, political plotting.'"(n.40, p456)

The "cures" in Swift's *Tale* figure in Brown's account as punishments, treatments, or confinements, treating those too enthusiastic or untamed in spirit to be confined to Bedlam. In Swift's version, Jack hates music because his dissenting religion is against music, while in Brown's account, music is used to exhaust the "incurable" spirit until they are ready for treatment in the hospital.[3]

Brown's *Amusements* chronicle an encounter with a nonjurur priest who is said to be "left off cheating People in a *Coat,* to put Tricks upon the World in a *Gown*" (35). The explanation is given later, when this priest is ridiculed as they leave him to "come down from his *borrow'd* Pulpit, as soon as he had finished his *borrow'd* Harrangue" and delivered "the *Gown* he *borrow'd*" to his "Reverend Brother" (35). The borrowed pulpit, gown, and rhetoric, work together in Brown's satire of the dissenting minister in a way reminiscent of how Swift's coats communicate the brothers' religious beliefs. Brown's accounts of Protestant ministers often include a description of their pulpit or identify them by the place from which they are speaking: For example, in Covent-Garden, a Presbyterian minister is called a "Tubster" (74). Another "*Wou'd be Bishop*" is said to "[fill] a Pulpit very well, but . . . he cloys his Auditors with . . . unpalatable Ragoust . . . in plain English, *Twice-boil'd Cabbage*" (70). In other words, he goes so off-topic and lets "the Subject be what it will" in his speech, that the speech is like a soup where all the parts are boiled together and indistinguishable.

The contemporary discourse around Swift's "Oratorial Machines" helps to explain the role of the pulpit in the creation of his Grub Street persona. Swift's account of the pulpit, and the

[3] The Cambridge edition notes that Swift's reference to "Stinging of the Tarantula" is connected to religious prohibitions on dancing: in Italy, the cure for supposed excitability produced by a Tarantula bite was music and dancing until it wore off, but this is thought to be a work-around for religious prohibitions on dancing and music (n. 38, p. 455-6). Jack's hatred for music is "cured" by plotting and scheming, and the "incurable" in Brown's account are treated by music to exhaust their spirit and make them treatable (34).

other speaking platforms, places conditions and a political spectrum on his account of the Grub Street "modern": by representing the tub as he does, by placing it alongside the other speaking-platforms, and by identifying it with Hobbes' work, he aligns the *Tale*'s persona with a particular Tory-monarchist Grub Street I also identify in the works of Ward and Brown. Swift's strategy with these oratorial machines is a spatial one—it attacks political and religious adversaries through the place from which they speak. The tub itself is code for a Tory-monarchist view through the associations with its popular use in Grub Street culture. The way Swift uses the Tub is consistent with Ward and Brown's personae, spatial strategies, reputation-making, and career-formation. Ward and Brown frequently use the same connotations of the tub figure in their religious satire.

In *A Pulpit to Let* (1665), the role of the pulpit figure is to attack Anglican ministers who abandoned their pulpits. The pulpit is a public space, risky to occupy during times of crisis, disease, or under the threat of conflagration. The immediate dangers that the church itself would burn, the risk of smoke exposure, or the dangers of contracting illness, are inherent in holding a public position and speaking from the pulpit. In this satire, the pulpit itself is figured as a coffin, morphing into a symbol of the danger it represents (and perhaps the fate of state religion). Likewise, the surplice, a cloth worn by priests, transforms into a funeral cloth. In this account, as priests flee the city, thinking that their position is too dangerous, while Protestant preachers take the place of Anglican ministers at their pulpits.

In another partisan poem, *Upon the Burning of Dr. Burgess' Pulpit* (1710), the public burning of an Anglican pulpit provoked a Tory response. The poet calls out the Whig act by evoking the figure of a tub, which he compares to the Anglican pulpit, which was destroyed:

Invidious Whigs, since you have made your Boast,

That you a Church of England Priest would roast,

Blame not the Mob, for having a Desire

With Presbyterian Tubs to light the Fire. (7:393)

The suggestion that the crowd would "roast" the priest is explained in a note from *Poems on Affairs of State*, which traces the phrase to earlier that year (1710), when Sir Stephen Lennard proposed that Sacheverell be "roasted." (POAS 7:393). This note identifies that moment as the origin of the modern sense of the phrase (POAS 7:393). Importantly, this passage shows that the distinction between the Protestant tub and the Anglican pulpit was used by Tory satirists and pamphleteers to insist on the authority of the Church of England and to disparage Protestant preachers through the speaking platforms they used, which were presumably on the street and readily available when something was being burned. The irony is that the only accessible fuel with which the mob could burn the Anglican pulpit was a dissenting tub—which undermines the goals of the mob's roast.

In a number of other satires of the period, the pulpit becomes an epithet used to disparage preachers, so there are titles such as *The Pulpit-Fool* (1707) and *The Pulpit-Lunaticks* (1717). There are also partisan attacks on Anglican priests such as *Pulpit Tyrrany: or, Observations upon Four High-Church Sermons (1710).* Often, however, the pulpit is attacked by suggesting that the priest is bawdy and intemperate. In his *Hymn to the Pillory (1703)*, Defoe transforms the pillory into a pulpit for an Anglican priest:

Upon thy Pulpit set the Drunken Priest,

Who turns the Gospel into a Baudy Jest;

Let the Fraternity Degrade him there,

Lest they like him appear.

There let him his Momento Mori Preach,

And by Example, not by Doctrine Teach. (204-209)

Defoe's characterization of the pulpit as a place for bawdy and drunken behaviour is not unique at this time; though most of those attacks come from Tory writers attacking Protestant priests, it is a common trope in satire of Catholicism as well. This difference between Defoe's characterization and Tory satires is an opportunity to consider how space works in this context. Where Defoe's pulpit shames the priest, who speaks with "Doctrine" and not with action in his everyday life (i.e., at home, in the streets, in public), the Tory satire of movable pulpits implies movable or changing morals compared to the certainty of the fixed, immobile pulpit in the Church of England. In his *Walk round London and Westminster,* Tom Brown calls Protestant ministers "Low-Church saints" as "Bifarious Anythingarians" or "Priests of *Baccus*," and attacks one minister who, he says, keeps a "Library under Ground, and whenever he Preaches, 'tis to a Congregation of Drawers over his own Liquor" (280). Adopting the language of a reforming minister, Brown suggests these drunken meetings are held "in order to reform them from Tippling below stairs, drawing Pots too full, cozening the Bar with false Reckonings, and giving Bumpers of Palm-wine clandestinely to the Cook-wench" (280). This more animated description of Defoe's "Baudy Jest" suggests that the reform and moral benefits of such preaching are a moderate improvement in manners. It also suggests that preaching allows the minister to disguise his for-profit business as a ministry and library.

Pulpits and the itinerant, ad-hoc version, Tubs, are both the target of satire and convenient markers used to make class distinctions about the status of preachers and to sow seeds of doubt about the pious nature of religious leaders. This tradition informs the strategy Swift uses in the *Tale*, as he takes on the persona of a Grub Street writer. The *Tale* is about

religious sects and division, and religious factions, but it is also about the Grub Street writers who live in these neighbourhoods and make a living from religious controversy. Swift uses the "oratorical machines" (the pulpit-tub, the ladder, the stage-itinerant) as shorthand for Protestant meeting-houses, but they are also embodiments of the Grub Street spirit. The spaces of Grub Street are embodied in the *Tale* through these oratorical machines and in the style of Grub Street writing, which is often indistinguishable from the style of the street. The speaking platforms of street discourse enable satire of both Grub Street and of the Protestant preachers who use them to speak to their congregations. Only after examining the way the Tub was used by other writers during this time does it become clear that Swift uses the entire spectrum of connotations and associations that come from this tradition of tub satire. There is an affinity between Swift's politics and the Tory writers attacking the dissenting tub—Swift was not completely removed from the gutters of Grub Street or the filth of the Fleet.[4]

As early as Samuel Butler's *Hudibras (1663-1678)*, the pulpit, in the form of a barrel or tub, was mocked by comparing it to a powdering-tub, or a barrel used to treat venereal disease. Tom Brown, in *A Walk through London and Westminster* (*Works,* vol. 3, 1715), uses this same comparison to code the dissenting preacher as bawdy and diseased, suggesting that the preacher had previously used the tub to treat his disease before he made use of it as a pulpit. These examples illustrate a tradition where pulpit literature codes a preacher as crazy, diseased, and bawdy, to undermine a whole religious group. As Said points out about Swift's career, when the *Tale* was written, these Tory views were ideologically dominant and widely-held; they had a

[4] Both images are used by Pope in the Dunciad, and a stronger affinity between Swift and the material contexts of Grub Street support Carol Fabricant's argument in *Swift's Landscape*, since the gutters and ditches of Grub Street are much closer to Swift's Dublin roots.

voice and a wide audience. This particular form of partisan satire had an audience and a voice in Grub Street

As both a treatment for venereal disease and a pulpit for a dissenting preacher, the figure of the tub is used to equate personal, bodily ailment with popular religious speech. Nowhere in the *Tale* is this more extravagantly laid out than in its explication of the *Aeolists* (Sect. VIII). The editors of the Cambridge edition explain that the term *Aeolist* relies on depictions of *Aeolus,* the god of winds: Rabelais refers to the winds given to Ulysses as a "rousing fart"; Henry More equates flatulence with enthusiasm with a reference to *Aeolus*; and Charles Cotton also writes on Aeolus and flatulence (417, n.1). The suggestion from this tradition is that religious enthusiasm is excrement, a bodily function rather than religious insight. In addition to this image, and the amplification that the tub's barrel shape adds to this flatulence, the tub's simultaneous connotation with a vessel used to treat venereal disease further layers sexual activity and disease to conflate the body and the spiritual again—equating sexual ecstasy with spiritual inspiration. The same logic used to justify the significance of "wind" is also used to justify the three oratorical machines: the pulpit, ladder, and stage-itinerant are considered important because of their height (and, therefore, their moral high-ground); likewise, since man is the most important of God's creations, any air that comes from him is of value and importance ("Man is in highest Perfection of all created Things . . ." 99) and any air that comes from man is "*Quinta essentia"* and "of a Catholick Use upon all Emergencies of Life" (100). In Chapter Four, I examine a similar logic in *The London Spy*, where Ned Ward compares the "low" morals of the monument to its great physical height. Likewise, the image of the tub in Swift's *Tale* relies on this comparison between the functions of the body and the spirit, and the physical and the material, in order to target religious enthusiasm. Remarkably convenient as the tub is, its true usefulness lies

in its ability to hold multiple meanings together; it is at once a tool for treating sexual disease and a platform for religious speech. The tub's earlier life storing ale connects it to a tradition labelling priests as drunks, provocatively conflating the physical and the spiritual.

The figure of the pulpit positions Swift politically and signifies a specific stance against ancient models of philosophy, learning, and literary production. The Meal-Tub plot, a scheme to 'discover' Sacheverell's plot against parliament, helps to position Swift politically because this scheme too is now associated with dissenting priests and their speaking platform. Likewise, one of the most enduring images of a tub is Diogenes' use of a tub—his only possession and shelter. Ned Ward draws on Diogenes' ascetic lifestyle and the philosophy of cynicism he espouses in the preface to *The London Spy* as part of a diatribe against ancient philosophy. The tub, then, also helps identify Swift's persona as a proponent of "modern" learning who rails against classical authority.

This discussion of the role of the pulpit and tub figure in Swift's Grub Street persona sets up the conditions for the spatial strategies of satire I examine in Ned Ward and Tom Brown's work. The persona Swift adopts is particular to Grub Street, but beyond that, it models the type of personae that Ward and Brown take on for their writing, which is fundamentally linked to the immediate, material circumstances of their life in the city. Ward and Brown understand the trades and vices of the neighbourhoods they represent and use that knowledge in their arguments. They use the collective understanding of these places as an authority against which a satiric target can be measured. They can easily adopt, mimic, and parody a range of political and religious opinions *because* the metropolis is politically and religiously diverse and they are immersed in its diversity; and, most importantly, they express this knowledge of faction and difference by drawing boundaries that communicate that difference within the social hierarchies

that structure political and religious life. Grub Street hacks not only define, individually and collectively, the boundaries of their community of professional writers, but also the political and religious communities they write for. The personae that Ned Ward and Tom Brown adopt rely on their knowledge of the city, using its spaces to direct attention to the places people occupy as evidence and to draw boundaries around groups within the city. In other words, the boundaries of Grub Street that Swift alludes to are a functional part of Ward and Brown's rhetorical strategies and of their identity as suburban writers.

Satire of Westminster: The Tory Personae of Ned Ward and Tom Brown

I have argued that Swift's *Tale* draws from representations of the pulpit by Ned Ward and Tom Brown and that alongside his satire of Grub Street there is sympathy with the Tory views of these writers, who are living and writing in Grub Street but are critical of its ethos and of the dissenting religious groups associated with it. My discussion of Ward's work in Chapter 3 will take up the Tory position on the literary marketplace and the public sphere in more detail. Here, I discuss Brown and Ward's position as Tory writers in Grub Street by looking at how they represent Westminster. Their satire of Westminster Abbey targets "vain" poets that overshadow the monarchy and the abbey itself. In this way, their satire of Westminster argues that public spaces should reflect the authority of the monarchy and church, not individual achievements. These accounts focus on Westminster, but in later chapters I will build from the principles here as Ward's satire targets the use of public funds in London, which his work suggests should benefit the people who live in the community rather than enriching those who build the projects. Likewise, where in these accounts the argument is that symbolic monuments should hold those in power to account and keep them honest, Ward's later satire targets monuments without this purpose, suggesting they, too, are vain and corrupt projects. The arguments in this satire of

Westminster are playful, but at the heart of this writing there is a sincere belief that public structures should have a direct benefit to their community and reflect communal values, morals, and beliefs. This satire of Westminster also represents the way Ward and Brown's work focuses on events leading to Charles II's Restoration in 1660, targeting republican activity during the English Civil War. This motivation is an important foundation for the way Tom Brown attack's Dryden's religion and for the way Ned Ward uses Jamaica, which the English took from Spain in 1655 during the Commonwealth, to launch a career-long attack on London's Whig-dominated trade.

The accounts of Westminster by Ward and Brown are among many influential accounts that shaped the work of Scriblerian authors of the early eighteenth century. Benjamin Boyce, the author of Tom Brown's biography, writes of the "Two Debts for Tom Brown, With a Credit From Joseph Addison." One of these debts in Addison's work is to Ward and Brown's accounts of Westminster, which was later used by Goldsmith as well. Boyce settles on conclusive evidence that Brown's work was influential in these later accounts of the Abbey:

> It is possible that any visitor in the early eighteenth century would have been struck by the same features. However, there is sufficient evidence in this essay and in The Spectator No. 26 together to make one believe that although Addison saw the Abbey with his own eyes, it was the "ingenious droll," "Tom Brown of Facetious Memory," who served as guide. (269)

Brown's widely copied account of Westminster in *A Walk through London and Westminster* (1715) was possibly the result of a collaboration with Ward, and it criticizes the vanity of large memorial stones in Westminster Abbey, one of which now bears Brown's name. Addison used the work of Ward and Brown, and Antony Pollock asserts that he also made it polite and

accessible to a larger audience. Because Ward and Brown are not polite, they write with an immediacy and urgency that brings their audience alongside them, expressing their view of the city as something that felt and experienced in the places they visit. They do not restrain themselves in their political stance, and they are not concerned with offending readers who would see themselves in the things they criticize. Ned Ward's account of Westminster and the surrounding area helps to illustrate his Tory politics and the way architecture contributes to my concept of "spatial morality." Tom Brown's account of Westminster Abbey introduces the problem of literary fame from a Tory perspective. Tom Brown's grave site, and the inscription planned for him, offer an alternative model for thinking about literary history from based on Ward and Brown's careers.

Tom Brown targets Westminster twice in his *Works*: in *Amusements Serious and Comical* he visits Westminster Hall, and in *A Walk through London and Westminster* he visits the Abbey. Ned Ward visits the area around Westminster in *The London Spy* as well. These visits to Westminster Hall are excellent examples of the way Tom Brown and Ned Ward use the rhetoric of buildings and monuments as part of their satire. The rhetoric of these structures is used to make a moral argument in their satire without making ad hominem attacks against their opponents. I consider these examples from the perspective of my concept of spatial morality: the embodied experience of these spaces, their accounts of human failings in these places, is how the moral lessons are communicated.

Westminster Hall is filled with contradictions: it is a "Magnificent Building" but the men inside carry "Baubles and Toys; it is "open to all the world" but "in a manner is shut up, by the prodigious concourse of People who crowd and sweat to get in or out" (*Amusements, 43*) The magnificence of the building is undermined by the "pettyfogging" that goes on inside its shops

(*Amusements,* 43). These contradictions are a simple irony with high stakes: the grandeur of Westminster Hall is used for such low and petty activities, and this is worth observing, but to a Tory author, the fact that state buildings are being misused and degraded is political and more broadly symptomatic of social disorder. Because the buildings are so accessible, their grandeur so familiar and widely understood, the contradictions in their use are undeniable. To this initial hook, Brown adds that the judges within the courts at Westminster-Hall "now and then take as comfortable a Nap on the Bench, as if he were at Church" (45). Not only is the Hall filled with the trivial shops and hordes of people, but the building's function as a court is also undermined by the somnolent judges. Although he at first passes this off as a difference between ancient and modern judges, Brown eventually gives the impression that the judge is so overwhelmed and indecisive that he falls asleep (45). From napping in church to napping on the Bench, human failings undermine the grandeur of the places where these actions occur, which is the central irony of this satire. Brown's satire of Westminster Hall relies on exposing the simple, fallible humanity of the activities that occur inside such a grand structure. Brown's account does not offer a critique of the court itself. Rather, he shows that the realities of the judicial system fail to live up to the ideal. In Brown's formulation, the ideal is self-evident in the architecture of the building, while the realities are there for all to see by walking through and observing the activity within. In Brown's embodied model of satire, the building's architecture stands for the ideal, while the human activity and failings within are the target of his satire. For Brown, architecture of the state is an ideal that is constantly subverted and under attack by the lived reality of how its space is used as a marketplace.

In his account of the area surrounding Westminster, in *The London Spy*, Ned Ward brings attention to injustice and vice associated with the courts at Westminster in an observation about a

broken clock tower at Westminster Hall. Here, as in so much of *The London Spy,* Ward targets actions during the Civil War and Commonwealth administration against the Anglican churches:

> There's nothing . . . concerns me more, than to see any piece of Antiquity Demolish'd. It always puts me in mind of the Ignoble Actions of the Sanctified Rebels in the late Domestick Troubles, who made it their Business to deface Old Images" (186-7).

"Old Images" refers to the Revolutionary army's occupation of Churches and destruction of "Popish" religious symbols during the English Civil War. The spy's friend takes issue with the defacement of what the clock tower stood for and the social role it played: the Bell is said to have been made with funds from a fine levied on a judge who took bribes (187). Ward refers to Ralph de Hengham (d. 1311), a Chief Justice who was fined 10,000 marks for misconduct (Brand "Hengham, Ralph). The fine went toward the construction of a clock tower at Westminster (Brand "Hengham, Ralph"). The bell from this clock tower was a constant reminder that corruption in the courts would be punished; now that it is destroyed, Whitehall can no longer hear the bell or its warning. By drawing attention to the rubble of this clock tower, Ward's satire effectively takes the place of that reminder, calling out the corruption he sees by appealing to the tower that used to be there for that purpose. In other words, literary authorship takes on this role as a defender of the tower's authority and the moral lesson it stood for, upholding the tower's rhetoric after its destruction at the hands of Civil War armies. By targeting the Revolutionary army's occupation of churches and destruction of religious symbols during the war, Ward's satire is a defense of the state even though the tower was criticizing a corrupt legal system. This dissertation draws attention to the skillful maneuvering in Ned Ward's work to consider the role of these Tory satirists in the context of their print culture. As part of his role in Grub Street, Ward is part of the print trade but critical of it. When it comes to matters of the state, he fiercely

defends the authority of the state, but is critical of any corruption or misuse of power. In his writing about London, he defends his own business and the honest trade of others but is critical of all trade that is self-serving or deceptive. In other words, his work is a fine balance of his politics and the moral role of a satirist who targets human vices and failings on an individual and institutional level.

Tom Brown's description of Westminster Abbey is much like the account of Westminster Hall I already discussed: just as the baubles and trivial shops detracted from the grand purpose of Westminster Hall, the Abbey is filled with graves, which Brown says are signs of the "foolish Vanity of Men, in extending their Folly beyond this Life" (312). The monuments of Westminster Abbey have slowly superseded the monuments of the monarchy. The gravestones are signs of pride that continues after death, suggesting that the role of the author is not to be self-aggrandizing. In this way, the reputation and status of the author has moral implications; authors' reputations are not considered based on their achievement or merit, but judged by their actions:

> *Pride*, that was their Vice while living, will not forsake them in the Grave, they making that the lasting Monument of it. Flattering Inscriptions and Marble Monuments they have Refuge to, when they want Soul to recommend themselves to Posterity by their good and generous Actions. (312)

The monuments are a symbol of pride because they exaggerate and compensate in death for status and moral actions during life. Brown contrasts Cowley's literary reputation with the inscription on his gravestone, which was erected by George Villiers, the Duke of Buckingham (Lindsay, "Cowley, Abraham (1618-1667)). Cowley's inscription is of "equal truth" to his monument, "for he was no more the *Horace, Virgil, Ovid, &c. of England,* than the Monument was of his Grace of Buck's erecting, at least paying for" (313). Because Cowley's grave

exaggerates his fame and his wealth, it is not only detracting from those of the monarchy, but also a false representation of his achievements and status. Behind Brown's observation is a Tory defense of the monarchy and a class system resistant to someone like Cowley getting more credit than his station would allow.

Brown exaggerates the distinction between these vain and overstated gravestones, comparing them to the monarchs', which are less prominent and less decorated than those of poets: "here we see Kings, after their Death, cloth'd like Vagrants; and all their Pomp and Grandeur confin'd to a Rag and a Cupboard" (316). If Brown is appalled at the difference between how the kings and poets are treated, outraged at the simplicity of the kings' graves, what does this mean for his own position as an author?

Brown's account of Westminster Abbey raises the question of whether he benefits from how the literary profession is so highly regarded. Given the circumstances of his own burial, on the other hand, I argue that his work advocates for a modest and collective view of authorship and literary legacies. Brown's own interment, and the epitaph written for him after his death, both point to an understated view of literary legacy: Brown was buried in the cloisters in a grave that bears only his name and the year of his death. There was an equally understated epitaph planned, written by Dr. James Drake, who paid for Brown's burial, but the engraving was not carried out. Compared to the high praise given to Abraham Cowley, which Brown detests as inflating his legacy and fortune, the epitaph planned for Brown was understated and humble. It modestly says he "yielded no small genius," and had "little help from Fortune" in life. [5] It acknowledges that he ran from creditors, wrote poetry that critics found offensive, and that the subjects of his writing were "trivial." All this, it says, "suited his nature," but, "he wrote not for

[5] All quotations are my own translation. See Appendix II

approval, but with impunity." Importantly, it expresses a wish that he "rest with those he celebrated" (*inter concelebres resquies[t]cat*) and does not mention poets specifically. Instead, it refers to all who were buried in the Abbey, the monarchs and the poets. This line is potentially quite provocative and may be the reason the inscription was not laid out as planned. Aphra Behn, Brown's likely lover and collaborator, is buried a few paces away from Brown's gravestone in the cloisters, and if this line hints at their relationship, it would be scandalous to have it engraved.

Ward and Brown's writing on Westminster shows how architecture can be read rhetorically in satire, which is not to take over the state's position in a vain project, like the monuments at Westminster Abbey do, but rather to come to the defense of what has been attacked and undermined. Ward takes this view when he comes to the defense of the destroyed clock tower and reasserts its moral lesson. The clock tower anticipates the way Ward's satire of London criticizes corruption and opposition to the state. In Chapter Three, the relationship between the rhetoric of architecture, monuments, and satire is part of Ned Ward's satire of the public sphere.

In the chapters that follow, the satire I discuss focuses much less on a defense of the monarchy, but the relationship that Brown's satire of Westminster sets up between the literary profession and the state is important. Brown's description of the Abbey raises questions about the way royalty is overshadowed by literary figures in the Abbey, and the circumstances of his burial suggest a humble alternative mode of authorship and legacy. If individual literary fame is in opposition to the state, it opens up the possibility for another model of authorship that is not focused on individual fame or vanity.

II. Form and the Body: Tom Brown's Satire of John Dryden's Conversion

Tom Brown's entrance into the literary scene of Restoration Grub Street was a sensational attack on the Laureate, John Dryden. Brown wrote dialogues using a fictional voice of Dryden. This "Mr. Bays" was a popular parody of Dryden on the stage, but Brown's version uses an astonishing number of intertextual references to Dryden's work. Brown's Artful attention to form sets his dialogues apart from other parodies of Dryden writing. This was reputation-setting work for Brown, and it paved the way for his London rambles in *Amusements Serious and Comical* (1700) as much as it anticipated his *Letters from the Dead to the Living* (1702). The posturing involved in taking on the Laureate and the literary persona Brown adopts to criticize Dryden's conversion set the tone for the rest of his career. The persona of these dialogues is unambiguous: he speaks with masculine literary bravado and high-church Tory sympathies. The connection between male sexuality, masculinity, and public literary personae has a long history that Ray Stephanson accounts for in *The Yard of Wit: Male Creativity and Sexuality 1650-1750*. Stephanson argues that "The male body was used literally and figuratively to identify three aspects of a man's literary labour: the inner site of creativity; the process of writing and generating the text; the public entry of the author and his works into a world of homosocial and economic status" (94). Discussing Dryden's body and sexuality are part of the way Brown discusses Dryden's fall from the Laureate position and his public persona as a celebrated author. This view of the body, sexuality, and literary status is communicated through the setting of Brown's dialogues. Covent Garden is used to cast Dryden as effeminate, disloyal, changeable and hypocritical. What Joshua Broby has called Dryden's "poetics of indeterminacy," provoked outrage, sustained literary attacks, and physical violence (29). The masculine pleasures and privileges of his seat at Wills, the benefits of party loyalty and royal favour, are

the carrot held out to lead Dryden to Covent Garden from his walk in St. James Park.[6] Brown's challenge to Dryden's conversion happens on the formal level as well. Where Dryden's *The Hind and the Panther* (1687) is a pastoral allegory for religious unity, Brown's response uses the partisan fervor the dialogue form is associated with to insist on a more factious outcome. Brown's dialogues are embodied—the voices in dialogue are speaking from real places—and this embodiment works against the abstracted and pastoral context of Dryden's vision in *The Hind and the Panther*, suggesting it is a naive paradise, lost long ago. Where Dryden's *The Hind and the Panther* breaks with the dialogue tradition in its allegorical religious argument, Brown's dialogues respond by altering the dialogue form in the opposite direction, making the dialogue form more concrete and specific instead of more abstracted and disembodied, as Dryden did. On one level, Brown draws on an existing tradition of ghostly dialogues in the tradition of Lucian. This tradition is effective at making past (dead) voices speak to current political and social contexts, but Brown uses it to bring back Dryden's past opinions to confront the argument for his conversion in *The Hind and the Panther*. The voices of Brown's dialogues are embodied in the real spaces of London's suburban landscape shifts the focus from Dryden's ideas and beliefs to his body. In this way, the dialogue form and Brown's focus on Dryden's body work together: on a formal level, the way Brown uses the dialogue form is embodied and has a concrete urban setting in St. James Park and Covent Garden, compared to Dryden's allegory, which has an ethereal and ambiguous natural setting. Alongside this formal difference, the dialogues represent Dryden's body in St. James Park and Covent Garden, where he lived and worked, and this redirects the focus to Dryden's habits and actions, to where he lives and works rather than what he thinks. In other words, accusing Dryden of the crime of allegory is a formal intervention and a resistance to the strange mixture of

[6] St. James Park was a notorious haunt for prostitution. For descriptions of the park during this time, see Edmund Waller. *On St. James' Park, As Lately Improved by His Majesty.* (1661) and, of course, Wilmot, John. *A Ramble in St. James Park London*. (1680).

allegory and religious debate in *The Hind and the Panther*, but it also claims that by moving into allegory Dryden has forgotten where he is and where he speaks from. Brown's work corrects this by countering the disembodied hind with an embodied, urban "Mr. Bays" to suggest that Dryden remembers where he has been and where he lives. Brown enters the literary trade in 1688 with *The Reasons of Mr. Bayes Changing his Religion* in this way, taking on the Laureate and engaging with his work on a formal level.

Brown's influence on Joseph Addison and Lawrence Sterne was noted early in the 20th century, but he has rarely been the subject of critical engagement (Eddy, "Tom Brown and Tristram Shandy"; Thompson, "Tom Brown and Eighteenth-Century Satirists"). Pat Rogers' *Hacks and Dunces* mentions Brown twice: once for his role in the preface to Swift's *A Tale of a Tub (*where he is an "intimate friend" of the fictional author) and once to compare Brown's "journalist's camera" to Swift's "canvas for the formal *Descriptio"* (Roger Savage, "A Description of the Morning" qtd in Rogers 207). Brown's parody of Dryden attracted the attention of his biographer, Benjamin Boyce, who uses this series of pamphlets to frame the beginning of Brown's career, his allegiance to the Church of England and the Tory party (19-31). "Except *Amusements Serious and Comical* and *Letters from the Dead*" Boyce says, "nothing Brown did was better managed artistically and . . . nothing was better known" (19). Despite Brown's long-term success writing about Dryden, these dialogues have not been taken up in the critical conversations about Dryden.

Dryden's identity and public persona are important not simply because Dryden is the subject of Brown's dialogues but because Brown's work takes Dryden's writing so seriously on a formal level. Mid-twentieth-century scholarship began to consider the source and ambivalent perspective of *The Hind and the Panther*'s parable of the swallows (Anselment, Manley) Since then, there has been a renewed and sustained interest in Dryden's identity and his conversion that makes it an appropriate time to revisit

Brown's dialogues. Ten years after Molly Murray's *The Poetics of Conversion in Early Modern English Literature,* Brandon Chua reads *The Hind and the Panther's* formal incongruities as an "acknowledgement of entrenched differences" in religious belief (41). There is some disagreement about whether Dryden's conversion was politically motivated or based on personal convictions. Geremy Carnes argues that Dryden "lacked any doctrinal convictions and perhaps even embraced deistical views" ("Tyrannick Faith" 36). Philip Harth considers Dryden's skeptical thought and suggests that Dryden's thought is Pyrrhonist and anti-rationalist (1-2). From this position, he argues that *The Hind and the Panther* is a sincere change based on Dryden's "intellectual conviction" about the authority of the Catholic Church (*Contexts of Dryden's Thought* 227). James Winn agrees, calling Dryden's conversion a "hard-earned personal conviction . . . reached at the end of a process of soul-searching stretching over at least four years" (415). Winn also challenges the assumption that Dryden converted for political gain by pointing out that Dryden's support from James was tempered by the influence of his patron, Rochester, who avoided taking communion with James and remained Anglican (*John Dryden and His World*, 413). Like Winn, Harth disagrees with Donald Benson's claim that Dryden's conversion was a response to political shifts and changing policies in the Established Church (412); however, Stephen Zwicker has also argued that Dryden prioritized political service to the king by defending James II's Declaration of Indulgence (*Politics and Language* 123). Since Tom Brown's dialogues are motivated and concerned with Dryden's identity and reputation, Brown's work speaks to the fact that this is not a new preoccupation and Dryden's life—especially his political and religious views—have always provoked questions about his identity. Most recently, Horowitz's "Partisan Bodies: John Dryden, Jacobite Camp, and the Queering of 1688" offers a reading of a "queer Dryden" that builds a case for the ways in which Dryden's multiple voices and identities throughout his career meant that he was treated as queer throughout his life. In addition to Steven Zwicker's extensive work on Dryden, there is a large

body of work devoted to *The Hind and the Panther.* The work most relevant to Brown's dialogues on Dryden is Steven Zwicker's "Why are They Saying These Terrible Things about John Dryden? The Uses of Gossip and Scandal," in which Zwicker argues that gossip and rumours about Dryden aids our understanding of the "fears and anxieties" provoked by Dryden's conversion (176). Zwicker argues gossip about Dryden in Roger Morrice's diary are "striking evidence of Dryden's visibility, and then of the importance of conversion to what we might call public opinion or an emergent public sphere in the age of James II's rule" (166). Most importantly, Zwicker hints at what was so objectionable for those who participated in speculation and gossip about Dryden's conversion: "Politics, religion, and language—these formed the matrix where identity was constituted, and it was these idioms that Dryden treated as if they might be subject to steady revision" (174). Most critics agree that Dryden's conversion was not good for him politically. That "Catholicism had forced him out of his laureateship and the circles of public authority monopolized by the Church of England," as Carnes argues, is perhaps the most relevant part of Dryden's conversion to Tom Brown's dialogues ("Catholic Conversion" 5). Brown's dialogues question Dryden's conversion on these grounds, arguing that the laureate is more important than Dryden's personal beliefs and opinions about church doctrine.

Tom Brown's three-part pamphlet dialogue series is a labyrinth of intertextuality, which in its form and inspiration combines Dryden's work (*The Hind and the Panther* (1687) and *Essay on Dramatic Poesie* (1688)), plays responding to Dryden (*The Rehearsal* (1672) and *The Hind and the Panther Transvers'd to the Story of The Country-Mouse and the City-Mouse* (1687)), and early successes of Brown's (*Amusements Serious and Comical, Dialogues from the Dead to the Living*). The dialogue form is perfectly suited to this type of parody of Dryden; its tradition provides precedent for the way this parody draws on Dryden's past writing, religious faction, and gendered stereotypes of Catholicism. Moreover, each strategy has a history within the dialogue form through ghostly "dialogues

of the dead," argumentative dialogues between factions, and marriage dialogues. At the same time, these pamphlets diverge from the dialogue tradition in their material focus on specific spaces in the city and on Dryden's body. Specific spatial references and bodily presence are as unexpected for the dialogue form as the moral and theological reflections in Dryden's *The Hind and the Panther* were. Dryden's *The Hind and the Panther* was widely criticized for conflating religious allegory in its poetic form. The relationship between these two exceptionalities is critical. The offending theological and moral excess, and the religious tolerance and oblique allegory of Dryden's poem are countered by a familiar and recognizable material specificity, as if this new representation of Dryden's body in a familiar setting can undermine the abstract theological discussions and allegory of the beast fable. Further, since the target of these pamphlet dialogues is Catholicism as much as it is Dryden, the body is a satirical target because of the way it is integral to Catholic communion and the doctrine of transubstantiation. The body's importance to these pamphlets is threefold. First, they attack transubstantiation through their dialogue. Then, they ridicule Catholic celibacy as an unreasonable and unnatural constraint on priests. Finally, Dryden's body moves throughout the dialogues as Mr. Bays, who is always represented in a specific material context that parodies Dryden's conversion and absence from London's literary centre. In this way, these uses of the body are joined to the setting of the dialogues. Covent Garden's reputation for prostitution is used to ridicule celibacy. Will's Coffee house, established in 1671 at No. 1 Bow Street, was successful partly because of Dryden's frequent patronage (Sheppard, 185). Will's is used in Brown's dialogues to lure Mr. Bays back into Town. All this is done to confront his faith in recognizable places rather than through a purely abstracted conversation about religious doctrine.

The history of Covent Garden's architecture helps to explain the sexual connotations that on which Brown's dialogues rely. Covent Garden, which gets its name from a convent that existed in the area before it was sold to the Bedford estate, developed as a religious, commercial,

and literary centre. When the parish of St. Paul was created in 1635, Inigo Jones was commissioned to rebuild the church of St. Paul. After the Great Fire of 1666, Jones' goal with the design of the church was to create a modest design that suited a small parish, but the main facade, which faces the square, is much more elaborate than the churchyard and gives a stately look to what is by all accounts a modest parish church. The reason for this is because the east-facing facade that looks into the square was originally designed as the entrance, but Jones was asked to place the alter on the east part of the building and entrance had to be reconfigured (Sheppard 185-192). When the neighbourhood was laid out, Long-Acre on the northern border was isolated from the rest of the city, with no northern access out of Covent Garden. To the south was an expansive open field as well; however, the neighbourhood was quickly built up as its popularity resulted in rapid expansion.

Covent Garden was the target of reform from the 1760s through to the mid-1800s (Sheppard 57). Coffee houses were growing so fast in Covent Garden by the 1720s that homes were not allowed to be used as such in the piazza of Covent Garden. (Sheppard 83) Coffee houses were not just literary centres, however, and there are accounts of the variety of appetites which Covent Garden could satisfy. In *The London Spy,* Ward jests about Covent Garden ladies who remained respectable by telling their families they were going to St. Paul's churchyard, only to nip off to the square to work the street instead (207). Ned Ward also suggests that a beau "is as constant a Visiter of a Coffee-House, as a Drury-Lane Whore is of Covent-Garden Church" (202). The backward-facing facade of St. Paul church aids in stories of such duplicity, as if the church is turning a blind eye to the activity of the square (Sheppard 6:64-76; Charles E. Ward 143-4). These spurious aspects of Covent Garden are part of the way Eugenius and Crites parody Dryden's conversion. If Dryden is hypocritical and duplicitous in his religion, the dialogue

suggests, perhaps it is simply because that is the way things are done in Covent Garden—where, like on the stage itself, no one is what they seem or purport to be.

Covent Garden stands in for the freedom of the marketplace and the literary activity that defines this neighbourhood around the Theatre Royal on Drury Lane as a centre for trade and culture; bringing Dryden back to this haunt is the main objective of the adversaries in the dialogue, who hope to reconvert the laureate by bringing him back to Covent Garden. In fact, there is something of an obsession with Covent Garden, and Will's in particular, in Brown's work; it is a favorite target, and he parodies the discourse of Will's throughout his *Works*, especially Whig figures who frequented the coffeehouse. I will take up Ned Ward's satire of the coffeehouse and the public sphere in the next chapter, but for Tory writers in the Restoration, the coffeehouse itself suggested sexual activity, Whig journalism, and Whig-dominated trades.

Dryden faced an onslaught of criticism after *The Hind and the Panther* that continued after his death. *A Description of Mr. D—n's Funeral. A Poem*. (1700) is irreverent and rude, especially considering his status as Laureate (Salvaggio 75-91). The anonymous account of Dryden's funeral has often been falsely attributed to Brown, but, as Trolander and Tenger point out, Frank Ellis conclusively argues that it was written by John Tutchin in *Poems on Affairs of State*, since it was advertised in *The Foreigners* and later included in a list of Tutchin's publications by his publisher, Mr. Fabian. ("Criticism Against Itself" 336, n. 68; *POAS* 6:208). Dryden's stance on literary feuds and parody of his work suggest he thought little of these trivial attacks, but Boyce does cite correspondence showing Dryden was aware of Brown's attacks (*Tom Brown* 29, n 17). The preface to Dryden's *Essay on Dramatic Poesie* suggests that he paid little attention to the criticism of his work, but it also suggests that he wrote some things quickly or from a new perspective, to improve his writing: "Sometimes, like a Schollar in a Fencing-School I put forth my self, and show my own ill play, on purpose to be better taught" (5).

Brown's dialogues are untimely and insensitive, below Dryden's reprisal. Instead, *The Hind and the Panther* was topical, focused on the state of the Catholic religion under James II. Dryden concedes in the preface that the work was already out of date before it was published, since the reforms he argues for in Part III had been enacted by the time *The Hind and the Panther* was published in 1687. By 1688, the year Brown wrote the first of his dialogues, the transition of power to William and Mary was dangerous for Dryden, who as a Catholic under a new monarch was in danger of being found guilty of treason and was in no position to defend *The Hind and the Panther*. The vulnerability of this situation was the impetus for Brown's parody of Dryden. His retreat from his public seat as laureate spurred Brown's vitriol. Brown considered Dryden's conversion a betrayal (of his 'sub-literary' following and its dominant politics) and so he suggests Dryden's literary position and his religious belief is weak, effeminate, and impotent. Brown enters his literary career in opposition to Dryden's person, body, and religion, in favor of the metropolitan vigor and literary trade. The spatial logic behind the attack is rooted in a perspective that views the environs around the Drury Lane Theatre and Dryden's seat at Will's Coffee House as the centre of the literary strength and masculine community. Dryden's fame and his association with Covent Garden is the reason that Brown uses Covent Garden's reputation against the laureate in his satire.

Dialogue writing in the Restoration relies heavily on classical antecedents of the dialogue form, particularly the work of Lucian, Horace, and Juvenal. Brown's success with the form in his attack on Dryden is remarkable because of how different these dialogues are from the rest of the tradition. Other dialogue satire depicts religious factions, marriage dynamics, or the conflict between country and city life. Literary dialogues occur between two living people, or, as in the case of many early modern examples based on Lucian, between one living satiric target and a deceased ghostly voice that chastises the target for his behaviour. Set apart from these topical and purposeful dialogues are debates in

dialogue form between more abstracted competing views—religious and political debate between parties, dialogues based on tropes from married life and, even more abstracted, dialogues between the soul and body or the soul and mind. That Dryden chose to work in an allegorical form of dialogue for his *The Hind and the Panther* is strange and does not fit with the form's tradition—the dialogue is not an overtly religious form. From its classical roots to its early modern tradition, dialogues are lighthearted, full of personal attacks, caricatures, and diverting resurrections of the dead to shame public figures. Dialogues were not a form used to discuss religious beliefs in earnest.

There are exceptions where the form is pastoral and moralized, but it is not until Elizabeth Rowe's dialogues later in the eighteenth century that there is such an expressly moral purpose to reform and instruct the reader in the dialogue form. There is an affinity between Dryden's *The Hind and the Panther* and Rowe's dialogues in her 1746 *Poems*. Although Dryden's attempt to discuss religion in a pastoral setting, as a dialogue, was out of place at the time, it would have found its place alongside Rowe's dialogues, which warn against the pleasures of the town and extol the virtues of a country life. In 1687, Dryden's work was completely atypical of this dialogue form.

The closest formal equivalent to Brown's dialogues in the larger dialogue tradition are dialogues meant to chastise the living with the words of the dead. This form has a long tradition based on Lucian's work. Dialogues in this vein were adapted to contemporary politics throughout the Restoration and eighteenth century. Fontanelle's *New Dialogues of the Dead* appears in an English translation in 1683, and earlier imitations of this genre existed as well. The persistence of the genre into the eighteenth century illustrates the genre's popularity and success. Its versatility is illustrated most clearly by the success of Elizabeth Rowe's *Friendship in Death; in twenty letters from the dead to the living* (1750), which was written well before the *Dialogues of the Dead* by George Littleton (1760, 1768) and Thomas Francklin's *The Works of Lucian* (1780, 1781). Rowe's work is distinguished by its explicit aim to effect

the moral education of her readership—the stated goal in her preface is “to impress the Notion of the Soul's Immortality” on the reader (i). Rowe is also exceptional in that she uses the genre to describe the afterlife and distant planets similar to the earliest influences on science fiction, like Bergerac’s *Histoire Comique: contenant les états et empires de la Lune.* (1657) and its eighteenth-century English translations by David Russen (1703) and Samuel Derrick (1757). One of the earliest English examples in this genre was Tom Brown's *Letters from the Dead to the Living* (1702).

The ‘dialogues of the dead’ form traditionally deals both with metaphysical and bodily concerns. There are a number of dialogues between the soul and the body that struggle with the concept of materiality. Margaret Cavendish's *A Dialogue betwixt the Body, and the Mind,* Andrew Marvell's *Dialogue between the Soul and the Body*, and other examples of the theme wrestle with the relationship between the immaterial and material aspects of human existence (rational, emotional, spiritual, etc.) from a range of religious and secular perspectives.

Brown continued to sell dialogues after his initial success with the genre, and the publication of his series of dialogues critiquing Dryden is part of a transition from the disembodied voices of the dialogue tradition to one where the voices in dialogue have a concrete materiality and an identifiable context. The spatial context is a central part of the critique of Mr. Bays. The speaking context is specific to St. James Park and Covent Garden, which provides Brown’s readers with a familiar reference point from which to navigate the action and the critique of the dialogue. The neighbourhood, Covent Garden in this case, informs and guides the reader through the dialogue, so that the context of Covent Garden and the associations it brings with it, its “character,” is a central part of Brown’s critique of Dryden's religious conversion.

Dryden’s Form

Tom Brown’s dialogues on Dryden’s conversion draw on the earlier traditions of the dialogue

form, but they are exceptional for the attention paid to Dryden's work and person. Brown incorporates Dryden's work, references his previous writing, and represents Dryden's body in Covent Garden once again. The dialogue relies on the activity within Covent Garden—literary, religious, and sexual—to frame the theological arguments against Dryden's Catholic faith. The archetypal figures Crites and Eugenius discuss Dryden's position on poetry from his *Essay of Dramatic Poesie*. Drawing on the tradition of ghostly dialogues, Crites and Eugenius are resurrected in Brown's dialogues to confront Dryden.

Two important aspects of the dialogue come into play in the way Brown uses the form: as a writer of ghostly *Dialogues from the dead to the living*, which by tradition uses an authority figure from the past to shame the religious or political situation in the present, Brown adapts the form in his dialogues of Dryden to shame the new, Catholic Dryden by putting him in dialogue with "old Dryden," or Dryden's ghost, a sort of memory of Dryden's public literary persona in his seat at Will's Coffee House; the characters speaking to Mr. Bays are voices from his past literary work—Crites and Eugenious. Alongside this reworking of the dialogue form, the material context of Brown's dialogue is significant for the way Mr. Bays is represented: his body's movement back to Covent Garden makes the attempt to re-convert Mr. Bays concrete and material. The dialogue relies on *where* Mr. Bays is to communicate the design toward his re-conversion.

Tom Brown's claims for the character of Covent Garden are part of his critique of Dryden's religion and morality. The most direct parallel is Crites' comment that the phrase "I come as a thief" is apt at a prison, but not in Covent Garden: "Just as you know, Mr. Bays, the Venio Sicut Fur is a very pat and agreeable Thought on the Dial at Newgate, but wou'd lose very much of its Poignancy, if it were removed to the Pillar in Covent Garden" (101). In other words, these places have a specific character and reputation that suits some activities and some phrases, but not others. Brown's dialogues explicitly

call attention to this to contextualize the conversation with Mr Bays. Crites's jests at the nature of labour at Newgate and in Covent Garden, one penal and one sexual, underscores that the move from St. James' Park to Covent Garden is central both to the critique of Dryden's character and to its moral arguments about Dryden and Covent Garden.

To illustrate Dryden's familiarity with the area, Mr. Bays part of the dialogue shows how well he knows the way things are done in Covent Garden. His knowledge is important, because it frames him as part of the neighbourhood. Covent Garden, likewise, is part of his identity that he cannot escape. Mr Bays' knowledge relates to the habits of literary speech and conversation. In one example of this, Mr. Bays comments on the way arguments are made in Covent Garden:

> ...you are to be informed, that 'tis a pretty new way of Disputing we have got at this End of Town; for a person to suppose that the person he disputes with, will raise such and such Objections to the Matter in Hand, and then for this person to answer 'em himself. (109).

In this way, Brown generalizes Dryden's habit of adopting and trying out other arguments, extending this to all of Covent Garden. Appealing to the character of Covent Garden and to the type of arguments and discussions that happen at Will's Coffee House is Brown's attempt to remind Dryden of his past and his literary career, which is perhaps the easiest route for criticism of his conversion. Mr. Bays' companions attack Mr. Bays for his poetic past and for simple contradictions between his past work and his present arguments for the Catholic faith. Crites' argument is that when Mr. Bays advocates for a more "rigorous" faith via poetry he is being hypocritical and engaging in an unnatural literary practise:

> I must confess, Mr. Bays, it looks as odd for a Poet to be angry with any Religion, because it is not guilty of Rigour, and Severity, as for a Bawd to quarrel with the

> Government of London because it does not Hang, Draw and Quarter all People that have committed Fornication: Such an Objection from a Poet is altogether as unnatural, as it wou'd be for an Atheist to find fault with the Translation of Lucretius; or for a Parson, that carries Three Steeples in his Pocket, to condemn the Church for allowing of Pluralities. (158)

In simple terms, poets benefit from print culture that allows for the publication of a wide range of ideas and perspectives. They participate in and rely on the intellectual and moral leniency that allows for the publication of their poems. In Crites' view, Mr. Bays' religious change is antithetical to his literary position and the interests of the literary profession. Crites' argument also aligns the profession of a poet with that of a whore and a parson with multiple congregations in a not-so subtle attempt to remind Dryden of the many roles he and other poets play in their trade.

Brown takes Dryden's *The Hind and the Panther* seriously by paying attention to the particularities of its arguments on points of theology and addressing them in some detail in his dialogue. Covent Garden—its character and connection to Dryden's literary career as an iconic centre of literary activity—is central to the case against Dryden. It is also connected to the theological arguments, especially the issue of chastity among religious leaders. It is natural that chastity should be discussed and mocked so explicitly in Will's Coffee house, and that is the point. Brown takes Mr. Bays to Will's to remind him of what he used to know and practise there.

Covent Garden is at the centre of Tom Brown's dialogue satire, and it is often the target of Ward and Brown's satire; references to Will's Coffee house, especially, are used to target Whig writers. However, In Brown's satires of Dryden, Covent Garden also seems to stand in for the freedom of the literary activity that defined this neighbourhood around the Theatre Royal on

Drury Lane and bringing Dryden back to this haunt is the main objective of the *adversarii* of the dialogue, Crites and Eugenius. But Brown's use of Covent Garden precedes this series of dialogues on Dryden. In his *Dialogues of the Dead*, Covent Garden is important to his "Letter from Jo. Hains to his friends at Will's Coffeehouse in Covent Garden" and the subsequent answer to that letter; and though the letters from classical authors to modern figures place less importance on the city, many more examples are immediately set in the context of Covent Garden and explicitly marked as such in the short titles: the letters from Beau Norton to his Brothers at Hippolito's in Covent Garden; Mr. Dryden to the Lord D---; A letter from Abraham Cowley to the Covent Garden Society; Certamen Epistolare, between an Attorney of Clifford's-Inn and a dead Parson; and three letters from Sir Giusippe Hanesio to his Friend at Will's Coffeehouse in Covent Garden. In the letters between members of the Calves-head-Club too, which draw on the successful accounts of their activities and songs that were popular at the same time as Brown's Letters, also contain references to the physical club, not an association of people. Brown was consistently targeting Covent Garden's literary society as part of his satire.

Brown's brand of dialogue satire relies heavily on place to identify people and professions, to bring the reader in by promising an account of the intrigue of Covent Garden, and for more political ends to reveal the secrets of the Calves'-Head-Club, a Whig society. Brown's use of this genre carries over into his dialogues on Dryden's conversion. The dialogue itself relies on his experience with these letters by referencing Dryden's literary success in his *Essay of Dramatic Poesie* (1688) and *Annus Mirabilis* (1667). With regard to form, the dialogue of Brown's satire on Dryden is also closer to the theatrical dialogue of the stage and classical models of dialogue than the previous dialogues in letters, both of which are important to the critique of Dryden's conversion because of the way the form suggests Dryden's past as well as a

classical heritage. The resulting message of Brown's satire is clear: Dryden should return to the stage.

Dryden's *The Hind and the Panther* conducts a theological argument in a pastoral setting, and the rigorous discussion of theological tenets resists the short-sighted feuding so common in religious dialogue poems and broadside attacks on religious groups. This temporary dichotomy—or fantasy, perhaps, of a peaceful life free of religious discord and the chaos of the metropolis—may help explain some of the intense pushback Dryden's work receives, but more importantly for this argument, it illustrates the distance between Dryden's vision in *The Hind and the Panther* and Tom Brown. If Brown's criticism of Dryden is an attempt to ridicule Dryden for his Catholic faith, it is also a defense of the activities of Covent Garden and its importance to literary culture. This is the place where Dryden lived and worked, so integral to his career and to the literary aspirations of the upstarts like Brown. By setting the dialogues here, the neighbourhood has a purpose in the dialogues: to show Dryden's new religion to be at odds with his position as Laureate.

"Mr. Bays" was used throughout the Restoration as a literary caricature of Dryden. After Dryden's attack on Shaftsbury in *The Medal* (1682), a number of responses to Dryden were written in the tradition of *The Rehersal* (1671), where the George Villiers, Second Duke of Buckingham first used Dryden as the basis for his Mr. Bays. "Bays" is a reference to the laurels and the poet laureate, which Dryden held from April 13, 1668 until 1688, when he lost his laureateship after William and Mary took the throne (Hammond, ODNB). Mr. Bays became a type of stock character in a prolific tradition of attacks against Dryden.

After Dryden's conversion to Catholicism and the publication of *The Hind and the Panther* (1687), Brown's parody started in 1688 with *The Reasons of Mr. Bays Changing his*

Religion, but it continued until after Dryden's death, where it resurfaced in Brown's 1704 collection of dialogues. The first dialogue in that final collection, *A Dialogue in St. James Park,* follows Dryden from St. James Park to Covent Garden.[7] *A Dialogue in Will's Coffee-House* picks up where the first dialogue left off, and it is an incredibly detailed examination of points of theology in dialogue with Mr. Bays' companions. In *A Conversation between Mr. Bays and Mr. Haynes,* Mr. Bays discusses the reasons for his conversion and the conversation is more personal than argumentative.

Tom Brown represents Dryden's public persona as weakened and emasculated after his conversion to Catholicism, and I argue that the movement and status of Dryden's body is central to the way his conversion is parodied. Although I deal with one particular body—John Dryden's—and one particular neighbourhood within London's metropolis—Covent Garden, I argue from the perspective that bodies and cities are mutually constitutive. There is much interest in Dryden's body while he holds his position as a playwright and laureate, and his position and status are defined by where he is within the metropolis.[8] Dryden's role in literary culture is parodied with both a fictional literary voice and a physical presence in the Town. The parody of Dryden's conversion brings Dryden back to his position at Will's Coffeehouse and attempts to retell the story of his public position while insisting that Dryden's religious conversion is aired and legitimized in Covent Garden. Dryden's conversion was discussed publicly; however, this fictional challenge to his conversion resists his conversion by placing Dryden back in his public

---

[7]This first dialogue has a long publication history. It first appeared as *The Reasons of Mr. Bayes Changing his Religion* (1688 and 1691), which was later published as *The Late Converts Exposed: or The Reasons for Mr. Bayes Changing his Religion. Considered in Dialogue* (1690) and finally, in the 1704 collection, as *A Dialogue in St. James Park* (1701).

[8] The view that bodies make up the organization of cities, and, conversely, that cities define and prescribe the ways in which bodies move and act within them, has been used to discuss historical inadequacies of this relationship and to imagine the future of urban centres (Grosz, 31-33). Roy Porter's social history of eighteenth-century London makes this point as it tells the story of how London's disorganized inhabitants occupy its crooked lanes and sprawling development (*London*, 7-8).

seat to interrogate his personal religious views. Thus, I discuss the ways in which the cult of Dryden's presence at Will's coffeehouse was disrupted by Dryden's conversion and, through parody of his work, reasserted in a conservative impulse through Tom Brown's literary imagination to bring Dryden back in line with the character of Covent Garden. In this way, Brown's dialogue represents the laureate once again as he used to be.

I have argued that the dialogue satire form is important to this reading, and beyond his attention to that form, Tom Brown's dialogues show evidence of thoughtful consideration and a thorough understanding of Dryden's works, such that, considered together, they are more thoughtfully constructed than might be expected for such topical and arguably predatory satire, which takes advantage of popular criticism of Dryden's conversion and of the recent loss of his laureateship. As such, it is not simply personal satire aimed at Dryden that fuels the series of dialogues, since there is also a structured criticism and imitation of Dryden's work, which is used to criticize Dryden's conversion. From Brown's perspective, taking Dryden's work seriously is necessary, not only professionally–his dialogues would not be taken seriously if he didn't understand Dryden's work—but also because Dryden's poem necessitates a careful reading and a knowledge of the surrounding events. The conversations within Brown's dialogues demonstrate his understanding of Dryden's: they closely answer and imitate the original. Additionally, the structure of Brown's series of dialogues follows that of *The Hind and the Panther* and models its critique of Dryden's work; the dialogues also correct and avoid the problems with Dryden's original by moving from allegory to a concrete and embodied. Brown's attention to Dryden's work in this series of dialogues extends beyond *The Hind and the Panther* to include aspects of Dryden's *Essay of Dramatic Poesie* (1688). Crites and Eugenius are taken from Dryden's use of these rhetorical characters and employed by Brown in a similar fashion to show how Dryden

used them earlier. They are also used to turn the tables by appropriating the voice of these commonly used dialogue characters.

Thus, Tom Brown's dialogues on John Dryden parody the form of Dryden's *The Hind and the Panther* and appropriate the voices from his *Essay of Dramatic Poetry.* Brown's motivation for such an attack is not clear; although Dryden's conversion to Catholicism made him an easy and acceptable target, the extent of Brown's parody and his investment in Dryden's argument suggest this was not a thoughtless personal attack, but rather a sort of defense of Dryden's literary production from those who admired him as laureate. How is this possible? Brown's parody of Dryden goes far beyond a parody of the form of *The Hind and the Panther* and the dialogue of his *Essay.* Brown extensively parodies the argument and uses material strategies of satire to refute Dryden's religious conversion. These material strategies, scatological humor and the spatial movement of Dryden's body from St. James' Park to Will's Coffee House are conservative and prohibitive: Dryden is not allowed to change his religious belief or move from his station as Laureate and his seat at Will's. Although Brown's description of Dryden's funeral is irreverent, it also demonstrates a celebration of his life and literary career in a manner usually reserved for royalty and nobility. I consider Brown's insistence on Dryden's literary identity over his religious changeability to be part of an overall conservative strategy. This strategy uses Dryden's past to restore him to his previous arguments, his seat at Will's, and his past religious belief; however, it also insists on masculine, two-party oppositional politics. Mr. Bays' return to Will's is also supposed to mean his entrance into political debate, and, if Brown would have his way, a commitment to the Tory cause. Thus, this parody of Dryden involves attention to the formal aspects of Dryden's *The Hind and the Panther* as well as an embodied

critique where the movement of Dryden's body to Will's suggests a change to his political and religious positions.

On parody of Dryden's *Absalom and Achitophel,* Robert Mack suggests that,

> Whereas Dryden's own parodic method revels in the options of poetic and imaginative choice—the multiplicity of meaning—the decidedly second-rate parodists of Dryden's satire insist on flattening the poem out, on crushing that distance for the sake of an uncompromised, two-dimensional, party polemic (158).

When parody of Dryden is politically and personally motivated, it can also be reductive of Dryden's exceptional ability to deftly inhabit multiple voices to two-sided party factions and vitriolic feuding. Brown's dialogues are not two-dimensional, and his writing is not simply Tory propaganda. He engages with Dryden's writing on a formal level and uses the laureate as an example of the importance of the literary profession. For Brown, the laureate, and the authority it carries, are far more important than Dryden's religious beliefs. But his argument clearly takes *The Hind and the Panther* more seriously than such simple attacks may seem to suggest, even though it reverts to an attempt to reassert the boundaries and binaries of political faction through debate about religious doctrine and by shaming Dryden's conversion. And while reducing Dryden's position to extremes is an effective—though simple-minded—refutation of the "middle way" that Stephen Zwicker describes as a "camouflage of conventional rhetoric," Brown's parody raises further questions relating to representations of Dryden's body (*Politics and Language in Dryden's Poetry,* 87). James Horowitz's articulation of a "queer Dryden" who erodes the binary between Whig and Tory in an increasingly polarized political era is especially relevant here. Horowitz argues that Dryden challenges two-party politics and heteronormative sexuality at once, "suggesting that compulsory heterosexuality is as limiting for human desire as

the labels of Whig and Tory are for a Jacobite" (40). The dialogues with Mr. Bays are at odds with a queer Dryden both in their attempts to align Dryden with stereotypes of Catholic celibacy and to cast him as impotent, as well as in their attempts to reassert his masculinity and restore him to his patriarchal seat at Will's Coffeehouse. In this contradictory formulation which at once casts Dryden as impotent and attempts to restore his seat, the parody of Dryden's conversion can be understood as an argument in favor of the primacy of a (masculine) literary career in the Town over what is coded as an effeminate or impotent religious and political conversion and retreat from Covent Garden.

Brown's revisionist parody of Dryden's conversion might be interpreted as reductive in light of Dryden's critique of two-party politics; however, Brown parodies Dryden's conversion using formal aspects of dialogue. This level of engagement with the form of both Dryden's older work and his conversion fable demonstrates an attempt to restore—in fiction if not in reality—a previous, public narrative of Dryden-as-laureate. The professional confidence that, from Dryden's perspective, allows him to speak the "truth," to argue according to conscience, and to take his laurels where he will—even to mass—has caused offense. What was most offensive about his conversion? There are multiple layers of dissent from established norms in this case—from the Anglican norm, his physical absence from Will's Coffee house, the political implications of the changing beliefs of the laureate—and each of these are addressed in Brown's parody through a multiplicity of forms. Brown's parody addresses Dryden's religious conversion by using against him his own words from previous writing; the dialogue form mediates the past and present, undermining Dryden's "hypocrisy" by using "old Dryden" (from his *Essay)* against the "new" (in *The Hind and the Panther*) like a ghostly dialogue. Dryden has a physical presence that moves from St. James' Park to Will's, so that where the companions take Dryden is explicitly connected to the attempts to challenge his conversion, to argue against the tenets of his new

Catholic faith, and to test his masculinity against the bravado of his companions. Further, where Dryden's *The Hind and the Panther* has a distinctly pastoral quality through its setting and allegorical animal characters, Brown's parody is metropolitan, masculine, and anti-pastoral. In this parody, Dryden's movement into Town replaces the pastoral with the suburban landscape of Covent Garden and insists that Dryden take up the literary career and politics of his past.

Dryden's Body

The ebb and flow of bodies in and out of the city is a part of Early Modern London's collective spatial organization of the city that is as essential as the Thames' tides. Criminals are taken out of the city to Tyburn to be hanged or exiled through transportation. The Lord Mayor's Parade, running from Mansion House to Westminster, symbolically links the governance of London with the Crown. In both Brown's dialogue satire of Dryden and Tutchin's description of Dryden's funeral, Dryden moves through London. *A Description of Mr. D—n's Funeral. A Poem*. (1700) exceptionally irreverent, and as and it traces the movement of Dryden's body through the city to its internment at Westminster Abbey. Dryden's movement from the city to the Abbey at Westminster is an honour that acknowledges his service as Laureate. In the dialogues, Dryden moves from St. James' Park to Will's Coffee house in Covent Garden. The implications for our understanding of Brown's dialogue are that the movement of Dryden's body shows a desire for his return to his post, a return toward the city, and a return to the Anglican faith as Dryden's companions lure him away from mass to discuss his faith. Tom Brown has an interest in Dryden as a literary figure, but there is an interest in Dryden's body (where he is and how he is physically treated by others) that pervades Brown's writing and the most irreverent criticism of Dryden.

Interest in Dryden's body is common throughout the Restoration: from parody of him on

the stage as Mr. Bays—and Mr. Hains' role in playing Mr. Bays—to Dryden's assault, to his funeral, Dryden's body is consistently and publicly discussed. Horowitz argues that the focus on Dryden's body is due to his career in the theatre, "which had given his audiences a feeling of 'public intimacy' with the poet" (28-29). Given the importance of the status of Dryden's body through his literary career and at his death, it is imperative to trace how Dryden's parodied body is made to move from St. James Park, which evokes the pastoral setting of *The Hind and the Panther*, to Covent Garden. The opening lines of *The Hind and the Panther* evoke a pastoral vision aligned with the purity and authority ascribed to the Catholic hind:

> A Milk white *Hind*, immortal and unchang'd,
> Fed on the lawns, and in the forest rang'd;
> Without unspotted, innocent within,
> She fear'd no danger, for she knew no sin. (123)

While this opening sets the stage for the purity of the pastoral ideal within which the hind will articulate her theological vision, the parody undoes this pastoral vision through a series of material strategies that are designed to replace the pastoral with the urban and suburban, the pure and innocent with the commonplace, knowing, and familiar.

Brown's dialogue paints spots on the spotless hind; it represents Mr. Bays as someone who has intimate knowledge of the city, which undermines the purity and innocence of the fable. On a formal level, this is done through a real topographical counterpoint to the imaginary setting of *The Hind and the Panther*. Walking through St. James Park, Mr. Bays checks whether the path is clear, then discusses the fate of the park rakes at the end of the world:

> Hold, — Are the Walks clear? So, —Why then, Gentlemen, to my certain
> Knowledge, the Conflagration is at hand; and 'tis impossible for the World to

> continue above Ten Years, as 'tis for a Town-Debauchee to live as long as one of the Patriarchs before the Flood. (19)

Mr. Bays' uses language of the recent fire to describe the moral state of the Metropolis, which, contrasted with the reference to the biblical flood helps explain the comparison he is making about the life-span of "Town-Debauchees" compared to the biblical ancestors. Undermining both Mr. Bays' high moral stance and the immortal, spotless hind, however, is the fact of his "certain knowledge"—suggesting that Mr. Bays may have intimate knowledge of the pleasures of St. James' Park—along with the reference to the fire, which was still recorded on The Monument to The Great Fire of London itself as being the fault of Catholics. Mr. Bays' response effectively exposes two reasons for his being there, either for worship or for pleasure, and this trap leaves Mr. Bays with little room to manoeuvre as Crites and Eugenius accost him.

Mr. Bays makes Dryden seem more knowing than innocent and pure, and his route through the town makes use of the discourses of coffeehouse culture to do so. Joanna Piccoto's *Labors of Innocence in Early Modern England,* accounts for the ways coffeehouse culture was either extolled as a Utopia where there was a social levelling and all are welcome to the knowledge within, or feared as a regression to a state of nature which would undermine social hierarchy and order (299-300). Mr. Bays' knowledge of the Town works within this dynamic and references Milton's work when he suggests a way to "correct" *Paradise Lost*, by trying to

> bestow a little good Breeding upon our First Parents, to shew them the Gallantry of a Court, and the Discipline of an Academy, to give them a turn or two in the Mall, and the Galleries at Whitehall, to entertain them with a Play in the King's Box at the Theatre, and afterwards with a fashionable Oglio at Locket's, or the Blue Pots, that so they might be prevail'd with to leave the contemptible Frugality

of feeding up-on Sallads, and shake off all that clownish Rust which they had contracted in a former Education. (46-7)

Thisre-imagining of the creation narrative, in which Adam undergoes an intellectual education mirrors sentiments about coffeehouses as a place where anyone could be privy to the news and knowledge of the day and "shake off all that clownish Rust" of antiquated ideas. In Mr. Bays' account, Adam and Eve go to ordinaries, and the theatre, and Mr. Bays unwittingly models the process as well when Eugenius and Crites attempt to reconvert him by taking him back to Will's Coffeehouse (47). The pastoral paradise of Dryden's *The Hind and the Panther* is replaced by a suburban paradise of intellectual freedom, curiosity, and knowledge-seeking, of literary activity and entertainment.

Undermining the supposed purity and innocence of Mr. Bays' walk through St. James Park and enticing him back to Covent Garden is the goal of this parody. This movement of Dryden's body from St. James Park to Covent Garden sets up both a critique along more specific theological grounds as well as a plea for his literary career. Both strategies to convince Mr. Bays are grounded in the movement of his body out of the park and into Covent Garden, and so the context of that neighbourhood becomes central to my understanding of why this parody chooses to physically move Dryden back there to confront him about his conversion.

In Dryden's work, the hind is politely convinced to talk with the panther during a walk, aided by the serene pastoral setting:

"For when the herd suffis'd did late repair
To ferny heaths, and to thei r forest lare,
She made a mannerly excuse to stay,
Proff'ring the Hind to wait her half the way:

That since the Sky was clear, an hour of talk,

Might help her to beguile the tedious walk (139).

Similar to the way Mr. Bays is surprised and convinced to walk with Cries and Eugenius in St. James park, the panther uses the occasion of a walk to discuss religion with the hind; however, rather than retiring to the forest, Mr. Bays is taken from it. In contrast to the "ferny heaths" along which the pair proceed toward a cave in this interaction, Brown's dialogue is set in the suburban landscape of the Town. Mr. Bays is lured from St. James' Park to Will's Coffeehouse in Covent Garden. This transition to a coffeehouse (rather than a watering hole) by a theatre (rather than a cave) creates a familiar material context to the transition which mirrors Dryden's fable but challenges the pastoral setting that frames the religious dialogue there. Brown's version insists on a context that foregrounds Dryden's literary career, and this fundamentally changes the possibilities of the dialogue; the successful movement of Mr. Bays' body provides a resolution to the original goal, which was to lure Mr. Bays back to Covent Garden. It opens the possibility for Mr Bays' more permanent return to Covent Garden, physically in his seat at Wills, but also, presumably, in an intellectual and spiritual sense as well, toward the political and spiritual beliefs he once held.

The importance of Dryden's body within the context of this parody is that it serves as a concrete material reality in comparison to the beast fable. *The Hind and the Panther* puts the discussion of Dryden's conversion back into recognizable London environs that are filled with the literary activity and history of Dryden's career, which is part of the strategy of this parody. Brown's first dialogue criticizes the fact that the metaphor is not sustained through *The Hind and the Panther* and opts instead to make his own dialogue concrete by using Dryden's own voice in the character of Mr. Bays. As in the first part of Dryden's poem, Dryden's companions lead him

to their own watering hole as they take him to Covent Garden. Dryden was also criticized for discussing points of theology in verse instead of in prose, so in this parody the theological dialogue is largely written in prose. Through this corrective formal action, the parody attempts to restore Dryden's religious position.

Theological arguments

Where Dryden's fable relies on a pastoral setting to supply the peace that allows a conversation between the beasts that would be impossible in the factious context of religious dispute in the public forum, Brown's dialogue re-situates the dialog in London and brings Dryden's body back into the context of Covent Garden and to his seat at Will's Coffeehouse. The second dialogue in Will's Coffeehouse is modelled after the second part of Dryden's *The Hind and the Panther*. One by one it takes up the points of theology and church history discussed there and answers them with contributions from Crites and Eugenius. Throughout all three dialogues, the theological arguments are spatialized by using the context and intrigue of Covent Garden to foreground the issue of celibacy and ridicule the Catholic faith, especially marriage as a sacrament.

The material context of Covent Garden, and its history as a residence and workplace of literary figures, works as a counter argument to Dryden's *The Hind and the Panther.* Covent Garden has a long tradition of literary activity. Samuel Butler lived and died on Rose Street, which also has a violent past: Dryden suffered a violent assault in December 1679 on Rose Street as he was leaving Will's Coffeehouse and heading home to his house on Long-Acre (Sheppard, 183). Bow Street became infamous for its residents, including Gringling Gibbons, William Wycherly, D. John Radcliffe, Carcellus Laroon, Sr., Dr. Humphrey Ridley, John Ayres, Lady Craven, and the proprietor of Will's Coffeehouse (Shappard, 185). Brown's second dialogue is set in Will's Coffeehouse rather than the natural retreat where the panther and the hind discuss

the finer points of their theological disagreement. Point-by-point, Brown uses this dialogue to discuss the arguments in Dryden's second part of *The Hind and the Panther.* Crites and Eugenius supply the arguments neglected by Dryden's beasts, and the character of Covent Garden becomes the organizing principle for this criticism of Dryden. The most striking and persistent example of this is that where Covent Garden is a centre for sexual labour, the recurring critique of the theological differences between Anglican and Catholic religious tenets is the point of chastity as it relates to the Catholic religion. Chastity as a religious principal for priests is attacked to criticize Dryden's conversion, undermine his masculinity, and ridicule his theological perspective on one level. On a base level, it panders to the interests of those who revel in irreverent mockery of the Catholic tradition. As the California *Works* suggests, the motivation for Dryden's thought in *The Hind and the Panther* was a desire for a "harmonious relationship of faith, reason, and sense" (334). Even as Crites and Eugenius criticize Dryden's religious belief, they have a more restorative project in mind as well, which is to correct an imbalance between these three areas (faith, reason, and sense) using Crites as a critical, rational voice and Eugenius and a more genial and grounding influence. The idea is that if Dryden, in *The Hind and the Panther*, has had a little "too much" religion after his conversion, these two companions to Mr. Bays will help sort him out and achieve some form of balance once again. Covent Garden's architecture, its association with sexual activity, and its reputation as a centre for literary figures, are all employed as part of the critique of Dryden's conversion; alongside the argument that uses the sexual reputation of Covent Garden to criticize Dryden's religion, Brown's dialogues raise questions about the role of literary professionalism, especially within the position of the laureate, and religious convictions. The argument tends toward the primacy of state religion, but also suggests that as laureate, this literary role and its authority should be more important than matters of religious doctrine. From

this perspective, the position of laureate forecloses the possibilities of private religious belief, especially when discussed in such a public way.

Recalling the background and sexual reputation of Covent Garden outlined above, I now turn to how Brown takes Dryden's *The Hind and the Panther* seriously by paying attention to the particularities of its arguments on points of theology and addressing them in some detail in his dialogue. Covent Garden—its character and connection to Dryden's literary career as an iconic centre of literary activity—is central to the case against Dryden's conversion and connected to the issue of chastity among religious leaders. Brown takes Mr. Bays to Will's to remind him of what goes on there and what his literary reputation is.

Changeability is decried as hypocrisy by Tory writers in Grub street. The favourite epithet in Ned Ward's *The London Spy* is to call someone "amphibious" for having more than one opinion or interest, or for saying one thing and doing another. In these dialogues, changeability has a religious meaning and is attacked by discussing the tenets of Dryden's new religion. Transubstantiation is the theological issue most relevant to the problem of Dryden's conversion, since the competing views on the sacrament of communion and the belief in the presence of the Holy Spirit in the Host contain a thinly veiled criticism of Dryden's religious changeability:

> Dumb you were born indeed, but thinking long,
> The *Test* it seems at last has loos'd your tongue.
> And to explain what your Forefathers meant,
> By real presence in the Sacrament,
> (After long fencing push'd against a wall,)
> Your *Salvo* comes, that he's not there at all:

There chang'd your Faith, and what may change may fall. (22)

Mr. Bays' argument is that Anglican refusal of the sacrament reveals change in religious tradition—and therefore also a weakness in the tenets of its community. This argument that change is weakness becomes a central part of the way Mr. Bays is undercut, since Dryden's religious changeability is made to show his weakness and to be a sign of a lack or lapse in reason. For Dryden too, "What may change may fall." But rather than driving this issue home explicitly, Mr. Bays' claim that he has the power to change the religious beliefs of the nation through his verse parodies a vain Dryden who claims his companions must "have then read the most Exalted, and most Sublime Piece of Poetry that was ever extant in the Universe" (96). Mr. Bays claims that his arguments are an "Unerring Guide" to the tenets of the Catholic faith and that "if this were not an Age, wherein People were resolved never to trust their Faith out of the company of their Reason, I should not question to reduce half the Kingdom in due time, only by the Sweetness and Majesty of my Verse" (96). Dryden's use of the poetic form for religious criticism and the vanity of being able to change religious opinion with literary skill is presented as a problem whereby the merit of his literary skill, not reason or faith, is supposed to be the way in which he will convert the masses. In this way, there is a problem of balance. If literature is to be formed from a balance between faith, reason, and sense, while also striking a balance between political and religious thought, *The Hind and the Panther* fails to achieve this. For Brown, Dryden is too focused on religion and faith, neglecting reason, sense, and political concerns.

The issue of the unity and peaceful union of the Catholic Church in Italy and Spain is discussed with less levity than the previous theological arguments. Dryden's claim in *The Hind and the Panthe*r that the Catholic Church has not been challenged by religious factions, andhis optimism about the Church's unifying potential in England, are challenged in Brown's dialogue

through a discussion of the ways in which the Catholic Church has violently suppressed dissent. Dryden's *The Hind and the Panther* argues explicitly in its dialogue for the Catholic Church's unity:

> One in herself not rent by schism, but sound,
> Entire, one solid shining Diamond,
> Not sparkles shatter'd into sects like you,
> One is the church, and must be to be true:
> One central principle of unity,
> As undivided, so from errours free,
> As one in faith, so one in sanctity. (154-5)

This ideal vision of a unified church is mirrored in the peaceful nature of the conversations that take place between the allegorized animals of Dryden's fable, and so along with this plea for unity comes an implicit rejection of violence along religious divisions. Zwicker suggests there are "more sharply aggressive" moments that suggest "what we have seen thus far of mildness and probity could well, and may perhaps at any moment, give way to unchecked fury" (*Politics and Language*, 137). The allegorical animals exist in harmony with each other, despite the tension of potential violence, especially between the wolf and hare on the periphery of the more intimate conversation between the hind and the panther where the religious debate takes more concrete form. In opposition to this view of unity, the parody of Dryden insists on more divisive party politics. By centring the violent suppression of dissent that is part of the history of the Catholic religion, Brown attempts to disrupt Dryden's claims and paint them as idealistic and revisionist in their history through references to the inquisition. With repeated claims of Dryden's vanity Brown goes so far as to say he "chose a Religion . . . only to confront the World that [he] had

one (96). This parody tires to undermine Dryden's fable by framing the desire for unity as an idealist dream, and Dryden's conversion as a public confrontation.

A few points of theological doctrine are taken up with a much lighter view to examining their contradictions in a more popular mode. Eugenius poses a problem by bringing up the fact that the church conferred seven sacraments to the Gospel. He jokes that matrimony is redundant next to the sacrament of penance (114). There is an inherent contradiction in arguing for the infallibility of biblical text while using short passages to serve your own purposes or to find (and/or make) parallels to religious allegories, like those used in *Absalom and Achitophel* and in later analysis of Dryden's work (120). To criticize Lent, and the fasting that takes place at that time, Brown uses Dryden's own words from *The Indian Emperor* (1665) to mock the religious fasting during Lent: "cheaply you sin, and punish each Offence, / Not with the Soul's, but Body's Abstinence; / First injure Heaven, and when its Wrath is due, / Your selves prescribe it how to punish you." (I.II, 160). What these challenges to the tenets of Dryden's new Catholic faith have in common is the way in which they use Dryden's past work to challenge his new belief. Religious allegory is proffered as contradictory to Dryden's belief in the infallibility of the Gospel. Dryden's own argument against fasting undercuts his new religious practices and beliefs by showing them to be in conflict and changeable, making Dryden out to be either hypocritical by acting against his previous convictions or irrational for changing without deferring to his previous reasoning. In both of these situations, Brown uses Dryden's previous arguments reassert what he views as more rational arguments over Dryden's new religious belief.

By quoting directly from *The Hind and the Panther,* Crites and Eugenius engage directly with Dryden's work. One instance of this is connected to the issue of celibacy in the ranks of priests. In a combination of analysis and satire, Mr. Bays repeats Dryden's argument before

them: *Bethought him of a Wife, e'er half-way gone, / For 'twas uneasie travelling alone. P. 22. (107).* Including a citation in this passage is an important marker that Crites and Eugenius are quoting directly from *The Hind and the Panther*. It makes explicit to the reader that the following passages are taking up the arguments from Dryden directly. Mr. Bays' companion attacks celibacy as an imagined utopia with no grounding in human nature (122). Crites makes this intervention to assert reason as a balance to a perceived overuse of faith and sense, and to make the most of the comic potential of the issue of celibacy. *The Hind and the Panther* plays right into their hands, providing the justification for dwelling on the issue of celibacy. By taking Mr. Bays to Covent Garden, where the celibate are sure to feel out of place, Crites and Eugenius have even more reasonable and common-sense arguments for discussing the problem of celibacy in the ranks of priests.

Mr. Bays' conversation with Mr. Hains continues to engage with the form of Dryden's work and to develop the criticism of Catholic celibacy as a strategy to parody Dryden. After an ecstatic greeting, wherein Mr. Hains calls Mr. Bays the "Ornament and Glory of the English theatre," Mr. Bays tries, unsuccessfully to ply Mr. Hains for information about the Catholic Church in Rome (203). Mr. Hains says "Nay, not a syllable of Theological Discourse, as you love me, Mr. Bays; in Poetry, or business of that nature, you may command me as far as you please; but for Divinity I desire to be excused, it never suited with my Complexion" (204). Mr Hains is more forthcoming about his travels and sexual exploits than he is about literary and religious developments abroad, boasting, "I had the good Luck to charm all the Ladies where-ever I came" (205). From here on, Mr. Hains' exploits are described with an increasingly heightened style, culminating in a Horation Ode in which Hains says won over a *Bona Rosa.* What seems at first to be gratuitous boating and bravado, actually sets up Brown's third dialogue

to imitate and critique the last part of Dryden's *The Hind and the Panther.* The main thrust of the argument narrows in on the parables of Dryden's work; however, the dialogue between Mr. Bays and Mr. Hains leads to a discussion of Mr. Bays' literary career, ensuring him that it is not too late to change his ways and restore everything he once had.

The third part of Dryden's *The Hind and the Panther* consists of the exchange of allegorical stories between the two beasts, but Brown puts Mr. Bays in dialogue with another recent convert in his parody. *The Hind and the Panther's* parable of the swallows can be summarized like this: the swallows are given advice by the martin to stay instead of migrating, and when they do so, they end up being frozen on their journey. The Anglican Panther tells this parable, and it points to the hazards of staying in a position that is advantageous but temporary, like the Catholic cause in the English court under James II's rule (Anselmet 256). There is an important aspect of the parable Brown's dialogue uses: the Catholic swallows are foolish to listen to the martin, who convinces them to act against their own interests, much the same way that Brown argues that Dryden should act in the best interest of his literary career. The difficulty with this parable is in what Francis Manley calls its "ambivalence." Because Dryden relates this parable in the voice of the Anglican Panther and the warning comes from the martin, it is unclear how sympathetic his own position is, or that of the hind. This is the strength the parable, Francis Manley suggests, because the way he agrees with the martin's sentiment that the Catholic sparrow's shouldn't flee, while also associating the martin with superstition, allows him to "damn the martin . . . and at the same time to praise his advice" (486). Brown's dialogues reframe the central problems of this parable in literary terms, which we cannot fully separate from the religious context of the original: instead of focusing on how well Catholics might fare in James II's court, the dialogues are concerned with how Dryden's literary career and reputation will fare after his conversion. References to the parable, then, come in the form of a warning to Dryden that the timing of his conversion is

temporary, that it will be short lived, and that it would be foolish to act in a way that undermines his own literary authority and reputation, especially because that authority as laureate comes from the state.

Before looking at where Brown's dialogues engage with the parable itself, I want to consider possible ways that they reference its themes and principle actors. For instance, when the Chaplain presses his advantage with Mr. Hains after he was been cured of a tumor, he says, "I must nick you, Dear Friend of mine, in the Critical Minute, otherwise I shall be in danger of losing you" (220). In this instance, it seems Mr. Hains might fly away at any moment, but like the swallows, who do not leave, the patient is not likely going anywhere quickly. Later, when Mr. Hains relates a story about how the ship's Chaplain tries to convince him of points of the Catholic faith, beginning with the Pope's infallibility, Mr. Bays asks Mr. Hains' to "swallow" his argument: "If I had had the Management of thee, Mr. Hains, I had as soon have persuaded thee to swallow that Article, and twenty more of the same bulk; as a Covent-Garden Beau makes a straggling Citizen's Daughter in the Park believe she's handsome, and only made for Enjoyment" (220) To follow this up, Mr. Hains says, "When he saw the Infallibility was too gross a Pill for me to swallow, he accosts me with another Doctrine of the church; that was ten times worse, I mean Transubstantiation" (220). "Swallow" is repeated in this context throughout the dialogue. By chastising Mr. Bays for his disbelief in the story of his recovery, Mr. Hains suggests belief should be constant. He does this first by suggesting that disbelief in minor points is unbalanced—"'tis to swallow the Legend of Gargantua, and boggle at poor Tom Thumb"—he then uses the metaphor of credit to express the same sentiment: "Thou servest thy Faith just as a Merchant in Town serves a declining Tradesman, givest it credit at first for a Hundred pound, and afterwards wont trust it for a single Farthing" (226). By playing on the word "swallow" and reframing the delayed migration as an issue of trust, faith, or credit, Hains' asks Mr. Bays to rely

on his principles and to remain consistent in his beliefs.

The more direct connection between *The Hind and the Panther's* parable of the Swallow and Brown's satire is in the new "parable" of the Hermit and the Sage, which relates an account of a Hermit who has vowed chastity and maintained this state until late in his life. This version sexualizes the parable of the swallows, making it about chastity, but it also reframes the issue of change. This pursuit soon makes the Hermit ill: "Like ill-managed Hay that had not cocking and spreading enough, broke out at last into a Flame, and threw him into a very violent and burning Fever" (227). The physicians prescribe that the Hermit break his vow of chastity, and when he does, he is completely healed and acknowledges that it was folly to be chaste in the first place, concluding, "I took your Counsel, and must needs own the prescription was very natural and easy; it was perfectly recovered my health" (229). This story is an attack on the celibacy of Catholic priests, and despite Mr. Hains' assertion that he told the story because he "turn'd Roman Catholic no sooner," the account is similar to the way the Panther's parable of the sparrows postponing their migratory journey. While stubborn insistence on celibacy was harming the Hermit, the ease with which his "cure" is as damning as the cure's effectiveness.

Mr. Bays' dialogues begin with the possibility of an interrupted sexual encounter when it hints at the possibilities about why Dryden would be in St. James Park. His focus on intersections between theology and sexual norms—via issue of chastity among priests—allows Brown to do two things at once. First, he attempts to ridicule the Catholic religion in a way that will play well for the entertainment of readers appealing to popular methods of religious ridicule. Second, he places at the fore the sexual labour that, alongside the literary activity of the theatre, makes Covent Garden an infamous centre of sexual activity. The implication of references to Dryden's parable is that Dryden's conversion is opportunistic, that it will be short-lived. Paring

this sentiment with continual references to chastity and celibacy frames Dryden as effeminate. His conversion is emasculating. There was a real fear of castration considering that Catholic priests were castrated; this both strengthens the association with violence and alludes to the very real threat of violence against Dryden (Horowitz, 30-33). On the other hand, part of the satire relies on associating Dryden's changing religious belief with lewd sexual practices. Steven Zwicker discusses the ways in which "instability and venality were widely understood to be overlapping, nearly interchangeable sites –and throughout the whole age" ("Why are They Saying" 162). Setting these conversations in Covent Garden manufactures a disparity between the character of Covent Garden and the Catholic religion to which Dryden now lays claim.

Religion vs. Literary Ambition in Covent Garden

Dryden's religious conversion is parodied by showing it to be in conflict with his literary status and career. The character of Covent Garden is established in order to compare Dryden's religion to his new morality. Crites' comparisons are the most direct and brash. He calls Mr. Bays out as a hypocrite. But both Crites and Eugenius suggest that Dryden is above the religious feuding and discourse of factions in which he is now taking part. Mr. Hains, who played Dryden as "Mr. Bays" on the stage, admonishes Dryden for putting his religious views ahead of his literary career by suggesting that Dryden take the long view and rely on a stable career rather than on the tides of religious change. The consensus of each of these fictional companions is that Dyden is out of step with the character of the literary community with which he is most closely associated.

Mr. Bays is criticized for being changeable, and the foundation for this is laid by first examining his literary track record. The range and diversity of Mr. Bays' literary targets show a pattern of indiscriminate criticism which mirrors his religious changeability. Speaking of the

range of satiric targets in his earlier work, Mr. Bays says,

> From this beginning, I naturally fall a railing at London, with as much Zeal, as a Buckinghamshire Grazier who had his Pocket pick'd at a Smithfield Entertainment; or a Country Lady, whose obsequious Knight has spent his Estate among Misses, Vintners, and Linen-Drapers; and then I tell my Audience that a Man may walk farther in the City to meet a true Judge of Poetry, than ride his Horse on Salisbury-Plain to find a House. (32)

By acknowledging that his targets span all of London, Bays shows that he is as changeable and indiscriminate in his criticism of the city as he is changeable in his religion. He also demonstrates a knowledge of the Town that is at odds with the pastoral opening and the innocence ascribed to the hind. The same can be said of his stance on religion, since Bays says, "I have not that respect for any Person breathing, as to lose a good Thought for his sake; and I have almost as strong an inclination to suffer Martyrdom for my Wit as for my Religion: 'Tis the Love to the Jest, not any private Picque to the Man" (24). In this important link between his literary persona and his religious conversion, Mr. Bays establishes that he is willing to take the same risks to his "Wit" as his religion. In other words, Mr. Bays is willing to jeopardize his religious belief and his literary position to enter into a new controversy. Whether this is because of the comfort and stability of his position as laureate or due to a level of confidence in his literary career, this passage sets up the link between the two spheres of Dryden's life in a way that Brown builds on in the later dialogues.

Covent Garden is meant to remind Mr. Bays of his past and his literary career and provides a clear trajectory for criticism of his conversion, but Mr. Bays also appeals to his knowledge of the Town and its mode of speech, arguing that disputes happen by putting "such

and such Objections to the Matter in Hand, and then for this person to answer 'em himself" (109). Mr. Bays' companions attack him for his poetic past and for simple contradictions between his past work and his present arguments for the Catholic faith. Crites' point is that arguing for a more "rigorous" faith by using poetry is hypocritical:

> I must confess, Mr. *Bays,* it looks as odd for a Poet to be angry with any Religion, because it is not guilty of Rigour, and Severity, as for a Bawd to quarrel with the Government of the City because it does not Hang, Draw and Quarter all People that have committed Fornication: Such an Objection from a Poet is altogether as unnatural, as it wou'd be for an Atheist to find fault with the Translation of *Lucretius;* or for a Parson, that carries Three Steeples in his Pocket, to condemn the Church for allowing of Pluralities. (158)

Poets benefit from print culture that allows for the publication of a wide range of ideas and perspectives. They participate in and rely on the intellectual and moral leniency that allows for the publication of their poems. Thus, in Crites' view, the perceived rigidity of Mr. Bays' religious position is antithetical to his literary position and the interests of the literary profession. Crites compares the work of a poet to prostitution and a parson with many congregations in a not-so subtle attempt to remind Dryden of the many roles he and other poets play in their trade.

Eugenius makes the same argument for the literary profession over religious belief but does so in a notably friendlier manner. As Eugenius pleads for Mr. Bays to separate himself from religion for the sake of his literary career, it becomes clear that the argument for Dryden's place as a literary figure is about separating his position within literary culture from the type of infighting that takes place in religious discourse in which *The Hind and the Panther* intervenes. Dryden, Crites and Eugenius argue, is above this type of infighting and religious faction:

> Let the Motly Herd for Religion engage,
> Let them urge the Dispute with Clamour and Rage;
> Let their Authors keep on their vain Method of Writing,
> And set (if they can) both Parties a fighting:
> We ne'er make Replies, but are fully contented,
> Tho' Good Fellows and Drink have been misrepresented.
> Let their musty grave Volumes to Thames-street adjourn,
> Or rot in Duck-lane, or in Coffee-house burn: (17)

That Dryden's work clearly operates at a different level than the religious pamphlets and dialogues that "set . . . both Parties a fighting," and that it is a much more thoughtful and less partisan treatment of religion, is not at odds with the point Eugenius makes here. Eugenius is more interested in validating Dryden's work and suggesting that, as laureate, he keep from such infighting altogether. Mr. Bays' response concedes to the fact that some of his writing has met the same terrible end as the "musty grave Volumes":

> You can imagine what a Mortification it is for a Noble Author, who has, at the great Expence of his Fancy, writ something which is vigorous and fine, to have his Song tagg'd with half a dozen gouty Stanza's by a Grub-street-Hand, then advanc'd into a Ballad; and last of all, plaister'd up in a Country Ale-house, to confront the five Senses, and the four Seasons of the Year. (17)

In this exchange, the status of Dryden's writing, from Eugenious' point of view, is harmed by mixing religious opinions and literary ambition, which leaves his writing destined for either the sewers or the flames. Bays' counterpoint is that his writing meets this end anyway, since a "Grub-street Hand" will appropriate his work, where it will be experienced by the entire

sensorium in an Ale-house whether or not he was involved. The culture of Grub Street—which includes appropriation, piracy, and theft, infighting, personal attacks, and party politics—is essential to this argument for Dryden's literary career. Eugenius' admonitions beg to know whether, once one has risen above the muck, why any involvement with such common feuding would be warranted.

In the second dialogue, Eugenius jests in a similar vein, challenging the poet's faith in relation to his career as a poet. When Mr. Bays kneels to pray, he asks, "What should a Poet pray for, but a believing Bookseller, and an easie open-handed Lord, a kind Audience, and a confusion to all Criticks, a store of Claret, and such kind of Blessings?" (194). In response, Mr. Bays' prayer is that "M-nt-gue and Br-wn thy anger feel" and that when they ask what the cause of his anger is, they should be told "'tis . . . to profane J-hn Dr-d-n's Hind with an unhallow'd vein" (195). A prayer for such an intersession, within earshot of his companions who are making the criticism on behalf of Brown, is a short-lived detour into more explicit satire on Dryden himself rather than a parody of *The Hind and the Panther*, taking issue with his lack of response to criticism of *The Hind and the Panther*.

Mr. Bays undermines *The Hind and the Panther* by making the emphasis on unity hyperbolic, conflating religious belief with the literary profession. Bays suggests government regulation for the literary production surrounding funerals and takes this argument further by suggesting that, to support the "Manufacture of Poetry" there should be a mandate for how funerary poems are paid: twelve stanzas of Pindaric poetry at one pound per stanza for a Lord, a heroic poem for a baronet, and an acrostic for a variety of administrative roles (54). As a sort of satirical counter-argument for the advancement of literary production as opposed to its descent into party politics, Mr Bays' comments attempt to reconcile the problem Eugenius puts forward

by suggesting a more equitable mode of literary production based on state patronage that would advance and support the industry. Considering how the literary and the religious are so intertwined in this dialogue, Bays' comment points toward problems with such an alliance between the state and literary production that might also contain a veiled critique of the role of the Anglican church within the state.

In contrast to the lighthearted discussion of Mr. Bays' career in the earlier dialogues, the final conversation between Mr. Hains and Mr. Bays concludes that Mr. Bays should choose either religion or his career. Mr. Hains was reconverted to a Protestant faith, and tells Mr. Bays that, as a poet, he should continue as a Protestant to be able to continue to write for the Play-House or seek any other employment in the city, since it is the fashion to be Protestant "which, the Poet likewise [ought] to observe as religiously as he does his Interest" (253-4). Mr. Hains' argument for "Observing" the fashion of one religion over the other uses the language of religious observance casually and irreverently to suggest that Bays observe his literary career with the same devotion as his religious observance. By focusing on the playhouse, and on Dryden's future as a playwright, Hains' conversion is brought to bear on Dryden's choice to convert. Mr. Hains' case acts as a reminder of the career he is jeopardizing in the process.

Mr. Hains is the voice for Brown's account of Dryden's conversion, and he expresses his desire that Dryden is reinstated as Laureate. Mr. Hains directly links the conversion to his absence from Will's and gives Mr. Bays a way to return there: "'Tis but leaving Will's Coffee-House for two or three Days, and then saying, that Mr. *Baxter's* Winding-sheet of Popery has opened thy Eye-sight" (255). He then suggests that if Mr. Bays were to be taken back into the Anglican fold, he would have his laurels and his seat at *Wills*: "Besides, who knows but some Noble Peer or other may restore thee to thy Poet Laureat, and Historiographer Royals Place

again, upon thy Re-conversion, and you need fear no drubbing in this cafe; consider of that, Mr. *Bays*" (255). Determined to assuage Mr. Bays apprehensions of mistreatment if he converts back, Hains confirms the way this series has always been about Dryden's body. By making a jab at the fact that Dryden was assaulted a mere block from where they now sit, Hains continues to be reassuring even as he mocks Mr. Bays and challenges his masculinity.

Hains' final attempt is an appeal to literary reputation and urban life. First, he appeals to the nature of the publishing world that connects writers to the whole structure of printsellers, booksellers, and readers: "Even so, Mr. Bays, we Gentlemen Authors write for the Gentlemen Printers: the Gentlemen Printers print for the Gentlemen Book-sellers: The Gentlemen Booksellers sell to the Gentlemen readers" (256). Then, he follows with an appeal to all that the city has to offer: "Christmas Pies, the Tarts, the Trunks, the Banboxes, the Paper Kites, the Coffee-Houses and Grocers Shops, and immediately consume what the Gentlemen Readers bought" (256). Participation in this long line of literary activity—ending with paper used to wrap commercial products—becomes the final argument for Mr. Bays to come back to the Anglican fold and to Covent Garden. There is a tradition and a fraternal bond around literary production that Hains argues for and wants Mr. Bays to participate in. Once again Dryden's conversion is antithetical to further involvement in those circles, regardless of the status his previous success gives him.

Brown's extended parody of Dryden places the activity and reputation of Covent Garden at odds with Dryden's conversion. The first dialogue uses characters from Dryden's *Essay of Dramatic Poesie*. By drawing heavily on his experience with the dialogue genre in Brown's *Letters from the Dead to the Living*, his satire of Dryden uses the laureate's voice to speak against his new religious position. The point that his second and third satires return to is that

Dryden is leaving the marketplace for literary activity by changing his religion, and this suggests that Dryden's conversion was considered a sort of betrayal in Grub Street. Brown parodies (and argues for) Dryden's literary career with a physical and material argument for Dryden's return to Covent Garden. The trajectory of Dryden's body runs from St. James Park to Covent Garden, where he is left by Mr. Hains to consider the future of his career. Brown's parody suggests that if Dryden's body is back at Will's, perhaps that is half the battle toward reinstating him in his former role at the centre of literary culture and at the heart of London's theatre.

III. Individualism and the Public Sphere: Ned Ward's Satire of London

The following two chapters deal primarily with Ned Ward.[9] This chapter will discuss his satire of London in *The London Spy*, and I will argue that Ned Ward's interventions in moral problems he reads in the streets of London are tied to his moral convictions that the role of the literary is to advocate for the needs of that place. His satire of London argues that the problems with the city's governance are harming its citizens. Chapter Four will extend this example, taking up Ward's satire of global trade. Ned Ward's Tory perspective on global trade and London's trading centres contributes to a greater sense of how Tory writers resisted the rise of Whig economic changes. Where Ward's literary reputation is concerned, I argue that his views on London's trade meant that Alexander Pope's attacks need to be reconsidered. In Pope's *Dunciad*, he attacks Grub Street's "dunces," including Ned Ward. He suggests that Ward's writing is only popular in the colonies and that he runs an alehouse in the City of London. I argue that by characterizing Ward as running a business in London, Pope was undermining Ward's criticism of London's trade.

Scholarship between 1930 and 1950 on Ward is disparate and sometimes inaccessible. It consists of some discussion of Ward's character-writing and influence on Scriblerian journalism, culminating in Howard Troyer's biography, *Ned Ward of Grubstreet*. Robert Allen's "Ned Ward and the Weekly Comedy" asserts that Ward's serial *The Weekly Comedy* and its later editions were influential and inspired a number of copycat publications. Since *The Weekly Comedy* takes the form of a play set in a coffeehouse. It is a lively satirical publication, but its content is largely

[9] Both chapters build on work I shared first at CSECS 2014 in Montreal on Ned Ward's *The London Spy* and later in Kingston in 2018 on his *Satyr on Bad Wine.* Since then, David McNeil's "'Watching the Watchers': The Spectatorship Game in Ned Ward's The London Spy" was published as part of a book based on the CSECS panel I participated in where I presented the paper: "The Satirical Topography of Ned Ward's The London Spy. " Paper presented at the Canadian Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies conference, Montreal, QC, Oct. 16, 2014.

character-writing that ridicules people with exaggerated description. W. Matthews undertakes a broader discussion of Ward's character-writing in "The Character-Writings of Edward Ward," which is an important overview to the style of writing that comprises much of Ward's work and half of *The London Spy* (1698-99). Two small notes recognize the influence of Ned Ward and Tom Brown on Scriblerian writing, particularly on Swift: William Eddy's "Ned Ward and 'Lilliput'" and G. S. McGrue's "A Seventeenth-Century Gulliver" both discuss the influence of Ward and Brown on seventeenth-century journalism and Swift's Lilliputians.

There is a small body of recent scholarship on Ned Ward that focuses on the public sphere, spatiality, and masculinity, which I will account for and position this work alongside. Anthony Pollock provides an account of Ned Ward's populist writing in Gender and the Fictions of the Public Sphere, 1690-1755. In his comparison between Addison and Steele's *Spectator* and the work of Dunton's *Athenian Mercury* (1691-97), Mary Astell's *Serious Proposal* (1694-97) and Ned Ward's *The London Spy*, Anthony Pollack argues that *The London Spy* contains "embodied ideologies of publicness," which in its "Tory masculinity" offers a populist, embodied critique of the city and public institutions that Addison and Steele would later make polite in order to market it to a more widely applicable—though largely Whig—audience (10, 34-54). Pollock concludes that while Ward's "populist, activist model of publicness relies upon a rather blatant array of categorical exclusions in order to construct itself," his "public-sphere theory offers readers street-level populism and a trenchant critique of how major institutions fail to promote the public interest" (53). Addison will later "aestheticize" the public institutions Ward criticizes, since London's institutions such as the Exchange and the coffeehouse are "crucial to the perpetuation of Whig economic and political hegemony" (53). Whether "publicness" applies to Ward's writing will be taken up more in Chapter Four.

Ward's contribution to the rise of journalistic writing has been recognized, but there is a political difference between his fiery Tory voice and the journalism of Swift, along with that of Addison and Steele. Anthony Pollock suggests that the Scriblerians wished to adapt the Tory writing of the late seventeenth century, to moderate it for a wider audience. I argue that the most threatening aspects of Ward's writing, the things that most needed to be contained or moderated, were his attacks on Whig economics, London's governance, and government spending for imperial expansion. These partisan criticisms were not compatible with the wide audience that eighteenth-century journalism needed, perhaps, but it is these interventions that define Ward's journalism. In short, he speaks for the place he writes from, damning any other interests.

I aim to make a few contributions to the existing scholarship by focusing on a reading of Ward's view of global trade and city governance at the end of the seventeenth century. Dianne Dugaw has examined Ward's writing on the South-Sea Bubble as part of her larger overview of South-Sea Ballads, but little has been done to consider Ward's economic views before the eighteenth-century.

First, where Anthony Pollock reads Ward's urban rambling and masculine Tory writing as an "Embodied Ideology of publicness," I resist a critical perspective that relies on the enlightenment model of the public sphere to consider how Ward's work criticizes global trade and the Whig supremacy governing the City of London in favour of local needs. Everywhere Ward insists on the collective needs of the community over the business interests of individuals and companies, but this is not simply a matter of public over private interests. Rather, Ward's insistence on community needs is a conservative reaction to the emergent economic system that takes aim at government funds and individual gain spent abroad instead of on those who need it at home.

Secondly, Briggs focuses on Ward's London writing as his "best" work and argues that Ward's preoccupation with legal matters has the potential to unify Ward's otherwise discordant serialized writing. While Briggs attempts to recover some of Ward's work and reputation in this way, he still disparages Ward's work and writing. Ward's most noticeable preoccupation and target in his work are visible in his defense, especially as the naive "Spy" of *The London Spy*, of the downtrodden and poor—what today we might call an interest in social justice and equity. Ward's writing targets the entrenched systems of power in London that seek profit and private gain over the needs of London's citizens. Misplaced priorities during the rebuilding of the Great Fire provide a means to criticize London's governance.

Finally, I build on recent scholarship that uses the narrative perspective of Ward's writing to examine the subjects of his writing. Kenneth McGraw's "The Treachery of Space: Discursive Reclamation in Ned Ward's 'The Mollies Club,'" for instance, examines the way Ward writes about The Mollies Club from a distance, separating his satiric persona from the club members and representing them as separate from London. The implications for this type of reading are important to the way I read Ward's spatial strategies, particularly in Chapter Four during my reading of *A Trip to Jamaica* and *The Barbacue Feast*. The feast is depicted in Peckham, outside London, for reasons similar to those in Ward's representation of The Mollies Club. While The Mollies Club and the feast in Peckham are both outside of London to distance their activities from the author and from London, Peckham is used as a setting to criticize the wealthy merchants who enjoy the profits of their trade and live outside London instead of spending their time and money in the place where their money and power have influence.

Laura Brown's argument about Swift and empire in *Ends of Empire* is particularly relevant to my position on Ward's representation of Trade. Brown says with Swift's texts she

finds herself pausing "between the exposure of misogyny in the canon and the discovery of an early ally in the struggle against colonialism" (*Ends of Empire,* 174). Ward's discourse on trade and empire, like Swift's writing, is part of a tradition of misogynist writing, but it also targets colonization; however, unlike Swift, Ward explicitly and repeatedly equates professional writing with prostitution. This difference is important in the way it provides context for the misogynistic descriptions of Billingsgate fishmongers and Port-Royal whores: at one level, the literary profession is implicated in Ward's attack on emergent capitalism. The differences between what this means in topographically diffuse Grub Street, in Moorfields, in the City of London, in colonial Jamaica, or exurban Peckham are where Ward's texts start to articulate a more sustained critique of city governance and the government's spending on colonial expansion.

Brean Hammond's evaluation of Scriblerean writers in *Professional Imaginative Writing in England, 1670-1740: `Hackney for Bread'* reasserts the writers' individuality and resists a reading that would group them all together. Specifically, Hammond resists Laura Brown's ideological reading of Pope's writing in favour of a more "symptomatic" reading of Pope; he argues that Pope's *Second Satire of the Second Book* in his imitations of Horace is more scurrilous than it first appears based on illusions to Horace and that it subverts the country-house poem instead of participating uncritically in the tradition (295-302). I connect Hammond's point about ideological readings of Pope to a larger tendency in Tory writers of the period toward what Srinivas Aravamudan identifies in Aphra Behn's *Oroonoko* as the critically celebrated "expressions of ideological ambivalence" (*Tropicopolitans,* 29). Between the readings of Pope from Brean Hammond and Laura Brown and Anthony Pollock's account of *The London Spy* there is room to make some important distinctions about Ned Ward's career. Hammond argues that Pope's position on Grub Street needs to be reevaluated, categorizing Pope's attacks on Grub

Street authors as "ammunition in an ongoing struggle between a dominant culture and the emergent forms that it seeks to disorganize, reorganize and finally contain" (291-292). In the case of Ward, Pope's sustained attacks come at a time where Ward was established in his career and his Tory views reflect the dominant political position. Pope's attacks in the 1720s are revisionist, seeking to make Ward's career appear marginal and his political views contradictory, even though his writing was successful and his politics were consistent throughout his career. Pope manufactured a story about Ward, and by mischaracterizing Ward's tavern ownership, he tried to discredit Ward's politics. My second point is that Ward's writing from the street is not, as Anthony Pollock suggests, an ideological position and that a public-sphere theory is not the most applicable approach for this high church Tory author. Hammond resists Laura Brown's ideological reading of Pope's writing as a reflection of class ideology, which instead points to Pope's views as a "middle way, a steering between extremes" (294). It would not be possible to claim something similar for Ward. In fact, I find Ward's satire targets ideologically-driven positions, factions, and the enlightenment rationalism of The Royal Society. But rather than suggest a middle-ground between them, Ward ridicules all challenges to authority and the status-quo. Instead of insisting on an ideological position in place of those he targets, Ward's satire focuses on injustices he reads and observes in particular places. Ned Ward's poetics are a poetics of moral outrage at political corruption and unfair economic policy, and his narratives speak for local collective interests compared to either the common weal, on the one hand, or individual self-interest on the other.

Ned Ward's Satire of London

As I examine the spatial strategies of Ned Ward's criticism of London, I want to distinguish his work from Whig examples and his Tory contemporaries. My argument is that

Ward's satire challenges London's governance by placing collective values and community needs above other considerations. *The London Spy* (1698-99) is a satire of the city, the public sphere, and individualism; it challenges Whig economics and rationalism through the figure of the individual, which is both the target of satire—as a self-interested tradesman, apothecary, bookseller, or royal-society gentleman—or as the object of pathos and pity--most powerfully in the image of the orphan that is used repeatedly in the opening of *The London Spy*. This account of Ward's satire of London will discuss how *The London Spy's* makes claims for the moral status of individualism through spatial strategies in contrast to the poetry of Defoe, Andrew Marvel, and Samuel Garth, who use similar spatial strategies to advance the interests of the public sphere or the interests of their trade. Defoe and Marvel challenge the authority of prominent structures of the State, while Garth targets the built environment and topography of the apothecaries' place of business and association. I discuss Defoe, Marvell, and Garth in this chapter because they help put Ward in context politically while using similar spatial strategies in their satire, but their goals need to be distinguished from Ward's project in *The London Spy.* Where Defoe's spatial satire relies on an individual voice speaking from the pillory against his own punishment, Ward's writing about punishment targets the public sphere and London's governance. The titular "spy" of *The London Spy* speaks as part of a crowd complicit in the spectatorship of punishment at Bridewell. Where Marvell uses the space occupied by monuments to challenge resistance to the public sphere, Ned Ward's satire of London coffeehouses exposes the coffeehouse ideal by representing the coffeehouse as a brothel and ale house. By setting Ward's satire of the city against these contemporary examples, I argue that the way Ward speaks from London, for London, and against the Governance of the city, sets it apart and insists, more than any other aspect of his Tory politics, on the need for shared values and policies that benefit the community.

This is where Samuel Garth's writing, despite Garth's Whig politics, has much in common with Ward's *The London Spy*: Garth aims to uphold his vision for his profession as one that serves the community's poor, and he does so by appealing to the architectural heritage of the college. Ward's criticism of London's neglect of the poor also appeals to architectural features and monuments, explaining how these features are examples of cronyism and excess spending during London's rebuilding. For Ward, the grand architecture of London is not an authority used to hold others to a higher standard, but an example of the city's neglect of the poor. His satire of London is made by participating in the crowds and then, as part of the community, criticizing the governance of London.

In Chapter One I discussed how Ned Ward and his contemporary, Tom Brown, both share a distaste for the individual of a particular populist Tory character, best understood, perhaps, in their satire of Westminster. I discussed how Brown's satire of Westminster Abbey rails at individualistic, "vain" monuments to poets, arguing that they have overshadowed the monarchs' tombs. In a similar fashion, the primary aim of *The London Spy* is to expose the city and its spending after the Great Fire of 1666. Because of this focus, *The London Spy* is less interested in a defense of the monarchy than the accounts of Westminster I discussed in Chapter One. This chapter argues that the Tory satirist's willingness to be specific about place is tied to his moral convictions that the role of the literary is to advocate for the needs of that place. While it is true that much of seventeenth-century satire is inscrutable to those outside of London and its society, it is also true that no other genre advocates for the needs of Londoners to the extent satire does. *The London Spy* is so effective at this "advocacy" because it is a remediation of Tory journalism, as if the events of Abel Roper's Tory paper, *The Post Boy*, were narrated first-hand; in other words, what Ward's remediation adds, and continually asks or simply shows, is how

London's decisions affect people who live there. And the argument it lays out is that Whig individualism and economics is patently bad for many individuals.

Lest this last statement be taken as though Ward is a seventeenth-century Marxist critic *avant la lettre*, I want to take a moment to situate Ned Ward politically and ideologically. It is useful to consider the spatial strategies and conservative ideology I examine here in Ned Ward's work in relation to the terms used in familiar critical accounts of the early history of the novel, because it illustrates one of the difficulties trying to categorize Tory satire of the late seventeenth century. Using Michael McKeon's framework from *The Origins of the English Novel: 1600-1740,* it might be useful to consider both the "conservative ideology"—aligned both with Swift's position against the circulation and accumulation of money and with Fielding's satire of land owners, banking, and corruption--and the aristocratic ideology that privileges the value of land where social positions convey moral value. (Hammond and Regan, *Making the Novel*, 9-10; McKeon, *Origins*, 21). Drawing hard lines between these categories in the late seventeenth century is difficult, but the target of Ward's satire is unambiguously the remaining category of McKeon's framework, the progressive, Whiggish economic system that values personal virtue over social class and privileges new models of business and projects (Hammond and Regan, *Making the Novel,* 10; McKeon, *Origins,* 264). Ward's satire of London is always oriented against this ideology, but rather than exposing the problems with individuals within this system, it focuses on the damage to collective wellbeing, to individuals that live in London while community is being eroded in favour of self-interest. In this way, Ward's London writing has remnants of aristocratic ideology, but while moral value is not ascribed to personal virtues, it is not given to the social position and a land-owning class either. To generalize from Ward to his contemporaries, what I call "The Tory Grub Street model of morality" ascribes moral value to

place, but the traditional boundaries are fuzzier: the value ascribed to class is less apparent in Ward's popular writing, and far from offering the country as an alternative to the problems of the urban, Ward's work occupies a suburban view in between these traditional distinctions. So, when we try to categorize Ned Ward's writing in this frame, his position as a popular suburban writer becomes an important caveat to this type of framework. While he supports the monarchy and the High Church in principle, his satire of London's economics does not fit easily into these existing categories of conservative ideology.

But discussing the 'ideology' of Ned Ward's writing is a bit disingenuous, as Ned Ward's relationship to seventeenth-century journalism is such that he writes against what will later be called the public sphere, and this too offers an explanation as to why Ned Ward's writing of London fits uneasily into McKeon's framework. Ward's writing is anti-ideological or counter-ideological in a way that offers no firm ideology to replace those he attacks. This skeptical and pragmatic view is essential to understanding how Ward targets economic self-interest in favour of the local collective welfare.

I read different models of an authority of place in the following examples, leading to my explanation of how Ward's emphasis on the mismanagement of London's governance and trade takes aim at the individualistic mindset of Whig economics to put forward an argument for an understanding of morality and place that takes the community into account. This account adds to an understanding of Tory criticism during the rise of Whig economics through Ward's more popular, embodied voice and his facility relating topical events and problems to a popular audience. I also look forward to accounts of the novel and consider Ward's journalistic proto-novelistic writing a counterpoint to the ways the novel has been centred on the individualist modern subject. And where Ward can elsewhere be aligned with Tory party politics, the sincerity

and concern with which he puts forward arguments against the state of social and economic problems in London gives one pause: his argument is sometimes presented with a sentimentality and pathos usually ascribed to sentimental fiction, not fiery Tory journalism and factious party politics. In these ways, Ward's satire of London has much to contribute to existing scholarship. It would be foolish to discount his account of London as a trivial picaresque rambling or ephemeral and reactionary response to Whig journalism. At its core, *The London Spy* represents a collective morality through the spaces and social problems Ward accounts for. But Ward's collective morality should not be reduced to Tory values in religion (shared Anglican beliefs vs. individual Protestant interpretation).

My goal in the rest of this chapter is to distinguish between the way these satires use space, their relationship to structures of governance and punishment, and their political and private motivations, to reach a better understanding of Ned Ward's approach to satire of London. In its critique of the city, *The London Spy* takes on Whig centres we associate with the public sphere, like coffeehouses, targets the self-interest and greed involved in rebuilding the city, and holds to account the mismanagement of London that undermined social institutions to balance the city's books. For me, the most interesting part of this study is the surprising fact that Ward's satire shares Samuel Garth's desire to benefit the community at the expense of private profits. And this shared moral commitment crosses political lines in a period otherwise characterized by factions and increasingly polarized politics.

Satire of Punishment: Defoe's *A Hymn to the Pillory* and Ned Ward's *The London Spy*

Daniel Defoe's *A Hymn to the Pillory* (1703) challenges the moral rhetoric of the pillory as a public space. By constructing the poem in the voice of an instrument of punishment and censorship, Defoe uses the poem to expose hypocrisy and injustice. Defoe's *A Hymn to the*

Pillory illustrates some of the spatial strategies I observe in Ned Ward's writing, but there are key differences between Defoe and Ward. Defoe's work targets the monarchy after a long period of Tory propaganda and attempts to crack down on Whig journalism. Defoe's poem reflects the individualism that seeks to protect each person's right to public speech, and I introduce it here to compare it to the way that Ned Ward's work approaches injustices in systems of punishment: both of these authors faced the pillory during their careers, but their literary responses suggest productive differences in the way they emphasize individual and collective moral problems in their work.

A Hymn to the Pillory critiques the pillory as a legal apparatus that sentences authors, booksellers, and ministers to be humiliated, while others more worthy of censure remain free of humiliation via the pillory. Those who stand in the pillory suffer harm to their character and reputation, but this oppressive punishment is politically motivated and selective:

> Thou art no shame to Truth and Honesty;
> Nor is the Character of such defac'd by thee
> Who suffer by Oppressed Injury
> Shame, like the Exhalations of the Sun,
> Falls back where first the motion was begun:
> And they who for no Crime shall on thy Brows appear,
> Bear less Reproach than they who plac'd 'em there. (55-61)

For Defoe, the real shame rests with those who send others to the pillory for things they do as well, and this hypocrisy, the politicised use of the pillory, is where the problem lies. Speaking one's opinion, the poem suggests, should not carry a punishment, especially when the punishment is dealt out unequally or for political purposes. Rather than supporting a more

cohesive nation, the poem argues that the pillory contributes to faction and discord. In short, it is a cause of public shame:

> Then Clap thy Wooden Wings for Joy,
>
> And greet the Men of Great Employ
>
> The Authors of our Nations Discontent
>
> And Scandal of a Christian Government. (160-164)

By speaking directly to the pillory itself as it claps its "Wooden Wings" and those who wield its power, the poem suggests that the power of the pillory be meted out equally: "Let all who merit equal Punishment / Stand there with him, and we are all Content" (66-67). This mirrors the biblical critique of punishment, where Jesus' response to scribes and Pharisees who are about to stone a woman for adultery is "He that is without sin among you, let him first cast a stone at her" (John 8:7). The pillory, the poem suggests, unfairly singles some out for punishment, while leaving others unscathed, and it is used to silence political rivals for political gain.

Defoe's poem raises the question of why authors like himself are singled out for punishment in the pillory and argues for the right of an individual to religious and political opinions in print. Ned Ward's satire of punishment targets the collective, social problem associated with the spectatorship of punishment, and as it shifts from prison to the spectacle, it reframes the target of satire, leaving Bridewell behind to target the Lord Mayor and London's administration. Bridewell becomes symptomatic of the governance of London.

One of the most challenging passages from Ned Ward's *The London Spy* is a visit to Bridewell prison, which is filled with women pounding hemp rope and working leather "as so many Jol-ly *Crispin*'s in a Garret, or *Vulcan*'s in a Celler o'er the merry Clinks of their Anvil" (134). The exchange sets up the question of whether women in Bridewell are being unfairly

treated or whether they deserve their punishment. One women tells the spy and his friend how she was taken to Bridewell after the tradesman she served got her pregnant. She goes on to describe how she was cruelly lashed despite her condition (134). Immediately after this, another woman interjects to say this story is a lie and insists on a lewd story about how the first woman was a career prostitute, sent to Bridewell for stealing from a client. The competing narratives suggest the women are either whores and liars who cannot be trusted or victims who, in addition to being sent to Bridewell unfairly, are now undermined when they attempt to appeal their cases. This account of Bridewell women draws from a tradition that uses misogynistic writing to criticize the public sphere. In her account of Eliza Haywood's *Fantomina* (1725) and *The City Jilt* (1726), Mellisa Mowry discusses the way Haywood's writing draws on and subverts this line of attack against the public sphere in order to read some of Haywood's works politically, a reading which has been "neatly excluded" from criticism of Haywood (647). Mowry draws from arguments connected to early modern pornography and the public sphere to take up the "exclusionary desire [that] operated at the heart of early English pornography" (648). This early English pornography argues that "access to political power and public discourse was a privilege, not a right" (648). It targets both sex workers and the wives of tradesmen, calling both a threat to public discourse and political power; in short, it turns these women into symbols of urban influence and the erosion of the authority of the monarchy (648). The tropes from this early pornography connect the downfall of female protagonists to fathers who, after the Restoration, lost the estates they gained during the English Civil War (650). From this position, I argue that Ward's account of Bridewell women participates in this type of satire of public discourse, using the conflicting accounts of these two Bridewell women as an attack on the public sphere and on urban women in general; however, like the early English pornography Mowry discusses, this

satire of Bridewell targets these urban women as an indictment of Whig political influence in London.

The London Spy's account of Bridewell women and the public sphere quickly becomes a satire of the city. As the spy leaves Bridewell, he passes through the court, where a woman is being lashed with the door open for all to see (135). The crowd is comprised of "Fellows in Blew-Coats, and Women in Blew-Aprons"—blue aprons were worn by tradesmen and domestic servants. Young orphans at Christ's Hospital (the "Bluecoat School") also wore blue coats (135). This scene in the court shows the vulgar interest of these tradespersons, who occupy the court to ogle the women as they are punished: when a woman was accused in front of this court with no one to speak on her behalf, she was "forc'd to shew her tender Back, and tempting Bubbies, to the Grave Sages of the Grave Assembly" (135). The punishment is a spectacle, and the spy and his friend find "little Knowledge to be gain'd from their proceedings, and less Pleasure and Satisfaction from their Punishments" so they "leave them to Flog on till the Ac-cusers had satisfied their Revenge, and the Spectators their Curiosity" (136). The references in this passage to other places and people in London demonstrate that the target of this satire of punishment is not primarily tradesmen and the lewd spectacle of punishment that Bridewell has become, but the city's governance itself.

Both Presidents of Bridewell at this time served as Lord Mayor. Sir Robert Geffery (or Geffrey, d. 1704), was President of Bridewell during the publication of *The London Spy*, and he had served as Lord Mayor from 1685 to 1686. William Turner was President from1669 to 1687. From 1690 to his death in 1693, he also served as Lord Mayor. As the administrator of this punishment and the figurehead of the spectacle Ward describes, the President of Bridewell prison (and in both cases, also the Lord Mayor of London) is the real target of Ward's satire. The most

interesting part of this satire of Bridewell is the way it connects the President of Bridewell to maritime trade and slavery. The women in Bridewell are described as “so many Slaves” who “were under the Care and Direction of an Over-seer.” (133). When the women in court is punished, the comparison to the punishment of slaves continues: the court was “mov’d by her Modest Mein, together with the whiteness of her Skin, to give her but a gentle Correction” (135). Bridewell prisoners were employed making products to support maritime industries—the production of rope, oakum for fixing ships, etc.—so the connection between Bridewell and the shipping industry was already established. But the President is described as being “like a Change-broker at Lloyds Coffee-House,” where goods and ships were sold at auction along with insurance--more like a slave auctioneer in this case than the judge of a court (135). Henry Marshall’s “London, Locke, and the 1690s Provisions for the Poor,” describes the connections between members of the Board of Trade (John Locke, John Polloxfen, Abraham Hill) and London merchants who had interests in slavery and provided goods produced in private London Workhouses for the Royal African Society. One of these merchants, Thomas Fermin, in *Some proposals for the imployment of the poor* (1678), says "Vagrants . . . and sturdy Beggars that have no habitation . . . will not work unless they are held to it as Galley-Slaves are tied to their Oars” (Firmin, qtd in Marshall, 192). At a time of severe economic distress in the 1690s, the opinion of Whig merchants, particularly members of the Board of Trade, was that workhouses should be created to compel the poor to work. By making these connections between Bridewell prison and the auction at Lyod’s coffee house, *The London Spy* gestures to this larger process wherein London’s prisons and workhouses were being used to support maritime trade and slavery. The Bridewell scene in *The London Spy* discusses punishment from within the crowd, questioning the morality of spectatorship, but ultimately the culpability rests with the governance

of the prison, which is being used to support maritime trade and where the prisoners are being treated like slaves. This trajectory of Ned Ward's criticism of London is something the next chapter will take up by focusing on Ned Ward's satire of Global trade, but here it speaks to the cruelty of the practices used in plantations abroad and workhouses in London. It also introduces a critique of coffeehouses and trade that is sustained throughout *The London Spy*, which I will take up now as part of a broader critique of the public sphere in Ned Ward's work.

Struggles in the Public Sphere: Andrew Marvell's statues and Ned Ward's Coffeehouses

In the critical discussion of Ward, there is some disagreement over Ward's position in relation to the public sphere. Anthony Pollock's account attempts to position Ward as part of an argument about the formation of the public sphere, arguing that Ward's fiction is comprised of "embodied ideologies of publicness"; however, Ned Ward's satire includes a sustained attack on the public sphere (10). Brian Cowan's discussion of the Coffee-house and its role in the theorization of the public sphere comments on Ward's extended satire of the Coffee-house, which includes *The London Spy* (1698-99), *The Weekly Comedy* (1699), *The School of Politicks: Or, the Humours of a Coffee-House* (1690; 1691) and *Vulgus Britannicus: Or The British Hudibras* (1710). Cowan argues, "For Ward, urban coffeehouse society was a den of frivolous news reading, foppish display, and dishonest trade at its best; at its worst, it was . . . a gathering place for disaffected subjects, most often dissenters" (349). Throughout his career, Ward represents the coffeehouse as a place of idle excess that harbors dissent, with a common goal to tear own any pretensions to civility that associations with the coffeehouse might have. This sustained attack on coffeehouses in the 1690s is an attack on Whig journalism and print culture. The political association and religious beliefs of those who protested against bawdy houses is not clear cut at this time. Tim Harris' account of the Bawdy house riots in 1668 describes the riots as

a protest of the Court's policies against religious dissent, aligned with the "whig position of the Exclusion Crisis" and not a conspiracy by ex-Cromwellian soldiers, as the Court claimed (555-556). However, Ward's attacks on coffeehouses and bawdy-houses associate these places with a Whig public sphere. Spaces like these are not clear-cut in their political alignment, but Ward's work represents coffeehouse as places that operate behind a thin veneer of civility, like whorehouses and taverns.

To understand the struggle that underpins Tory satire of Whig journalism, we must start with Andrew Marvell's satire of statues of Charles II, which takes issue with Charles' attempt through edict, in 1675, to suppress coffeehouses; Marvell was criticized for this unlicensed satire (Ellis, 72-73). Ward's satire of the coffeehouse aids this ongoing effort to undermine Whig journalism and the ideal of coffeehouse as a place for civil discourse, which was not in place until Addison and Steele later made considerable efforts to construct it. The Habermasian theory of the public sphere upholds this ideal of the coffeehouse as part of its teleology, but at the close of the seventeenth-century, its reputation was under fire and the Tory onslaught against Whig journalism and dissenting religious views had considerable momentum. Ralph Long and Philip Harth trace the propaganda campaigns of the late seventeenth century, which endeavored to shut down Whig propaganda in the press by combating it with Tory propagandists (Long, 79; Harth, *Pen for a Party,* 18). Ned Ward's attack on coffeehouses is not just an attack on the obvious targets named within; his coffeehouse satire supports this ongoing effort to undermine Whig journalism and political propaganda by flooding the market with Tory writers.

Three related poems are attributed to Andrew Marvell in the Yale *Poems on Affairs of State* relating to statues in London: *On the Statue Erected by Sir Robert Viner* (1675) (1:266-9), *The Statue at Charing Cross* (1675) (1:270-73), and *A Dialogue between the Two Horses* (1676)

(1:274-283). In Marvell's *Dialogue between Two Horses*, the statues effectively speak on behalf of the neighborhood they are in, and everything from their appearance and how they were created to their orientation is part of their importance in the square. Though the final poem may be attributed to John Ayloffe, the three poems are in conversation with each other and with contemporary political events. I discuss them here to establish a second framework for how public spaces are given a voice in satire. Here, the statues have their own inherent rhetoric in the literary imagination: they are already saying something by where they are, where they look, and how they were made. By bringing this context to life and reimagining it, Marvell mounts a critique of Charles II and the statue's creator, Sir Robert Viner.

In the first of the series, Marvell's *Statue Erected by Viner* attacks Sir Robert Viner and King Charles II by suggesting that the ugliness of the statue accurately reflects the king's character, if not also his body: "For the Graver's at work to reform him thus long; / But alas! he will never arrive at his end, / For 'tis such a king as a chisel can't mend" (54-6). The poem relies on an existing conversation about the statue and its aesthetic failure, but it then connects this material reality and representation of the King's body to the King's morality and character. The second poem, *The Statue at Charing Cross,* takes aim at the fact that the statue's construction was delayed to the extent that it became the subject of ridicule (270). Marvell redefines this delay as the statue's reluctance to look at Whitehall: "So the statue will up after all this delay, / But to turn the face to Whitehall you must shun; / Though of brass, hey with grief it would melt him away, / to behold ev'ry day such a court, such a son" (52-56). Rather than using an aesthetic failure to stand in for a moral one, this second poem reconfigures the temporal delay in the statue's construction as shame and reluctance to exist oriented toward Whitehall. The statue's positionally in that public space is read and interpreted as a critique of Charles II's court.

A Dialogue Between Two Horses imagines the two statues in conversation with each other. Markman Ellis discusses the final lines of this poem in *The Coffee House: A Cultural History*, as part of a reaction against Charles II's proclamation, and as an attempt to show coffee-drinking to be a "peaceable activity" (Ellis 93-94). Marvell's defense of coffee also reasserts the associations between Tory wine and Whig brandy, suggesting that the partisan drinks are alcoholic, not caffeinated:

> They that conquer'd the father won't be slaves to the son.
>
> It is wine and strong drink make tumults increase;
>
> Choc'late, tea, and coffee are liquors of peace:
>
> No quarrels nor oaths amongst those that drink 'em!
>
> Then, Charles, thy edicts against coffee recall:
>
> There's ten times more treason in brandy and ale. (183-8)

This poem establishes its authority by discussing the rhetorical importance of these statues with the initial assertion that "…statues without either windpipe or lungs / Have spoken as plainly as men do with tongues" (5-6). Thus, the satiric strategy of the poem is to interrogate the rhetoric of public statues by animating them through a conversation between the two horses. Although the poem begins by validating the premise that they speak with precedents, and it makes explicit the idea from the other two poems that the rhetoric of statues can be used to provide commentary, criticism, and interpretation of the monarchy they represent. In truth, the statues are already speaking—the poem just makes this fact literal and reimagines what the statues say.

Defoe's pillory and Andrew Marvell's statues demonstrate two different ways that public spaces can be used in satire. At the heart of both is the assumption that these spaces have their own rhetoric—that they are already speaking a message in order to hold up the authority of the

state. By reconfiguring this message and interpreting it in different terms, they mount a critique of the state through the objects—and the rhetoric of these objects—built to establish the state's authority. The goal of Ned Ward's coffeehouse satire is to uphold the authority of the state, questioning the claim that coffeehouses are peaceable by representing them as a place of dissent, and the knowledge transmitted therein as ignorance and idleness, at best; however, the satire shows more nefarious and dangerous practices as well.

Ned Ward's satire attacks the city and the public sphere. His route through London stops in at a series of coffeehouses, which are used to expose these places, so iconic for their association with Whig journalism and the public sphere, as havens for corrupt booksellers, factious pamphleteers, apothecaries, rakes, whores, and the idle and wasteful members of the Royal Society. This populist satire of the coffeehouse is less familiar than the Tory repudiation of the public sphere, but it draws on the same tradition and aims to show that the public sphere is immoral and unproductive.

In the first few sections of Ned Ward's *The London Spy,* the spy and his friend visit a series of coffeehouses in London, and this series of shops is used to target groups associated with the coffeehouses, which are paradigmatic of the emergent public sphere, but also a stronghold for Whig politicians. The first visit to a coffeeshop is a satire of the Royal Society, a member of which is called an "Old Sophister" who smokes and stares into space (11). This coffeehouse is an amalgamation of an apothecary shop and a Royal Society laboratory. Because the coffeehouse is filled with medicines of all kinds, the spy, a naive country-boy, mistakes it for "Quacks-Hall, or the Parlour of some Eminent Mountebank" (11). The member of the Royal Society is described as a fool who spends his money on schemes and "Projects" so regularly satirized by Tory writers. Kimberly Latta argues that "Tory writers . . . often accused the men who advanced

projects for generation of potentially limitless new wealth of observing no other authority than their own greed and of creating nothing but promises" (145). In this account, the man has wasted his money on a search for the "Philosophers-Stone" and foolishly burned hay to make medicine for horses. When the ashes get wet, their only value is as fertilizer to help grow more hay (12). Standing in contrast to this foolish and idle use of knowledge, the apothecary uses knowledge to fatal ends; the Coffee-house is frequented by a "Spark" who grows "Rich by Plurality of Wives" and will "send them one after another so Methodically to the Grave" with the help of an Apothecary (13). So the fundamental, iconic centre of the new public sphere is really a haven for Apothecaries and wasteful, projecting Royal Society men.

Perhaps more recognizable as part of the Tory critique of the public sphere and print culture, there is a bookseller in this coffeehouse as well, talking to a Protestant parson, who is pitching a new pamphlet. The pamphlet is part of *The London Spy*'s ongoing satire of the literary market and dissenters. The bookseller himself gets "an Estate by starving of Authors," while the parson pitches "Protestant Porridge to Scald the Mouth of an unbeliever" to this "Wit-monger," who the Friend says has stolen the estate of a boy that he was given charge of (14). The men in this coffeehouse, then, are made out to be a diverse group. What they have in common are unscrupulous, cheating, and frivolous ways.

The London Spy calls the respectability of the coffeehouse into question and represents it as a thin veneer, with a lewd reality underneath. Coffee is code for this pretense to respectability, and in jocular fashion it becomes an adequate excuse when the spy and his friend encounter a belligerent constable, who, the friend says, will

> Swear as heartily as a Lancashire Evidence, you were Drunk, tho' you drank nothing but Coffee in three days before; and that you abused the Consta-ble, tho' you gave him not an

> ill word; and Swore abundance of Oaths, tho' your Communication (Quaker like) was nothing but Yea, yea, and Nay, nay (38).

For the friend, coffee is an acceptable way to present himself as a sober urbanite to escape the clutches of this constable, just as his polite dialogue with the Constable is meant to portray him as a Quaker who won't give oaths. So, when the spy's friend suggests they visit coffeehouses, the trips are undertaken as if they were visiting a Quaker meeting-house--they stand in for a prototypical aspect of London that the young and naive country spy needs to see. At the Widdow's coffeehouse, there are women "a little in [his] Debt" and, the friend says, " if the Lewdness of the Town has lately thrown a Cully in their way, they may chance to be able to make me Satisfaction" (26). The physician-friend has already given his services to the women at this coffeehouse, but she has yet to pay the bill. Within the loose narrative structure of *The London Spy,* this provides a reason for their visit, but it also throws the reputation of the coffeehouse in question by representing it as a common whorehouse. This interaction is connected to the tradition of satire of the public sphere I introduced earlier; early English pornography attacks the public sphere through prostitutes who are the most visible urban women. Like the apothecary, Royal Society man, and bookseller in the last coffeehouse, *The London Spy's* attack on the coffeehouse calls the public sphere into question by arguing that its true ends are private gain and private pleasures.

Satire and the Individual: Garth's *The Dispensary* and Ned Ward's *The London Spy*

Through these depictions of London's systems of punishment and its coffeehouses, I have been arguing that Ned Ward's satire of the public sphere targets London's administration and aims to discredit places within the city. For the remainder of this chapter, I want to draw from Andrew Marvell's strategy—animating the statues to comment on their rhetoric—to consider the ways in which the rhetoric of London's architecture is taken up in two literary

works—Samuel Garth's *The Dispensary* and Ned Ward's *The London Spy.* While these two works have different objectives, I see a similar community-mindedness to the way they justify the work. Also, both works assert the authority of the places they speak from, despite the different political motivations. Samuel Garth's *Dispensary* relies on the image of the College of Physicians to uphold the authority and moral standards of the college in a manner similar to that in which Ned Ward uses the image of an Anglican church steeple to assert the authority of the established church over Protestant dissenters' meeting houses in *Ecclesia et Factio. A Dialogue between Bow-Steeple Dragon and the Exchange Grasshopper.* The works of Garth and Ward position themselves as though they want to put the interests of Londoners above private interests. This position needs to be examined more closely because of Garth and Ward's political differences. On one hand, Garth's dispensary project benefits his profession and undermines the apothecaries. Ward's writing is a more partisan attack on Whig economics and on the public sphere. But both authors use the interest of the community to make their arguments.

Samuel Garth and Ned Ward differ in their use of architecture for satiric ends in ways that help more precisely to clarify Ward's satire of London. First, as background to the dynamic between these two authors, there are many Tory satires of Garth's *Dispensary*, including *The Dispensary, a Farce* (1697), which lampoons the College of Physicians for its infighting, with comparisons to the factions and competing sects of Protestant dissenters, suggesting that the physicians, like tradesmen in London, are motivated by profits and self-interest rather than the welfare of their clients. The final image of that farce is instructions for a cordial, "Fanaticks Diascordium," which brings about a dissenting, "Schismatick" effect on the patient (351). There is some truth to the Tory criticisms of the College: the dispensary project, while it seems noble, was also an attempt to subvert the role of apothecaries by establishing the college as an authority

for the production of medicine, which was the purview of the Apothecaries' Hall. The College's effort to muscle in on the apothecaries' territory was retaliation for apothecaries who were practicing physic.

So, how is architecture an appeal to authority of place in satire? In *The Dispensary* (1706), satire appeals to the authority of the College of Physicians' architecture. Asking the members to uphold the College's reputation, this appeal comes with a moral imperative, and this is where the intersection of space and morality is so important in Garth's satire. The College of Physicians had recently established a set of rooms in its college, the dispensary, where patients could be treated at cost. This move was part of a larger trend in the medical community toward the provision of treatment for the city's poorest citizens. In 1653, Samuel Herring presented a petition to Parliament asking for provisions to pay physicians out of public funds. But the dispensary itself created a division within the college, which Garth's satire takes up in a genre-defining mock-epic.

A Short Account of the Proceedings of the College of Physicians (1697) provides the reasoning that lead to the creation of a dispensary within the College. The pamphlet reproduces the complaints made by apothecaries, answers them point-by-point on behalf of the College, and accounts for the ways in which the apothecaries and physicians who opposed the measures to help the sick-poor had their own self-interest at heart. It suggests a clear but somewhat disingenuous picture of the dispensary project. The truth of the matter is far more complex; as Harold Cook shows in *The Decline of the Old Medical Regime in Stuart London*, by the end of the seventeenth-century physicians had enjoyed a long run of privilege and authority where they had a monopoly on the title of physician, over the prescription of medicines, and over the care of dying patients. Apothecaries or unlicensed physicians administering medical advice and

intervention to patients who later died were legally liable, so they referred patients to physicians for all serious cases, but this practice was part of a continued trend toward growing power of the Apothecaries' Guild that coincided with the gradual decline of the power of the College of Physicians.

Samuel Garth was an advocate for reason who spoke out against apothecaries, and his reputation carried on throughout the eighteenth century. *Siris in the Shades* (1744) represents Garth as a voice of reason who intervenes in a conversation between an apothecary, Dr. Hancock, and Dr. Benjamin Smith. Smith is convinced of the benefits of tar-water based on the work of Dr. Hancock, but Garth sets him straight by correcting the misunderstandings inherent in his belief of a universal medicine. The dialogue takes a dig at Garth as well: since he joins the dialogue on the banks of the river Styx to visit his deceased patients, his effectiveness as a physician is called into question.

In his *Dispensary* poem, Garth chastises fellow members of the college who do not support the dispensary. He argues for the authority and supremacy of the College over the professional practices of apothecaries by comparing the particular spaces in which they practice their trade. In the first case of the poem's appeal to the authority of place, the College is introduced in relation to its proximity to the Old Bailey, drawing on the authority of this palace of justice to make an appeal for the College's role:

> Not far from that most celebrated Place,
> Where angry Justice shews her awful Face;
> Where little Villains must submit to Fate,
> That great Ones may enjoy the World in State; (1-2).

Significantly, within the terms of this introduction to the college, the prestige of the College of Physicians is first articulated in relation to the prestige of the surrounding neighbourhood. The grandeur of the Old Bailey is used to suggest that the College shares the same privilege, but it is undermined by the way that the Villians' "submit to fate" while the great Ones "enjoy the World in State," which suggests an abuse of power and exploitation as well. The authority of the Old Bailey, like the authority of the college, is under attack by those who abuse that power. Only after this introduction, which implicates both the court and the college, does Garth appeal to the architectural design of the College to emphasize the privilege of the college:

> There stands a Dome, Majestick to the sight,
> And sumptuous Arches bear its oval Height;
> A golden Globe plac'd high with artful Skill,
> Seems, to the distant Sight, a gilded Pill:
> This Pile was, by the pious Patron's Aim,
> Rais'd for a Use as Noble as its Frame (2)

The "sumptuous Arches," and "golden Globe," are used to suggest that the College was "Rais'd for a Use as Noble as its Frame." The "gilded Pill" is not simply synonymous with the "golden globe," and in addition to its more sexual connotations or its meaning as a reference to pills coated in gold-leaf or sugar, this phrase may also be used to playfully suggest that the rights of members of the College to prescribe medicines are implicit in the design and structure of the building itself. But the gilded pill also draws attention to the ways in which the apothecaries are undermining the authority of the college and the tenuous authority that they hold.

Garth's introduction to the Apothecaries' Hall is similarly rooted in place and architectural features, but the authority of the Warden of the Apothecaries' Hall comes from the "Black Fryars Annals," firmly rooting the Hall in a separate, less prestigious neighbourhood:

> She said, and straight shrill Colon's Person took,
> In Morals loose, but most precise in Look.
> Black Fryars Annals lately pleas'd to call
> Him Warden of Apothecaries-Hall. (20)

This description of the shop is an excellent example of the way morality is given concrete meaning through literary description of space: "loose" morals have a very particular "Look," Garth argues. The poem connects morality and place in its description of the warden and the apothecaries. The physical description and demeanor of the warden himself is associated with loose morals, so there is a human face and an individual target to Garth's satire. In a bleak image that connects the Apothecaries-Hall to more concrete actions with the dispensing of medicines to the poor, the Apothecaries-Hall itself is called the "Mansion where the Vulgar run / for Ruin throng, and pay to be undone" (20). Compared to the evocations of justice and the state that accompany the introduction to the College, these lines set the College and the Apothecaries-Hall in opposition. Finally, the descriptions of the apothecaries' shops in Garth's poem compare apothecaries to the collectors who resided in the area, suggesting that the apothecaries are little more than collectors of curiosities:

> Long has he been of that amphibious Fry,
> Bold to Prescribe, and busie to Apply.
> His shop the gazing Vulgar Eyes employs
> With Foreign Trinkets, and Domestic Toys (22).

This description of the apothecaries' shops, too, is a description of the "look" of loose moral practices and commercial dealings. These three ways in which the College and the Apothecaries' Hall are introduced—through the warden, the Apothecaries-Hall, and the shops—gesture toward a larger strategy, which uses space to suggest the moral status of each institution, reading in the surrounding topography the moral status of the rival houses and its effect on the neighbourhood. The Apothecaries' Hall is later associated with abortion, poisoning, and murder, with hefty bills, and with Fleet Ditch, which flows down "To wash his sooty Naiads in the Thames" (30). By associating the apothecaries in Blackfriars with the Fleet nearby, Garth anticipates the exodus of the dunces from London in Pope's *Dunciad*, denigrating the apothecaries by association with their neighbourhood and the neighbouring Fleet ditch, while the physicians remain safely a few blocks north. In Garth's *Dispensary,* it is as if the Apothecaries-Hall itself has poisoned the Thames and caused disorder throughout Blackfriars.

In Garth's satire, the College of Physicians links a moral typology with the moral topography: the allegorized characters Garth associates with each institution are physically manifest in their buildings. Sloth settles in to rest in the Physician's College, becoming a spatial and moral "type" by which to colour the group of physicians unwilling to act in favour of the Dispensary project and against the threat that Apothecaries will write their own prescriptions:

> 'Twas in this rev'rend Dome I sought Ropose,
> These Walls were that Asylum I had chose.
> Here have I rul'd long undisturb'd with Broils,
> And laugh'd at Heroes, and their glorious Toils. (11)

As Sloth inhabits the College of Physicians, it reinforces the relationship between character and place built in his initial description of the College. Further, the College is described as an Asylum, so Sloth's refuge threatens to make the College into Bedlam.

Samuel Garth's *The Dispensary* appeals to the authority of the College of Physicians as a physician structure; its architecture is code for its authority and reputation. Similarly, the satiric targets—the apothecaries and physicians objecting to the project—are put "in their place" by this appeal. The physicians are censured by the appeal to the College's place of prominence and they bear the burden of the fact that Sloth has settled in the College. Apothecaries, on the other hand, are identified in Blackfriars, which separates them topographically and signifies a class distinction they cannot escape. As I transition to a discussion of the way Ned Ward uses architecture in *The London Spy*, I want to keep Garth's spatial strategy in mind. Unlike Garth, who uses the College to scold physicians and keep apothecaries at bay, Ward examines the architecture of London to draw attention to social and political failings.

I have been discussing the satire of the public sphere in *The London Spy*, but I would like to revisit how Ward has been used to support a public sphere argument. Anthony Pollock's argument about Ward needs to be revisited and reoriented in relation to the attacks on the public sphere that I have taken up so far. My primary concern is that while it is true that Ward's writing is embodied and situated in London's topography, it is problematic to characterize it as ideological. *The London Spy* is filled with skeptical attacks on religious dissent, political factions, and new economic systems, but it takes on these new ideological structures not to present its own ideology but as an anti-ideological move. My second concern is that the characterization of Ned Ward's satire against "major institutions" over-generalizes the nature of the satire of London to all institutions. Finally, while Pollock's argument identifies the Whig

institutions that Ward attacks, at the end of the seventeenth century, with Tory government still in power, Ward is still writing from a position safely within a Tory hegemony, even if his literature of London moves into a space that is the birthplace of a growing Whig hegemony. In order to address these concerns, I have been working from Christopher Thorne's account of Pyrrhonistic discourse in *The Dialectic of Counter-Enlightenment,* which accounts for the ways in which skeptical arguments from ancient Greece to Early Modern England attack knowledge and ideology not with an argument for an alternative, but to discredit them so that the reader will "default" to the hegemony, so that whatever is most commonly held as belief or habit will stand as its own authority when new ideas are placed in contradiction. As *The London Spy* takes us through the city, there is no need to replace Whig ideology with an alternative in London to undermine the economic and political ideas at work there; instead, the spy need only show London to be in disarray and in contradiction. With Whig economics and politics (seemingly) in shambles, with Protestant faction with its pamphlet wars represented as chaotic and disorganized, Ward needs only to say these are failed projects. From a Pyrrhonist perspective, there is no need to make a positive argument for the state when the authority of the monarchy and the established church is what is left after other positions are dismissed as factious and contradictory, and this is, I argue, the best way to characterize Ward's satire of London. From what I might call this populist brand of Tory pyrrhonism that Ned Ward's account of the city offers, *The London Spy* is largely concerned with how the city has failed the public interest.

Ward's critique of London's architecture after the Great Fire uses the architecture of the city to make London's moral failures concrete. This culminates in his description of The Monument, which has always been part of a moralizing narrative about what caused the Great Fire in 1666 (Moore 498). In addition to the way spaces make these moral failures concrete, the

figure of the individual, especially the image of the orphan, is used to make the consequences of individualism and self-interest concrete. This too is an argument for the state and for the established church. If London has failed people after the fire, bankrupted itself, and taken the orphan's money, then by the Pyrrhonist view, the state and the established church are better stewards by default, and Ward does not have to explicitly make that argument.

Now I want to examine a couple of examples of how this works in *The London Spy.* The first example is a description of "blackguard children"—vagrant orphans who beg for money and do small jobs—who are unsuccessful during the day and have been refused shelter; they are on their way to a last resort, which is to sleep in their "Winter Quarters, the Glass-House, in the Minories" (35). Ned Ward's account alludes to a problem later vividly described by Daniel Defoe in *Colonel Jack* (1722)—that these children had to sleep in the walls of a bottle-making factory, warmed by the fires and ashes from the furnaces. This example is *The London Spy*'s introduction to the figure of the orphan. Throughout the work, the spy continues to make appeals to the figure of the orphan, and those appeals are indicative of the conflict this chapter opens up: the sensitivity towards the city's most at-risk is at the heart of Ward's Tory critique. But tellingly, Ward's account differs from the indictment of Defoe's novel in its political ends. Defoe's orphan transforms into a wealthy plantation owner as a demonstration of the benefits and possibilities for upward mobility under the emergent Whig economic system. For Ward, the problem is how London managed its funds and failed to support orphaned children, a problem he illustrates with his account of The Monument to the Great Fire of London.

The most compelling criticisms of the city in *The London Spy* are observations about architectural features that dominate the pedestrian experience of London. Prominent facades and towering "edifices" are consistently the subject of the spy's commentary. These passages where

the architecture of the city is discussed are an important way in which *The London Spy* maps power relations in the city and comments on injustices. Westminster Abbey is described with awe and called a "sacred edifice," and the spy and his friend are saddened by aspects of the abbey that are in need of repairs (177-179). Powerful trades and offices of the state are above comment: the Admiralty office and the Custom-House are off limits for conversation and the spy's friend refuses to discuss either for fear of what might happen if he does (51, 192). Bridewell and Ludgate are called a "prince's palace" and a "Noble Postern" by the naive Spy, which plays on the irony of the grandeur of their structures in relation to their purposes as houses of correction (121, 107). Likewise, the Spy mistakes Bedlam for "the Lord Mayor's Palace" before he is undeceived by a trip to visit the cells housing patients there, where one throws excrement on him (60). In each of these cases, the irony of the grand architecture becomes clear when the mundane or eschatological purpose is revealed. These observations of "edifices" in *The London Spy* are partisan. Ward will not touch matters of the state, but he comments on London's governance and trade. Thus, Ward's spy is really a Tory spy in Whig London. The spy's status as an outsider from the country, and his subsequent initiation into London, is an important marker for the suburban position Ward takes in his satire.

The London Spy considers the built environment for its usefulness to the public. One example is its discussion of how Dorset Garden's Theatre, abandoned and sitting empty, is considered a waste of resources. The friend speculates as to whether it will be pulled down or purchased as a Protestant house of worship (148). In this vein, The Monument to the Great Fire of London is considered a waste and a moral failure on the part of the city administration to adequately care for the poor in the aftermath of the fire. The monument, a combination of these earlier examples, is a prime target for satire: it was costly and useless for its original purpose.

The London Spy uses these failings to target London's administration and its handling of the efforts to rebuild after the Great Fire in 1667.

The contracts for rebuilding London after the Great Fire went to powerful and influential architects, who profited greatly from this work. Christopher Wren, Inigo Jones, and others benefited from this tragedy and the Tory critique of this process is that the money should have been spent for the benefit of London's poor. The monument was built by Act of Parliament in that year by Christopher Wren. Wren was the architect who rebuilt most of the churches in London after the fire (Wren 321-2).

Underneath the surface critique of the monument that references its height, is the historical failure of its construction. The monument had a poor reputation because it failed to live up to its design and purpose. John Moore discusses how rather than being used for experiments and astronomy, as intended, it was abandoned and became primarily ornamental (501). The monument became symbolic of frivolous spending, due to the great cost in its design and erection, and this wastefulness is what Ward elaborates on in his imaginative observations of the monument:

> the chief use of it is for the Improvement of Vintners Boys and Drawers, who come every Week to Exercise their Supporters . . . which fixes them in a Nimble Step, and makes 'em rare Light-heel'd Emissaries in a Months Practice. (54)

In Ward's account, the primary benefit of the monument, beyond any aesthetic value, is that waiters for wine-sellers can exercise themselves by running up and down the tower. The project is made even more frivolous by the fact that it was commissioned right after the fire, when the city's citizens were most in need of aid.

The London Spy's criticism of London's governance appears to privilege the injustice done to the poor above partisan politics, an exceptional quality for an author who often rigidly writes with a Tory politics and rarely criticizes his own camp. According to the spy, King's image was placed on the monument "to prevent the high flown Loyalists to Reflect upon their Treachery to the poor Orphans, since they may pretend (tho' they cheated them of their Money) 'twas with a Pious Design of setting up the Kings Picture" (54). Through this argument that the King's image was placed on the monument out of self-interest and to justify the project, *The London Spy* will not even spare Loyalist actions from satire if they interfere with the moral aims of its satire, targeting London's mismanagement of funds and the way the city has ignored the plight of the poor. The friend's take on the monument is less partisan and more cynical; he suggests the primary purpose of the monument was "the opportunity of putting two Thousand Pound into their own Pockets, whilst they paid one towards the Building" (55). This suggestion of corruption and profiteering leads him to say, quite ostentatiously, "'Tis a Monument to the Cities Shame, the Orphans Grief, the Protestants Pride, and the Papists Scandal" (55). By casting the monument as a wasteful use of public funds, *The London Spy* targets London and its administration.

Ward was not alone in his criticism of the monument, which continued to suffer and lose its reputation. Clare Walcot suggests the monument is "associated with the corruption, self-interest, and profligacy of the incumbents of Guildhall" (420), and its symbolic status was contested later as well. Walcot discusses the monument's importance as an unstable symbol of cultural memory, onto which Hogarth inscribes his dedication not to the Great Fire, but to the "Memory of the Destruction of this City by the South Sea in 1720" (417). When Hogarth reimagines the monument in his illustrations, he imagines it as a memory of another catastrophic

event; economic rather than physical, but equally devastating to the city. Ward's work consistently targets the emergent economic system that fueled the speculative South Sea Bubble. Ward's targets in this observation of the monument were the same political and social forces Horgarth targeted a few decades later.

The London Spy reads the physical height of the monument through the moralizing framework of satire, appealing to the physical height of the building to suggest the "low" moral standing of London's government: The monument is a "Towering Ediface . . . Erected thro' the Wisdom and Honesty of the City; as a very high Memorandum of its being laid low" (53). The monument stands in for the decisions made by London's administration; its height, useless for the practical purposes it was designed for, is now understood to correspond to the failed moral posturing toward any moral "high ground." Likewise, that London was "laid low," echoing the memory of the Great Fire, takes on new meaning with the implication that London's administration has sunk to new moral depths in its failure to help the poor. The target of this satire of the monument is the Whig-dominated City of London, and the satire suggests the rebuilding of London after the Great Fire is a moral failure that has neglected the people who suffered, benefiting others instead. To communicate this, *The London Spy* turns again to the image of the orphan to criticize the individuals who gained from London's rebuilding.

The London Spy builds on the moral lesson of the monument by turning it into a biblical allegory:

> To the Glory of the City, and the Everlasting Reputation of the worthy Projectors of this high and mighty Babel; it was more Ostentatiously than Honestly Built, by the poor Orphans Money; many of them since having beg'd their Bread; and the City have here given them a Stone. (53)

Two religious allusions are conflated in this allegory. First, London is aligned with a biblical image repeated in Matthew: in Christ's temptation, the devil tempts Christ to turn a stone into bread when he is fasting in the desert (Matt: 4.3-4), which is repeated later in Matthew: "Or what man is there of you, whom if his son ask bread, will he give him a stone? (Matt. 7.9). The Orphans have been offered a "stone" in the monument instead of bread. The second reference brands the monument a useless structure, but also raises the question of who received "bread" when others needed it more. Second, the monument is compared to Tower of Babel, which casts it as a prototypically vain project. Babel was constructed after the Great Flood , and subsequently abandoned (Gen. 11.4–9). The monument, built after the Great Fire, was abandoned as an observatory for the Royal Society. *The London Spy's* criticism of public spending is warranted. Orphans relied on parish donations to those entrusted with their care, but starvation due to misuse or inadequacy of those donations was a common problem (D. Marshall 92-100). Further to this general state of affairs, the rebuilding of London was financed from the city's treasury, drawing from the orphan's funds as capital. *The Case of the City of London, in Reference to the Debt to the Orphans, and Others* (1693) provides an overview of how the money was needed and what interest was paid to the orphan's fund, but tries to defend the city's use of the orphan's money. In a defense of London's role, it suggests that with revenue streams it had lost, it would be able to pay perpetual interest to the fund, to the benefit of the Orphans. I. G. Doolittle and Vanessa Harding have looked at the city's use of the orphan's funds in more detail, offering a damning account of mismanagement at the end of the seventeenth century (Doolittle 46-59; Harding 51-60). *The London Spy* sees the use of the orphan's funds purely as a theft, and the image of the monument is a moving: an architectural project with little utility value, when placed alongside the material needs of the orphans, whose money was used to build it, lacks any moral

standing. This moralized reading of the monument suggests it was a morally corrupt project that used funds better which would have been better spent restoring the health of citizens; instead of productive schemes to alleviate poverty during this economic downturn, London's elite were focused adapting principles used in colonial plantations to use on London's poor through the construction of workhouses (Marshall 181-200). Like Garth's *Dispensary*, *The London Spy* argues that any benefit to London's poor is more desirable than private profits or the financing for war that necessitated using the orphan's capital.

I have taken this account of Ned Ward's *The London Spy* through its treatment of punishment at Bridewell, which targets London workhouses and gestures toward maritime trade. I have also looked at the way *The London Spy* visits coffeehouses as a satire on the public sphere targeting the Royal Society, tradesmen, apothecaries, and others, as an indication of self-interest and greed far from the ideal image of the coffeehouse as an icon of the public sphere as theorized after Habermas. *The London Spy* uses the penultimate image of the individual, the orphan, to show how individualism, self-interest, and profit motivated by greed fails to benefit the disenfranchised. I have contrasted these accounts of *The London Spy* with Defoe's *Hymn to the Pillory* and Samuel Garth's *The Dispensary* not only because of how they use similar spatial strategies in their satire but also as a way to help distinguish what *The London Spy* does and how it is motivated by a different political project. Defoe's pillory and Garth's dispensary project both show ways of dealing with public space in satire that respectively challenge and support accepted authority, but Ward's politics cannot be defined by such a rigid distinction. Ward challenges the authority of London because he sees a particular type of mismanagement and injustice there. As a result, *The London Spy* frequently moves beyond satire of individual and collective vices to institutional problems and systemic issues and to individualism as a social

problem. Public spaces are a way to start a conversation about these issues because they have their own rhetoric, because they are familiar, persistent, and enduring records of decisions made and money spent. After the Great Fire, during the rebuilding of London, *The London Spy* depicts a problem with the way the money enriched a few while many continued to suffer. By focusing on this problem, Ward turns the infrastructure and architecture of London into a way to cast London, the Whig party, and a whole class of merchant tradesmen as the source of greed and self-dealing. This focus in Ward's writing is important, not only because of the way Pope tried to connect him to London, but also because it shows that the symbols of London's authority and the records of who built and profited from the reconstruction are not one-sided; rather, their rhetoric is contestable, changing, and facing resistance even as London, a new Whig economy, and global trade in a developing empire are growing at a rapid pace. Ward's work is politically aligned against these developments during a period of Whig-dominated city politics. Because the techniques he uses are, as Pollock suggests, appropriated and made more polite by the Scriblerian journalism that follows, Ward's satire of Whig governance in London should not be seen as a discrete moment to recover, but as an enduring influence on literary engagement with the city for decades to come. The image of the orphan is used in *The London Spy* to argue that global trade fails to benefit individuals who do not share in the profit. Self-interest erodes social structures in London, and it is the poet's role to speak on behalf of his fellow citizens.

IV. Colonial Excess: London's Trade and Ned Ward's Satire of the Colonies

Ward's satire of Jamaica, written at the beginning of his career, is inseparable from his discussion of Grub Street and the literary marketplace. In *A Trip to Jamaica* (1698), Ward says "if I was but as well assur'd of Pleasing every body else, as I am of Displeasing those who have an Interest in that Country, I should not question but the Printer would gain his End, which are the wishes of the Author" (To the Reader 4). As he tenuously acknowledges popular taste for a disparaging account of Jamaica, he revels in the fact that anyone financially invested in the colony will not be happy with his satire. The joint "wishes" (to offend those with an "Interest" in Jamaica and to write something profitable for the printer) introduce the story's primary concerns: colonization and literary production. Ward continues to place colonization and literary authorship, the solider and the writer, in opposition. A Trip to Jamaica is written in " times of Adversity . . . The Sword being advanc'd, and the Pen silenc'd," (5). Or, more colourfully, it was inspired by "Fools getting more by hazarding their Carcasses, than Ingenious Men by imploying their Wits (5). Its main concern, in other words, is why London's government is spending money so readily on soldiers and not writers. I examine this problem as a moral criticism of government spending on colonization, which Ward calls excessive and wasteful. Ward's representation of colonial excess has a spatial dimension, which is that it really is not concerned with the welfare of anyone in the colonies. Instead, Ward argues, money should be used for expenditures locally. Ward's focus on local needs is mirrored in the way every vice and folly in A Trip to Jamaica is identified as something that originates in the City of London.

Building on the idea of the Grub Street persona of Ward and Brown in Chapter One, and on the account of Ward's satire on London in Chapter Three, this chapter accounts for Ward's literary personae and reputation as a professional writer. The two texts this chapter focuses on

were written at different phases of Ward's career, but they are both written about colonization and global trade. *A Trip to Jamaica* (1698) was written at the beginning of Ward's career, while *The Barbacue Feast* (1707) was written at the end, when Ward had had become the proprietor of a tavern and was publishing less frequently. Alexander Pope attacked Ned Ward based on his status in the colonies and his reputation from *A Trip to Jamaica* so this chapter considers how Ward's satire of the colonies and his focus on colonization and literary production informs Pope's attack on Ward in the *Dunciad*. Pope represents Ward in London instead of in Moorfields. But rather than representing Ward in the place he is associated with, like Brown does with Dryden, Pope takes Ward out of Grub Street, making him out to be a merchant of the city. Pope's attack was effective because it associates Ward with the places and businesses Ward spent his career arguing against.

I approach this topic by first discussing the background of Pope's attack on Ned Ward. Then I turn to how Ned Ward wrote about London's trade throughout his career, including his defense of London's vintners later in his career. Finally, I examine his early satire of global trade in *A Trip to Jamaica* alongside his later *The Barbacue Feast.* Throughout this survey of global and local trade in Ned Ward, I am concerned with the spatial strategies these texts use to interrogate the moral failures of trading practices. *A Trip to Jamaica* continually relates the moral failures of trade in Jamaica to London, situating its moral problems within the familiar urban landscape of the city. In *The Barbacue Feast*, a gluttonous club of merchants draws on all the commodities of their global reach to host a feast in Peckham. Together, these satires of trade rhetorically place the blame of the moral problems of global trade in London, while *The Barbacue Feast* demonstrates how the spoils are consumed in ways that benefit no one outside of those profiting from trade in the colonies.

Backgrounds to Ned Ward's Satire on Trade

Ned Ward's early work focuses on global trade. *A Trip to Jamaica* (1698) takes on the effects of a global trade which has focused on imperial expansion to the detriment of local populations in the greater metropolitan area. These effects worked in favour of a small number of the merchant-class who controlled trade in the City of London. Like *The London Spy* (1698-99), Ward's other satire from this period that focuses on the city's trade, *A Trip to Jamaica* exposes greed, deception, and other unfair practices. Later in his career, after he has taken up proprietorship of a tavern in Moorfields, Ward criticizes deceptive practices in his new trade, praising honest vintners throughout greater London. This chapter, then, accounts for Ward's view of trade locally and globally, within the city and without, in order to show how he views trade practices and where he places the blame for problematic and deceptive economic activity. The spatial context in each case is an important part of how moral culpability is understood and blame cast. Ward represents London as a place where deceptive trade is part of the very foundations of the city, transcending class and part of economic activity from fishmongers to stockjobbers and bankers; Moorfields cheats are treated in a similar fashion to dissenting preachers—as itinerant upstarts with no roots or authority to speak from, making themselves into whatever they claim to be. The spatial strategies employed in the works that take on global trade are complex: on one hand, Jamaica is represented as a southern colony, intrinsically immoral due to its climate. Additionally, anyone in the colonies can purport to be different or better than they are, making themselves anew based on their own authority. *A Barbeque Feast* articulates these problems and targets in Peckham, an exurban residential area popular with wealthy citizens who wanted to avoid the high costs of the City of London.[10] The excessive feast, full of products from

[10] Peckham was a retreat for wealthy men seeking lower rents than could be found in the City. For example, Christopher Wren is said to have lived there during the Rebuilding of St. Paul's. Walford, Edward. "Camberwell."

colonies all over the world, is consumed by wealthy merchants who control London's politics but wish to pay no rent or taxes there to support the local population.

Alexander Pope's attacks on Ned Ward late in his career are targeted to undermine the efforts throughout his career to expose and ridicule the Whig economic model. In 1728, the year Pope's *Peri Bathos* and the first *Dunciad* were published, Ned Ward was an established, popular writer, with a career comparatively free of feuding with other authors. *Peri Bathos* dubs Ward a frog trying to keep his head above water, and thus a member of those "sinking" in poetry. But Pope's *Dunciad* attacks Ward on multiple fronts by undermining Ward's politics, disparaging his trade and his literary reputation.[11] Relegating Ward to the ranks of those popular only to the tastes of the colonies and disparaging Ward's business, Pope hopes his own works will "Not sail with Ward, to Ape and Monkey Climes, / Where vile Mundungus trucks for viler rhymes" (I:233-234).[12] This attack on Ward's literary reputation was accompanied by a spiteful attack on Ward's trade, first via a quote from Jacob Tonson attached to these lines that Ward "kept a publick house in the City (but in a genteel way) and with his wit, humour, and good liquor (Ale) afforded his guests a pleasurable entertainment" (79, n 200). That Ward kept an alehouse is repeated in notes throughout the Dunciad. James Nicholls accounts for the political associations with ale and wine, which suggests that Pope uses "ale" to label Ward as an ale-drinking Whig instead of a wine-toasting royalist (25). The accusation that Ward would sell beer was too much. It provoked a response from Ward, in the Postscript to *Appolo's Maggot in his Cups, or the*

Old and New London: Volume 6. London: Cassell, Petter & Galpin, 1878. 269-286, par. 15. *British History Online.* Web. 18 December 2019. http://www.british-history.ac.uk/old-new-london/vol6/pp269-286.

[11] For arguments on Ward's explicitly Tory writing and its relation to Whig history, see: Knights, Mark. "The Tory Interpretation of History in the Rage of Parties." *Huntington Library Quarterly*, vol. 68, no. 1–2, Mar. 2005, pp. 353–73; Michelle Orihel. "'Treacherous Memories' of Regicide: The Calves-Head Club in the Age of Anne." *The Historian,* vol. 73, no. 3, 2011, p. 435.

[12] In other words, cheap tobacco is traded for Ward's work. Similarly, but somewhat tempered, the Variorum edition of 1729 Pope wishes his works to be "Fair without spot; than greas'd by grocer's hands, / Or shipp'd with Ward to ape and monkey lands" (I:199-200).

Whimsical Creation of a Little Satyrical Poet (1729). Ward sets the record straight and insists that he keeps a tavern in Moorfields:

> He might as well have said in his Index: Ward Edward, a Tavern-keeper in Moorfields, but then he had told the Truth, and lost the satisfaction of imposing a Falsity upon his Readers . . . Suppose, Ward should say, in an Index under the letter P, that Pope Alexander keeps a House of Intrigue at Twickenham, in order to curry favour with Quality, and that's the Reason why so many Gentleman and Ladies are his constant Subscribers. All this is as true, as that Ward keeps an Ale-house in Moorfields, tho he lives there. But that which makes the insincerity of Pope the more provoking, is, his reporting this contrary to his own Knowledge and Conscience, for Pope has drank Wine at Ward's House, and knows it to be a Tavern. (Postscript 35-36; qtd in Troyer 227, n22)

The distinction between an ale-house and a tavern, between the sale of malt-beer and good wine, was of serious consequence to Ward—that much is clear—and in his response he accuses Pope of actions currying favour with the Court, of self-interest.

Ward's opposition to London is founded on exposing the self-interest of trade there, and his attempt to connect Pope to this "intrigue" is not completely baseless. Ward's opposition comes before the rise of "economic literature" in Julien Hoppit's account of economic literature from 1660. (85) Ward's writing is aligned with Hoppit's contention that economic writing is much more complex and varied during this period than it is made out to be in accounts that try to characterize it as a cohesive language aligned with "'mercantilist'" views or as "an emerging 'political economy'" (105). Jonathan Pritchard argues that despite his private suggestion that "Slav'ry be no more," Pope was implicated and invested in the slave trade starting with his investment in the South Sea Company (580). One notable study of this dynamic later in the

period is Catherine Molineaux's account of Hogarth's depictions of the problems of consumption and the slave trade (495-520). Here, Molineaux builds on David Bindman's contention that "'European patterns of consumption of luxury goods with the slave labor that produced them' until the 1760s" (qtd in Molineaux 495). Molineaux builds on Bindman's argument to suggest that "Hogarth's primary concern was not the oppression of black slaves, but rather the harmful effects that he perceived in his fellow Londoners' desire for foreign goods" (495). I approach Ward with these judgments in mind and with the understanding that most Londoners did not see consumption of foreign products as part of the slave trade at this point; however, where Ward's target is colonial spending and the excessive consumption, I want to draw attention not to consumption of foreign goods and colonization—as Horgarth does—but rather to the way these texts depict colonial spending as excessive, unsustainable, unethical, and immoral. In doing so, Ward oscillates between the periphery and centre to expose the economic and moral impacts of colonial spending. Ward's focus in his criticism of the economy is not on slavery. Instead, he focuses on the merchants of the city. His critique of excess and government spending in *A Trip to Jamaica* is a critique of colonization and global trade, but not for its impact on colonized land and people. Instead, Ward's argument centres his own trade and others in and around London. Ward's suggestion that money would be better spent at home is not a challenge to colonization on its own grounds, but his satire of the colony does suggest that the colonial project is wasteful, excessive, and frivolous. So, Ward's critique of colonial spending is not a total critique of colonization. At the same time, it is an important reminder that there was opposition to colonial spending and the economic tools used to support it at the end of the seventeenth century. This opposition is part of what Hoppit suggests is lost in economic histories that suggest there is a consensus in seventeenth-century economic thought.

The perspective Ward takes in this travel writing is a skeptical anti-cosmopolitanism that offers a counterpoint to characterizations of this period that connect cosmopolitanism with colonialism. Gerd Bayer builds on Howard Weinbrot's argument in *Britania's Issue* that in the seventeenth-century "The time was ripe . . . for literary texts to experiment with new approaches when it comes to confronting cultural and ethnic difference," reading a degree of tolerance and acceptance in travel writing that includes Giovanni Marana's *Letters Writ by a Turkish Spy* (1687), from which *The London Spy* was inspired (37). Ward's writing stands in contrast to the cosmopolitan ideals Bayer reads in travel writing of this period, but as he narrates Jamaica, a related theory of the cosmopolitan may help explain the way he connects human vice in Jamaica to London. "The 'rooted/routed cosmopolitan,'" theorized by Jennie Molz, is a hybrid between the traditional understanding of the cosmopolitan and P. Gilroy's theories of diasporic rooted/routedness, (4). This idea of a "rooted" cosmopolitan is similar to the way Ward's description of Jamaica always references back to London; however, unlike someone who "appreciates and is open to difference, and yet continues to be situated in one or more specific political, social or cultural spheres," Ward's writing is skeptical of the cosmopolitan ideal and critical of the colonization and global movement that enables it. (Molz 4). We can arrive closer to Ward's skeptical view of cosmopolitanism from Eddie Kent and Terri Tomsky's *Negative Cosmopolitanisms*, where Ward could be a seventeenth-century analog to the sceptical origins of the term "kosmopolitēs" in Diogenes' thought that their work draws on in its examination of "literature that represents cosmopolitan projects imposed by the forces of capitalism and imperialism" (12, 15). To put this negative cosmopolitanism in conversation with the economic arguments in *A Trip to Jamaica* and *A Barbacue Feast* about colonialism and the literary marketplace, it is useful to consider how Ian Baucom frames countercosmopolitanism as

"cosmopolitan interestedness" (230). Building on Poovey's *A History of the Modern Fact,* Baucom suggests that "to refuse disinterestedness . . . is to adopt an alternative mode of epistemological fiction making and to adopt a countercosmopolitanism, an alternate mode of inhabiting the planetary, a cosmopolitan interestedness" (230). Later, Baucom discusses this countercosmopolitanism in relation to Smith's economics, suggesting that Smith's economics recognizes the suffering that capital brings, but that it chooses "to neutralize the ethical burden of such knowledge by collapsing all the system's imaged miseries into a dispassionate, disinterested, actuarial science of aggregates, averages, and such numbers" (239). Ward writes about Jamaica as a skeptical observer of the colony, but his account is far from disinterested detachment. Rather, it is scathing, embodied, and sentimental. In short, Ward's writing is designed to upset anyone with an "Interest" in Jamaica by being interested.

To return to Pope's attack on Ward, the distinction between Moorfields and the City of London is just as important as the product of Ward's trade (wine, not beer). Moorfields, as a Grub Street centre north of London and some distance from Fleet Street, was central to Ward's identify, especially at this period in his life. Pope's attack on Ward's trade attempts to paint him as less accomplished, of lower social standing, and of less personal consequence to Pope than he really was; however, Ward's reaction is equally concerned with the distinction between the claim that he operated in the city and not in Moorfields, a distinction immensely important both for its implications about Ward's politics and in relation to Pope's own living situation. Ward's life in Moorfields was not only near Grub Street, a fact he seems keen to claim and preserve for his reputation, but it was also, significantly, *not* in the city—the centre of political power and the

centre of the trades Ward attacked throughout his career as greedy and deceptive.[13] Pope, on the other hand, as a Catholic, was unable to live and work in the city, and thus maintained his residence in Twickenham.[14] This dichotomy betrays the heart of the feud between Pope and Ward. In his attack, Pope tries to represent Ward where he does not want to be: rather than an honest representation of his work—which was oriented from Grub Street against targets of corrupt government and greed in London—Pope insists that Ward lives and operates his business in the city.

Against Pope's dismissal of Ward's career, this chapter looks at the spaces Ward's writing inhabits places in the city as a demonstration of his knowledge of trades. This strategy, embodying the places of trade that the satire targets, forms a conservative critique of the emergent global marketplace and an argument supporting professional writing. Situated outside London, in the literary culture of Grub Street, Ward's work argues for honest trade. Pope attacks Ward's position by displacing Ward from Grub Street to the city and, therefore, undermining the sustained critique of trade during his career. Two dialogues adopting personae of the city's trade illustrate a position against greed and hypocrisy in commerce and illustrate how Ward's critique of trade works at the local level; Ward's writing on Jamaica is global in scale, but its focus is a critique of imperial trade that originates from London.

Ward's position toward trade is not as straightforward as it might seem, but the biographical context of his involvement as a proprietor later in his life helps to explain the position he consistently held throughout his career. One thing is certain: although he moves

---

[13] Parliament was Tory governed until 1714, which also saw the death of Queen Anne; however, the city was a Whig stronghold, and as a High Church Tory Ward was opposed to the City's Whig tendencies and economic influence.

[14] Penal laws restricted Catholic laity from residing in London, establishing certain businesses and professions, and from holding public office, owning arms, etc. For Ward's part, the 1689 Toleration Act, exempting Protestant dissenters from restrictions, was a blow to his high church Tory allegiances.

gradually from a position of outright hostility to trade to a situation where he is the proprietor of a series of taverns between 1712 and 1731, Ward is consistently, in all stages of his life, a critic of greed, deception, and dishonest trade. Howard Troyer traces the development of Ward's business interests in his biography and explains that Ward felt the need to justify owning a business and viewed it as a necessity, which is symptomatic of a sort of reckoning between his preference for an honest life dedicated to his art and his need to find another source of income to diversify from what has been a very early instance of a professional writing career (173). This suggests his move to trade was made to hold out against a fall from fame and modest fortunes too common among writers, most notably Tom Brown, with whom Ward worked closely and had outlived by eight years in 1712, when Ward opened his first tavern (170). Troyer also points to Ward's growing competition in periodical and journalistic endeavors as a reason for his move toward a more stable source of income (171). Regardless of the explanation for Ward's transition to tavern proprietorship, I argue that although this was a difficult move—since Ward has viewed trade as dishonest and at odds with art throughout his career—nevertheless, Ward's writing demonstrates an intimate knowledge of London's trade and a great fondness for the ideal of honest trade.

Grub Street's ethos and material culture have been considered in recent scholarship, but the writing, motivation, perspective, and politics of Grub Street writers like Ned Ward are often dismissed. Pat Rogers, James Raven, and Brean Hammond have advanced our understanding of the economic phenomenon of Grub Street's trade in books and the social conditions of Grub Street as the centre for the book trade by demonstrating what the diffuse centre of the book trade looked like in practice. One important intervention is James Raven's work on the specific places and spatial context of printers and booksellers, which qualifies Pat Roger's observations about

the heart of bookselling by showing the multiple centres of the book trade (Bookscape 115). The popular streets for booksellers and printers were also frequently tenanted by Protestant meeting houses and other centres for exchange, and Raven argues that this confluence was generative: "in a city full of clubs and meeting rooms, encounter and exchange pervades this history. Proximity aided productivity and knowledge" (Bookscape 148). Although this work furthers our understanding of how Grub Street existed in multiple places and included religious and literary writers in co-existence, Ned Ward's literary personae inhabited these places. Because of the way his personae inhabit Grub Street and criticize its marketplace, his writing is an important addition to narratives of Whig economic progress (Williams72-73). I recognize two contradictions in the way Ward frames his writing: first, Ward is critical of the rapid economic change he observes, even though he relies on the literary marketplace for his own benefit; and second, he considers his professional writing to be an honest trade, even though he frequently compares his position as a writer to that of a whore. I consider Ward's insistence that his art is an honest trade to be an important part of his literary reputation, and I read through Ward's critique of trade in his career a sincere position oriented against a system he viewed as inherently, overwhelmingly dishonest. Compared to a narrative of the history of print culture which emphasizes Grub Street's hack writing, piracy, and factious political and religious attacks, Ward's idealized, conservative, and potentially naive view of trade pits itself against an overwhelming economic transition. From this position I hope to recover one Grub Street vision for the future of professional writing.

There are a few ways in which I think Ned Ward's perspective on trade can be oriented toward larger criticism of Grub Street, and toward the way satire is conceived of in Restoration and eighteenth-century criticism. In relation to Pat Roger's seminal studies of Grub Street, I argue that there is more to recognize in Ned Ward's writing and perspective than has been

allowed so far. Ward's limited role in Pat Rogers' study of Grub Street is to draw attention to the ways in which spaces carry incredibly specific meanings and localized identity: "places only a few miles distant from the city were regarded as remote: Ward of Hackney could be so identified—as opposed to Ned Ward of Moorfields, say—almost as though he were an ancestral laird" (4). Place is not used simply to distinguish between two people of the same name; rather, this localized knowledge of place maintains and reasserts the meaning of those two places so that 'Ward of Hackney" can be understood differently than "Ward of Moorfields." Moorfields was a significant part of Ward's identity during his later life. This is why Ward's answer to the claims that he kept a public house in Town carry so much weight. Ward insists he keeps his public house in Moorfields, because at that stage in his life he would not do so anywhere else (Shiells 294). While Porter uses this example briefly to assert the way that place circulates and distinguishes character and proximity to the city, I want to interrogate this problem more thoroughly as far as it can be read in Ward's writing.

While I focus on the way Ned Ward speaks about London—and from different places in London—to illustrate the importance of trade and place to his wide range of literary personae, there is a critical history of using Ned Ward for a specific type of anecdotal social and historical colour, which is part of the reason Porter's study of Grub Street is re-oriented toward Pope and Swift. Porter describes a practise where:

> The author combs satiric literature in order to tell us something about early eighteenth-century life in the capital. This book proceeds in an opposite direction. I hope to show how a knowledge of London topography can inform and enrich a reading of the greatest satire of the period. That is another distinction in passing. Usually critics have found it necessary to engage in London espionage with Ned Ward, and to bring in Pope or Gay

> only as incidental witnesses from outside, literary daytrippers rather than residents. Here the great writers will be allotted a more central place (7).

I insist on reading trade in Ned Ward's writing here not to return to the type of reading Porter disparages in this passage (though I do enjoy engaging in London espionage in Ward's *The London Spy*), but to try to take seriously the way Ward inhabits places of trade. He adopts their manner, sets his writing in their place of business, and demonstrates a knowledge of trades. In fact, Ward's perspective is so dependent on the trade of the city that he relies on it consistently to describe all manner of vice. This perspective, rooted in the trade and life of the city, is an important contribution to the way we understand Grub Street not as a unified centre of trade that thinks and act homogenously but as a diverse and contested conglomerate of business interests and writers who opposed the marketplace from within. Significantly, Ward's perspective is also at odds with the literary icons Rogers' study focuses on. By focusing on what Ward has to say about trade, I offer a challenge to an understanding of Grub Street that would come solely from the perspective of Swift and Pope. The closest critical account of this subject is Peter Briggs's "Satiric Strategy in Ned Ward's London Writings," where Briggs discusses Ward's works on London, including *The London Spy* and *The London Terrafillius*. Briggs does not take up the works discussed here, arguing instead that Ward's focus on the legal system might point to an unrealized unity in *The London Spy* that was not possible in the serial form. Ward's shorter dialogues and discussions of London trade have received no critical attention.

Ward is known for the success of *The London Spy*, where the extraordinary detail with which the city's streets and people are treated sets it apart from other writing in the period, and also from the flaneur and picaresque writing which it draws on. Ward uses his knowledge of London in other works, including his role in Tom Brown's *A Walk through London and*

Westminster, but perhaps the most striking use of Ward's knowledge of networks of trade, factions, and of the character of neighbourhoods in London, is in his trade dialogues, where trades are given a voice, a character, and motivation toward greed are Ward's satiric target

What distinguishes these "trade dialogues" from classical and early modern dialogue traditions is not only that the subject matter and the target of satire is neighbourhoods in London, but that the persona is based on knowledge of the city, its customs, and vices. Ward's persona establishes a productive balance between sympathy with the trades and an exposure of the vice that makes the satire work. The dialogues are sympathetic to the neighbourhoods of Billingsgate and the Exchange to the extent that they are well understood through setting, tone, and voice, which allows for the assertion that their customs justify their actions. These works give a voice to parts of the city that are willing to argue for their right to continue established customs in their marketplaces, and out of this logic of the tradition and customs of the marketplace comes the satire on the greed and deception of trade. Although these dialogues are closely aligned to these trades, the implicit criticism is clear: they seek to expose greed and deception and to show these trades to be hypocritically opposed to the folly they practice when they see it in others.

These dialogues are uniquely focused on specific centres of trade in London. Other dialogue forms of the period are focused on personal, spiritual, and moral circumstances, whereas the trade dialogue here is specific to the metropolis in ways that position it to see and reveal the problems of the city's trade and factions. This metropolitan persona challenges any action that opposes the norms of the city, even while it exposes the city's folly—that is the productive contradiction that makes the form work. It appeals to those familiar with the city and exposes the vices and problems of the city's trade.

By considering the persona of these trade dialogues, I enter a conversation about personae that has changed much over time. Challenging readings that identify the author too closely with the voice of the next, Maynard Mack established a framework for considering Pope's persona in three separate contexts—the "naif" (*ingenu*), the "good man" (*vir bonus*), and the "public defender" or the satirist as hero. When Mack insists on the separation between the satirist and the satiric persona, he accounts for the range of voices over an author's work, but his distinction is also somewhat false, since the author's political and religious views are sometimes quite obviously and necessarily a part of the literary voice. Since Mack's intervention, others have challenged this separation of the artist from his artistic persona. Reuben Sanchez's discussion of literary personae and its separation from the idea of the author accounts for the way that the persona is a complex network of "masks and ironies," layered over each other and interconnected to political, religious, and social positions, and to the immediate context of the satire's intervention (34). I am interested in where Ward's persona is positioned—where it exists in space, topographically, and where the personae are "speaking from." In the context of these satires of the city's trade, the setting of each poem ranges from Jamaica to Peckham, to trade centres in the City of London, but the personae are all speaking on behalf of a community on the border of an urban/suburban divide and on behalf of people impacted by and engaged with the trade these poems target. The personae demonstrate a knowledge of and argument against the trade and traditions of the city. I argue that Ned Ward's trade dialogues illustrate his sincere position on the city's traditions of trade: he disdains anyone who would tread on the wellbeing of its citizens by cheating them of their money, health, or honest trade. Most importantly, he perceives a difference between the greedy, deceptive targets of his satire and the literary writing

and tavern proprietorship by which he makes his living. This idealized vision for literary trade is the muse that guides Ward's pen.

Trade Satire: Ned Ward on London's trade

"A Dialogue Between the Genius of Billingsgate and Exchange Alley" gives two marketplaces a voice and character in an innovative use of the dialogue form. The conversation animates two places—a high-class banking centre and a low marketplace, traditionally for fish and other wares off the Thames—by giving them a character, a voice, and a moral stance on trade. The "Genius" of each area is a character of place, a spatialized and moralized satiric strategy that draws on the neighbourhood as a metonymic symbol of the collective human vices that take place there. Although this conversation between two networks of trade begins antagonistically, the rivalry between them falls apart as they realize their common motivation (greed), method (deception), and habits (namely, profanity). This conversation affirms the character of each place even as it undermines the marketplace as greedy and deceptive. Speaking from the Genius of each market, the persona for this exchange wholeheartedly argues for their rights and customs, but in doing so, it exposes the crass and underhanded motivations of the marketplace. Behind this adoption of the persona of the marketplace, in its criticism of the markets' greed, is a position that Ward holds throughout his career and contrasts with his "honest" trade as a professional writer. Significantly, these marketplaces are in the city. Ward's target is a view of the marketplace that supersedes the class distinctions of trade in search of motivations and contradictions common to all manner of trade.

These dialogues fit into Ward's record criticizing deceptive practices that accompany centres of trade, lotteries, and the sale of stocks, in a period where the apparatus of global trade and capital is rapidly expanding. *The London Spy* critiques bankers and stock jobbers and satirizes the language of

Billingsgate and the Thames. In fact, two poems published side-by-side in *A Collection of Historical and State Poems, Satyrs, Songs, and Epigrams* (1717) focus on the marketplace: “Truth without Dissembling, or, A Merry Ballad on the Times” and “A Dialogue Between the Genius of Billingsgate, and the Genius of Exchange-Alley” In “Truth without Dissembling” Ward writes, "Since Gold is the God of the Nation, / Which every Side does adore, / There is no other Quarrel in Fashion, / But what's for the Purse and Pow'r" (38). Ward's “Dialogue Between the Genius of Billingsgate, and the Genius of Exchange-Alley”is a similar critique of deceptive trade practices, but it works from inside, by inhabiting the marketplace and giving it a voice. By imagining a dialogue between the Genius of these two centres of trade, he inhabits these locales and voices their insistence on their traditions and authority. When Ward justifies the actions of the marketplaces, he does so to critique their deceptive practices and demonstrate a shared greed between two marketplaces that operate in different social classes.

Billingsgate and the Exchange engage in a rivalry as each marketplace makes a series of provocations and accusations to lay the groundwork for a levelling comparison between the two places that flattens the social and economic hierarchiesbetween them. The Exchange accuses Billingsgate of corrupting the women of the market into scolds, while billingsgate accuses the exchange of having no conscience. Billingsgate contends that the Exchange jobbers run the market as an extensive con game, where they sell "Stock, when they have none" (36). The exchange readily concedes the case but argues that Billingsgate is no better in its relationship with the truth because of the "Lies, ill Words, and Oaths" of the marketplace there (36). As these accusations of lies and deceit are levelled from both sides, there is no clear winner, both are regarded in an equally unflattering light. Ward’s criticism of the marketplace, then, comes from within, not from an outside view, or a with a victim’s scorn of their deception.

Billingsgate and the Exchange defend their actions by insisting on the primacy of local identity and tradition. This is an insular and conservative argument for place, where the accusation of deception is reframed as a way of life inherent to that place that cannot be criticized from outside. This conservative argument, used here to subvert these trading centres rather than to uphold their authority, is what makes the satire work and demonstrates the authority of place that I argue is the best way to express Ward's conservatism: the logic of these dialogues upholds the authority of the marketplace to set its own terms, but then turns around to ask whether these vices should be what is maintained under that authority. The vulgar and profane language of the marketplace is the right and even the pride of the inhabitants of Billingsgate, who "scold by Custom, not in Spight" (37). The Exchange's defense of its own trade practices also relies on a similar appeal to tradition. "Cunning" is the drive, motivation, and marketable skill of the trade in the Exchange, and innovation in this skill, where all "Each Day new tricking Arts invent," is considered, at least in the Exchange, a benefit and sign of progress (37). The vice of each neighbourhood has been reframed as a skill and custom and transposed from a moral argument about greed to an appeal to social custom and economic progress. In this way, the most damning critique of Whig trade in this dialogue is that the authority and traditions these places rely on are immoral, but common enough that they can be agreed upon across classes, from fishmongers to banking in the Exchange.

The central conceit and irony of dialogue is that Billingsgate market and the Royal Exchange, despite their initial feud, have more in common in their trade than they would like to admit. Since their hatred for the other is hypocritical, the resolution comes from understanding this and embracing the fact that they both profit from the same vices. For Billingsgate, the realization is made by comparing the marketplace to more respectable trades, where ". . . all Men have their useful Lies, And e'ery Trade its Mystery" (37). And as the Exchange asserts that ". . . he that's hasty to be Rich, Must deal with a

deceitful Breast," he asks for the friendship of the genius of Billingsgate (38). This resolution confirms the initial assertions of the identity of these areas and then generalizes to allow that deceit is part of every trade. Therefore, although part of its criticism is deceptive trade practices, the more explicit target is the hypocrisy involved in criticizing the seedy tactics of another trade when one's own trade involves another version of the same scheme. What begins as a satire on deceptive trade in a particular topographical area becomes more generalized to include trade throughout London. The local problem of greed and deception that can be observed in particular situations, this dialogue suggests, is not restricted to one class of trade in the city. Ward's satire of the marketplace navigates from the particular to the general through its form, putting the two trade centres in conversation until they reveal for themselves and the reader that they share a common deception and greed.

These dialogues model Ward's exceptional satiric strategy, which uses the habits, manner, and character of a place to pass moral judgment on it. By using voice of these two neighbourhoods, abstracted into their "Genius" or the ethos of these two centres that insist on the identity and customs of their respective trades, including the associated deceit and greed, the dialogue creates a persona of trade that models the values and vices of these two markets. This short work illustrates the force of such a satiric strategy in the formation and criticism of local identities of place and the moral associations with specific areas in London.

In *The World Bewitch'd*, the criticism of trade takes on a different form as the focus shifts to commercial activity outside the city; this distinction is important, because although much of Ward's critique of trade focuses on the City of London, his criticism of upstarts and cheats outside the city has a lot in common with the rhetoric he uses to attack dissenting and itinerant preachers. It links an upstart astrologer-turned-apothecary persona to sectarian Protestant biblical interpretation; if the conceit of Protestant biblical interpretation is that anyone can interpret and preach the gospel, the ancillary form of

that for trade is that anyone can sell fortunes, practice, or cures without training or knowledge. Conflating these two spheres, Ward levels criticism at upstarts of all kinds from under the guise of his astrologer persona. Ward's Tory bias is explicit in this work and joined with the righteous indignation of a satirist railing against upstarts of all kinds. Added to this, personal attacks against others in his trade add to the ways in which the author bleeds into the satiric persona: the voice of an unscrupulous new "quack" apprentice. In contrast to the impression we get of city marketplaces in the last dialogue, this personae has much more in common with the Grub Street Ward lives in and makes his living from; a world of upstarts, where Ward builds a reputation by knowing, understanding, and catering to the taste of his reading public and to popular political and religious discourse in the public sphere.

The World Bewitch'd: A Dialogue between two astrologers and the Author (1699), sets the tone by introducing his persona for the dialogue to follow. He suggests that the author stumbled into the trade of an Astrologer by chance. The origins of his new vocation are inherited—his "Father was a Moorfields-Astrologer" and his "Mother a Lancashire-Witch"—but also, he is genuinely predisposed to the trade: "I have a natural propensity to Sleep in the Day time, and Sit up at Night, to observe the Aspects and Motions of the Planets: by the frequent use of which, I have peep'd a wonderful height into the dark Mystery of Star-gazing" (To the Reader 3). The path to his trade, however, is more nefarious than this innocent scene of discovery suggests. After first studying under an apothecary, he soon switched to selling fake cures until, upon gaining notoriety, he switched to selling "some infalible Predictions" (4). This foundling astrologer and apothecary gives this explanation in a dialogue between himself and the two apothecaries:

> The World cannot be unacquainted with the great Emulation and Irreconcilable Enmity between G---. P---r and J---.P---dg, about a piece of Art which no body knows, and scarce any Body believes, viz. Making of Sygils and Fore-timing of Destinies: It being Lately my fortune to bring

> them together, I cannot by Oblige the Publick with a Vera Copia of a Learned Dialogue that arose between them; with which I have begun the following Treatise, to the great Credit of our Wrangling Ephemerists; and I hope to the Diversion of the Reader. (4)

In order to satirize the trade of the astrologer, the apothecary-astrologer persona of the dialogue takes infiltrates their world, becoming a new astrologer who happens to be privy to conversations between prominent astrologers and is able to bring these people together for a dialogue about their trade. Only such a persona—the voice of corrupted metropolitan trade and apprenticing traditions—is so well positioned to satirize those who make money by relying on the authority and reputation of others. Since the persona has become a prominent cheat by copying the prominent men who are the subject of the satire, the dialogue is able to inhabit that world and gesture toward its ubiquity.

Criticizing the Astrologers is not the only aim of the dialogue. Ward's reference to "infalible predictions" is a hint to the true author, who, by writing this brief satire, is capitalizing on the success of a pamphlet with "infalible predictions" for the calendar year. The pamphlet, which is also framed as the publication of a prominent astrologer to provide "predictions" of vice and crime that will invariably take place in different parts of the city. Further, Ward links the fortune telling of these astrologers first to the obvious ("the downfall of the Whore of Babylon") and then to the "prosperity of the Protestant Religion" which the astrologer sees as equally inevitable (3).

These dialogues rely on aspects of urban life and trade as a fundamental part of their satiric strategy. They are grounded in a perspective tied to the trade and political activity of the city. The dialogue between the Genius of Billingsgate and that of the Exchange explicitly inhabits those markets to express their character and expose their rivalry and hypocrisy. The dialogue between the two astrologers relies on knowledge of a number of trades in the city, and on knowledge of one immediate conflict—the way in which apothecaries would use

prescriptions from physicians to prescribe their own medicines and build their reputations, which is implied in the way the apothecary-astrologer persona develops (or simply steals) his "catalogue of cures" and builds his reputation on the authority of others. The astrologer-apothecary persona is highly spatialized in its genesis as well, generated as the progeny of a Moorfields-Astrologer and a Lancashire witch, the persona embodies a confluence of "cheating" types: one rural and feminine, the other suburban and masculine, who, through a knowledge of the trades of the city, have made a life predicting the events of the city and capitalizing on that knowledge by selling fake cures. Like the trade centres of Billingsgate and the Exchange, where cheating and deception are common across all classes of trade form the market to the banks, here the point is that cheating professions transcend the rural/(sub)urban divide and gender distinctions. Together, these dialogues give a taste of Ward's critical view of the city, contrasted with the personae of Moorfields, which relies on his own physical location and professional labour in the same area.

I introduce a third "cheating" satire here, but while deception is a preoccupation throughout Ward's career, this satire deals with Ward's own trade at the end of his career and helps contextualize the criticisms Alexander Pope levels at him in the *Dunciad.* Ward's *The Quack-Vintners: Or, A Satyr against Bad wine. With Directions where to have Good* (1712) ridicules two men—Thomas Brooke and John Hellier—for adulterating their wine. Shortly after writing his satire of these men, Ward provides a list of reputable shops in which good wine can be found. Structurally, it is a two-part work, with fourteen pages of accusations against Brooke and Hellier followed by a list—in four verse stanzas—of reputable vintners, with descriptions of where they do business. The Vintning trade and professional authorship should be understood as two sides of the same coin for Ward, and not simply because Ward had his hand in both. As he argues, "Poets by *Bacchus* do their Wits refine, / And can't but honor those

who draw good Wine." (15). This chapter has already examined Ward's knowledge of the city's trade, but this satire, uncollected in his Works and unrecorded by his biographer, Howard Troyer, is the closest expression of Ward's identity and moral stance as a tavern owner during the time when Pope attacks him. Against the city's trade that he criticizes in the dialogues above, this demonstrates Ward's ideal vision for the trade in which he now works.

At the centre of Ward's publication there is a controversy regarding its authorship. As Ward's biographer notes, *Brooke and Hellier, A Satyr*, published the same year, accuses Brook and Hellier of hiring Ned Ward to write the satire, ostensibly to gain notoriety and drum up business:

> When in his Lunacy he rages,
> 'Tis Admonition to the Sages;
> If he writes Satyrs none regard,
> Just as when Vintners hire *Ned Ward*;
> The Harmless unperforming Thing,
> Like *Umble Bee* that has no Sting,
> May hum and buz, and rhime or cease,
> It never breaks the Peoples Peace; (4)

Along with the accusation that Ward was hired by vintners for this poem (possibly as a sort of advertising campaign for Brooke and Hellier), the other accusation leveled at him is about potency—attacking Ward by suggesting his literary and professional impotence and lack of influence. In this regard, it has much in common with Pope's attack in 1728, and may have given Pope fuel for his fire.

If these accusations have merit, it may be possible Ward was hired for the job; however, his descriptions of Brooke and Hellier are unforgiving. He describes their "cloudy Wines" as "liquid Trash" fit for "Wapping Brothels" and in "Country Inns," and accuses them of making wine "Squeez'd from the

Berry which on Elder grows, / Lengthen'd with Cyder, and made rough with Sloes." (5). The company associated with these adulterated wines is a "City Cull, Raw Youth or Country Hick" on the tame end of the scale, but also associated are "Butchers, Bailiffs, and Flatcap Whores" and these associations are made worse because they are "poison'd by bad Wines, with which they're pleas'd" (6). The poem is polarized, lavishly heaping praise on others: "Truby, Witham, and their Part'ner Tash" who "Sell noble Wine, and scorn to deal in Trash" (7). If Ward really wrote a scathing satire of Brooke and Hellier to promote their trade, would that work? It is worth examining the allegations briefly here.

One take on this is a little grim: perhaps there is an attempt to valorize this terrible wine through the fact that Brooke and Hellier are poisoning the town's worst citizens, since although "B--- and H--- are destructive Foes" their victims are "Covent-Garden Punks, and pepper'd Beaus" (10). Yet, the call for the end of these vintners' trade is hard to ignore, as is the logic for drinking a better wine:

> Therefore let's low'r the Topsails of the Two,
> Who set false Brethren up against the true;
> That they may trade in Holes without a Sign,
> And under-sell the lawful Sons of Wine,
> Who pay large Rents, and great Attendance keep,
> That we who drink, the Benefit may reap; (13)
> …
> But who'd not rather give a Groat a Quart
> For Wine in Paradise to chear the Heart,
> Then chuse a Brimstone Devil for his Host,
> And drink in Hell at an inferior Cost? (14)

If this satyr has, in fact, been contracted by Brooke and Hellier, it is hard to see how the vintners would reap the benefit of the publicity, unless none of this rhetoric matters if their clients are simply incapable of spending a groat on better wine. In this case, the whole satire can be read as an advertisement, and where I read "avoid these crooks with your life, wine-lover" an eighteenth-century citizen might read, "here's where you go to be drunk without lightening your purse." At the beginning of the gin craze, this argument may have been a persuasive one. It also carries a moralistic implication and a hierarchy within trades that all aim to get you tipsy: gin-peddlers are at the bottom, the most reprehensible and morally suspect; tavern owners and importers of fine French wine are at the top of the hierarchy, friends to all creative-minded individuals, and a socially-acceptable way to stumble home. But the problem that hangs over the piece is how it manages to advertise both cheap liquor and fine wine at the same time, or whether it has an overriding allegiance to one, while being paid to serve the other. The triviality of this work, and whether it was intended simply as a double-edged advertisement, may support what we already know of the small status it holds and of the potentially self-serving motivation; however, as a systematized account of specialized knowledge of trade, it captures the spirit of Ward's literary career and of his views of Grub Street print culture.

The greater part of this *Satyr on Bad Wine* is a warning, cautioning a would-be victim about where bad wine is peddled. The poem calls Brookes and Hellier out by name as ubiquitous--their wares can be found all over and are consumed by the lowest types:

> Let B---ks and H-----r vend their cloudy Wines,
> In Wapping Brothels, and in Country Inns
> And furnish Midnight Cellars in By-Streets,
> For Roaring Bullies, Punks, and Sodomites (5)

Their product then, is sold not just in the city's by-streets, but in Wapping to working-class sub-urbanites and makes its way as far as country inns. What makes this wine so disreputable, we are told, is that it begins with a sort of Elderberry wine, but it is then "lengthened with Cyder, and made rough with Sloes" (5). John Evelyn, an advocate for cider as a virtuous domestic product which would reduce the consumption of barley and provide a use for waste fruit, might bemoan this characterization of his favourite beverage. On the other hand, it is easy to see the problem Ward had with tossing "sloes" (blackthorn fruit) into a barrel of spirits, adulterating the base spirit to make the disreputable punch.

This punch is not simply frugal or fraudulent; it makes way for the worst of human behaviour. Over this drink, "...Butchers, Bailiffs, and their Flatcap Whores, / Swear, drink, debauch, and squabble at All fours" until they die or the vicious drink drives them to the gallows, whichever comes first (6). This is the portrait of Brooke and Hellier's consumer, but the description of their trade is equally dark, likened to quack physicians selling poison as medicine:

> But 'tis the Part'ners merciful Design,
> To Rescue from the Rope, and kill by Wine:
> So Emp'ricks chase the Malady away,
> With artful Poisons, and by Physic slay. (6)

Through this description of the consumers and purveyors of the worst London has to offer those who are accustomed to drink, the trade has a strict moral hierarchy. That this adulterated "wine" is of the lowest moral standing available is communicated through its location (Wapping, by-ways, and country inns), its consumer (Butchers, Bailiffs, and whores), and its unscrupulous tradesmen, Brookes and Hellier.

The satire is half of the aim of Ward's verse. The other half is a complete catalog of reputable, reliable vintners, fabulously detailed. Each entry names the proprietor, the sign, and the virtues of the establishment: their specialty region, and moral virtues in terms of trustworthiness, conversation, and

friendship. It is an homage to fellow tradesmen and relationships developed over a long career of tavern drinking.

Most of the descriptions of the Vintners include a witty verse inspired by the symbol of the sign at which they can be found, and afterwards, a wish for continued quality and honesty in their trade. In an example related to the way professional writing is naturally allied with vintners, Ward argues the church should be as well:

> May *Smith*, whose prosp'rous *Mitre* is his Sign,
> To shew the Church's no Enemy to Wine,
> Still draw such Christian Liquor, none may think,
> Tho' e'er so pious, 'tis a Sin to drink. (16)

At the Sign of the Swan, we find a shop for the most subtle palettes, privileged for its honesty:

> May honest *Clifton*, at the *Swan*, still gain
> A thriving Credit from discerning Men:
> For without fawning he will draw us right,
> And ne'er deceive his Friends in Red or White. (19)

This pattern that draws on the sign of each tavern for inspiration, lavishing praise and good wishes for the future, is characteristic of many of the verses. I want to stress the difference between the moral characterizations involved as each shop is located by its sign. Honest and pious, Clifton and Smith are held far above Brookes and Hellier as examples distinguished as much for their moral character as for the character and quality of their wares.

The extent to which some of these verses take pains to be very specific about where these shops are suggests that place is an important marker of the quality of these taverns, and it creates a map of the

most virtuous vintners in the city. For example, Paine's *Three Tuns* is described as an honest place that is home to its own club:

> May *Paine*, at the *Three Tuns* in *Newgate-street*,
>
> Still draw the best, without the least Deceit;
>
> That his projecting Club, by Ev'ning Draughts,
>
> May be inspir'd with new successful Thoughts. (20)

Likewise, we find other descriptions locating these vintners very specifically, and these range topographically from Covent Garden to Smithfield and Hyde Park: "*Groness,* at the *Tuns* in *Shandois-street*" (21), "the *Cross-Keys,* by *Thavies Inn*" (22), and "*Hyde,* near *Smithfield,* at the *Martyr's-Head"* (22). Sometimes the place is specified to avoid confusion with similar signs: "*Folwell,* at the *Aldgate Pye*" (22). Presumably Pye is a good sign to have and Aldgate must be specified. *Lockets* is so famous already that its location in Covent Garden is not specified at all. In any case, Ward takes great care, specifying exactly where good wine is poured by honest fellows, just as he takes care to warn his readers where they might be duped into drinking sloes instead of sauvignon.

Some verses go beyond this established format and are personal, breaking from the detached catalog into an autobiographical turn focused on kinship among fellows in the trade. Stanton is described fondly and held up as an example of the welcome one should expect in an ideal tavern:

> May *Stanton*, at the *Sun*, for ever shine,
>
> Whose Face proclaims the Goodness of his Wine.
>
> Nor can God *Bacchus* to the World commend
>
> A better Vintner, or a truer Friend. (22-23)

This last example foregrounds the issue of Ward's persona in this satire, which veers far more into the personal and autobiographical than any of the other satires I have looked at in my work. Ward's politics and religious position are less a part of this persona, reflecting the way he transitioned away from writing political pamphlets later in his life to run a series of taverns. And although these verses stop short of listing his own tavern at Grey's Inn, he is certainly drumming up business and ridiculing his rivals.

Ward's attack on Brooke and Hellier levels a familiar criticism: like Billingsgate and The Exchange, they are greedy for profit; like the unscrupulous astrologer turned apothecary and physician, they sell inferior quality goods and try pass them off as good wine. In this way, Ward's satire consistently makes the connection between the quality of the product, where it is sold, and the moral character of those who sell it. But here Ward is more personally invested—this is his trade at the end of his career, and he has hopes that it will be a respectable one. His elegiac verses to the best vintners in town map the terrain of wine-selling both morally and topographically. And in a significant rejoinder to Pope's attack on him, this satire articulates Ward's vision for his retirement in a humble trade as one that is honest and among friends of his trade. This work came years before Pope's attacks, and Ward was clearly, as publicly expressed in his own writing and as established for years in his trade, a vintner. Based on this understanding of Ward's position at the end of his career, Pope's attack is vicious, personal, and attempts to undermine Ward's status to bolster his own. As I move to discuss Ward's own reputation-making, his moral stance on trade will help inform his stance on the global economics of trade in the New World, the popular discourse of which he builds his career on and returns to in his later writing. What I want to carry forward from these trade satires is Ward's consistent

focus throughout his career on greed, deception, and the connection he makes between the quality of goods and the moral character of those who sell them.

Jamaica: Ned Ward and Global Trade

Satire takes aim at contradictions in human actions, but when the target of satire is human actions on a global scale, it becomes harder to define those contradictions in large-scale processes and actions diffused over a whole industry. Henri Lefebvre's argument for *contradictions of differential space* is most concisely expressed with his claim that "Effective globalism implies an established centrality" (*Production of Space* 356). On a global scale, the contradictions between centre and periphery, and the movement between these two poles, give rise to difference: "Differences endure or arise on the margins of the homogenized realm, either in the form of resistances or in the form of externalities (lateral, heterotopical, heterological). What is different is, to begin with, what is excluded" (373). My discussion of Ned Ward's popular writing about Jamaica begins by recognizing that when *A Trip to Jamaica* represents the colonies, it insists on the centrality of London as the location for the vices it describes in *Jamaica*. This manifests in terms of Ward's understanding of the world and its vices, which always refer back to the familiar context of life in London. But Ward also represents the global environment and London, the implied centre of power, in a way that actively works against the differences between them. For every difference "discovered" on the periphery, Ward will establish its root, its equivalent, in London. Contradictions in space, as in human actions, open up the possibilities for the satiric imagination. The preface to *A Trip to Jamaica* implies that Ward's target is the expense of maintaining the colonies. Ward's work relates the vice and problems of the colony to London, and although it might be tempting to read this impulse as part of the subsumption of the periphery by the centre (which Lefebvre argues is inevitable), Ward's stance against the ends of the colonial project suggests, on the other hand, that his comparison is made as an attempt to undermine his target: profits from global trade.

In addition to the question of his target and aims in relation to global trade, Ward's persona establishes a posture in relation to the literary profession. In his preface to *A Trip to Jamaica*, Ward styles himself as a whore as he establishes his literary reputation with an account of the colonies. When Ward equates his tenuous position as a Grub Street hack to sexual labour, as he does in this preface, he suggests that "*circumstances . . . hath forc'd us to do that for our Subsistance, which we are much asham'd of"* (3); however, the whores of Port Royal are distinguished by their shameless "Swearing, Drinking, and Obscene talk," which makes them "acceptable to male conversation" (16). In the apparent contradiction between the supposed shame of sexual labour in London that he aligns himself with and his description of the celebrated obscenity and impropriety of colonial women, we can read *A Trip to Jamaica* as a statement about how both postures—demure and shameless—are utilized in Ward's role as a hackney writer. The other way Ward positions his writing is to say that literary work is more insecure than a soldier's: he suggests he is living at a time where "The Sword [is] being advanc'd, and the Pen silenc'd" and "Fools getting more by hazarding their Carcasses, than Ingenious Men by im-ploying their Wits" (5). So in framing his new work and positioning himself in the eyes of a reading public, Ward compares his literary work, reputation, and ambitions to sexual and military labour, the "body" of his work to the bodies of soldiers and whores. Doing so puts the risks and necessity of his writing at the fore; he needs to write about Jamaica since it is in the public discourse and relevant to his readership, but by criticizing the government's spending on the colony, he also puts himself at great risk. This risk is connected to the quality and integrity of the professional reputation Ward establishes at this point in his career: if he is willing to risk his reputation, who can question his motives?

A Trip to Jamaica was Ward's first real success; Howard Troyer attests to the poem's immediate popularity and to the number of similar travel poems written soon after Ward's (15-16). Although the subject is Jamaica, *A Trip to Jamaica* is not only about the colony taken from Spain in 1655. Ned Ward

is also staking a claim for his own turf in the cut-throat, competitive literary market of Grub Street. The well-established colonial project and the new marketplace for hackney writing have much in common, which makes a colony the perfect subject for an emergent writer who seeks to claim his own territory and develop a reputation in the marketplace: both are dominated by public, economic activity founded on the principle that individual status and reputation are whatever the author makes of them. As in Jamaica, where "an Apothecary will make a very Topping Physician," in Grub Street a literary hack may enjoy whatever success the market allows and will, perhaps, "*enjoy the Pleasure of being Celebrated by all the* Coxcombs *in the Nation"* (16, 3). At the same time, in Ward's writing, the individual is always embodied and inhabiting a particular place, speaking on behalf of the community that lives there, whether or not they are all Coxcombs. In this early commercial success, Jamaica affords Ward a platform for his own career and functions as an allegory for the literary marketplace in which he strives to make a living.

The Barbacue Feast has more in common with writing about secret clubs, societies, and proto-journalistic descriptions of the city than it does with *A Trip to Jamaica's* pseudo-travel writing. Despite the difference in genres, I argue that its focus on colonial products and habits—which comes at the end of Ward's career—alongside this early writing about the colonies is a progression in his satire from a comparative critique that relies on the juxtaposition of Port Royal and London to an damning display of an excessive and grotesque tradition the colonial machine has enabled. Like *A Trip to Jamaica, The Barbacue Feast* is about the colonies, but this intimate meal outside the city brings the colonies home for pleasure and consumption in the most excessive way.

Ward collapses the distance and difference between London and Port Royal by drawing attention to contradictions in global trade. His works are speaking from London, but the distance between London and Ward's subject, Jamaica and colonial trade routes, collapses in the comparison. In *A Trip to*

Jamaica, the comparisons are about moral actions, while in *The Barbacue Feast* they are about the consumption of products. Through simile, Jamaica is described with the language of London, and although the *Trip* paints the colony as an intemperate population of degenerate moral behaviour, domestic examples are used as a benchmark for the vice of the colony. This is done through a coarse use of simile, which forces an equivalence between Jamaica and London, with a striking effect: it brings attention to the ways in which the emergent empire exports vice around the world to the benefit of a powerful few in its metropolitan centre, and it insists that every extreme in Jamaica has its equivalent as a familiar vice in London. These equivalencies form the backbone of this satire of Jamaica, and like the comparison drawn between literary hacks and whores or between the Grub Street marketplace and colonial trade, *A Trip to Jamaica* uses London's vice to describe Port Royal. Whether this comes from a place of writing what he knows, or out of a desire to use familiar references to describe an exotic island, Ward's habit of describing Jamaica with his knowledge of London carries an implicit acknowledgement that English vice is being exported to the colonies to grow, unfettered, and his account brings it home again for public consumption. *The Barbacue Feast*'s focus is on consumption in its most excessive and absurd imagination.

Where the distance between Jamaica and London is collapsed by describing the same vice with a description of both places in *A Trip to Jamaica*, *The Barbacue Feast* collapses distance between the colonies and London by using ingredients, habits, and traditions of colonies in Peckham. And while *A Trip to Jamaica* insists that the extremes of vice on the island have their precedent in London, *The Barbacue Feast* draws on descriptions from colonies around the world to host a single, extravagant feast outside the city as a private event in Peckham. *The Barbacue Feast* describes vast networks of cultural and economic exchange with an annual event. In these two formative moments in Ward's hack-writing career, this spatial strategy collapses a global economy and military strategy into individual experience

and consumption.

In *A Trip to Jamaica,* the colonies are described at their worst as intemperate populations of degenerate moral behaviour, but I argue these accounts of the colonies are also an insightful critique of the ways in which the emergent empire was exporting the worst of its vice around the world, to the benefit of a powerful few in its metropolitan centre. At a time when sexuality, morality, and medicine were understood to be subject to differences in geography and climate, Ward's writing makes use of these distinctions in his satire of the colony. Since *A Trip to Jamaica's* preface compares the author to a whore and then goes on to describe the whores of Port Royal as the most immoral and proud sinners, the contexts which govern understandings of sexuality and morality over this distance need to be worked out here. Ward's writing is typical of a moral view tied to the geography of the colonies and tropics in Early Modern England, specifically the view that the hotter climate brought about an increase in human desires. This "Sexual Geography" is what Felicity Nussbaum's *Torrid Zones* accounts for as a tradition in early modern understandings of the body and the ways in which they are mapped onto geography. Not only are heightened sexuality and intemperate impulses explained based on geography and climate, but this assumption is also gendered in contradictory ways, which allow for the hypersexualization of the female Other at the same time as they continue to gender sexual desire as male, monstrous, or unnatural (95-96). Although this view continues throughout the eighteenth century, this geographical demarcation of global sexuality is checked and undercut, to a certain extent, by women's early travel writing and imagined feminine utopias (135-137). Thus, a moralized reading of race and sexuality is joined to geography. Since some humours were deemed to be more active and prevalent in hotter climates, this understanding relied on a moral construction of racial difference—European society, in colder climates, is more temperate, and southern nations are intemperate, passionate, due to the hot climate. More recently, in her discussion of Daniel Defoe's *The True Born Englishman* (1700), Amanda L. Johnson

connects this sexual geography to Spanish imperial expansion:

> The poem goes on to assign other sins: sodomy to Italy ("the torrid zone"), and drunkenness to Germany, for instance, but the passage on Spain is telling, as it spells out how the sin of pride drives the country's imperial expansion in the Americas. In the sixteenth century, Spanish-American colonialism sent massive amounts of gold and silver back to the metropole, creating drastic and steady inflation in the price of Spanish goods, which, according to Defoe, Spaniards could not afford because they "scorn to save." The economic disaster, which resulted directly from Spain's rapacious greed for resources derived from the colonies, then, made the country paradoxically "So very rich, and yet so very poor." Throughout his professional writing career and even before, Defoe championed England's involvement in American colonial ventures, but in The True-Born Englishman Spain stands as an example of what could go wrong if England, from excessive self-regard, became a victim of its own ambitions. (11-12)

Johnson argues that Spain serves as a warning for Defoe, a model of what happens when imperial expansion is favoured over domestic affairs, and this criticism of empire exists in Ward's account of Jamaica as well. That this type of criticism has been linked to the sexual geography Nussbaum describes is relevant here; Ward's descriptions of the island's sexuality and unfettered immorality are likewise part of his critique of empire as well. The sexual geography of Jamaica, in its early modern understanding, helps connect Ward's satire of Jamaica to his economic argument for greater domestic spending that would support the metropolis, and it brings a description of imperial affairs to the attention of the city that is more critical of the management and state of the colonies during the commonwealth government. In contrast to the argument that Ward makes in his characterization of Port Royal's prostitution, Aleksondra Hultquist's argument for the contradictory "Creole space" of Jamaica suggests that it can be "socially and morally redemptive" for female characters (33).With this context in mind, I want to return

to the way Ward's focus on prostitution is connected to how he introduces *A Trip to Jamaica.* On the one hand, he compares writing to prostitution. On the other hand, by including Jamaica's sexual labour in his satire, he extends the assertion that government money funds soldiers instead of writers by suggesting that they are the ones supporting prostitution. The literary profession then, gets no direct support from government spending on colonization. Instead, Ward suggests he is forced to write about the colonies, labouring with his pen instead of his body.

A Trip to Jamaica is a late example of writing about the colonies. In Brooke Newman's account of the codification of slave law in late-seventeenth-century Jamaica, the island is the subject of public discourse throughout the Restoration, since its capture in 1655 (Newman 27-66). However, it is only one among many such writings about the colonies parallel to the development of Ned Ward's early career and the publication of *A Trip to Jamaica*. For example, John Tutchin's *The Earth-quake of Jamaica* (1692), published just six years before Ward's *Trip*, describes this natural catastrophe as a sort of social and moral levelling that effects all alike:

> The Old and Young receive alike their Doom,
>
> The Cowards and the Brave,
>
> Are buried in one Grave;
>
> For Fate allows 'em all one Common Tomb (5)

The earthquake affects everyone, regardless of age, moral fortitude, or class and social status. This levelling effect of disaster seems to apply to generally to be a punishment for specific sins, but like the moralized explanations for the Great Fire of 1666 in London, the earthquake is assigned a moral meaning, where it was thought to be brought on to make "the Sinners there Repent" (8). The island is being punished by hurricanes and earthquakes, which Tutchin hopes will bring its population to repentance. Ward's Jamaica does not account for the earthquake, but it does suggest a different type of

equalization, where anyone there can make a new reputation for themselves, regardless of their social or moral standing in London.

Tutchin's *The Foreigners* (1700) follows close on the heels of Ward's *A Trip to Jamaica* (1698) and expresses anti-Dutch sentiment, taking direct aim at William III's court:

> Our ravish'd Honours
>
> on his Shoulder wears,
>
> And Titles from our Antient Rolls he tears.
>
> Was e'er a prudent People thus befool'd,
>
> By upstart Foreigners thus basely gull'd? (10-11)

William III's ascension is framed here as a rape and con, where the feminized, "prudent" motherland has been "ravish'd" and "befooled." Tutchin insists on difference and bears an overt sentiment of racial superiority, couched only in thin religious allegory which refers to England as Israel. In *The True-Born Englishman* (1701), where Defoe criticizes *The Foreigners* and sets the record straight by insisting on the historical record rather than a myth of purity: "Thus from a mixture of all kinds began, / That het'rogeneous thing, an Englishman . . . Since scarce one family is left alive, / Which does not from some foreigner derive" (52-55). Tutchin describes the ways geographical phenomena are framed as a punishment, and expresses his anxiety about foreign influence after William III's ascension. Ned Ward's writing represents the colonies as places with a distinct morality, where newcomers can reinvent themselves as anything they want to be, but his characterizations do not insist on differences; instead, *A Trip to Jamaica* and *The Barbacue Feast* ascribe the problems described in the colonies to people and economic structures in London.

To some extent medicine was also understood in geographical terms throughout this period as Jamaica and other tropical colonies were receiving a great deal of public attention through various early

accounts of travel and scientific research. Alongside this ethos of sexual geography and Tutchin's fears of foreign blood on English soil, the medical profession was upholding climatological understandings of disease. Treatment for diseases in the tropics was assumed to be different than that in northern climates. Ryan Williams's discussion of Hans Sloane's time in Jamaica explains, for example, that Thomas Trapham's *A Discourse of the State of Health in the Island of Jamaica* (1679) espouses a climatological understanding of disease, which Sloane was trying to work against and disprove (314). Sloane, on the other hand, was trying to disprove this type of understanding by documenting the cases he saw when he spent time in Jamaica and wrote *A Voyage to the Islands of Madera, Barbadoes, Nieves, S. Christophers, and Jamaica* (1707) (Williams 306). Medicine, along with sexuality and morality, was understood to be geographically dependent and distinctive. I want to consider *A Trip to Jamaica* and *The Barbacue Feast* in the context of these understandings of global geography and the climate's influence on morality, sexuality, and physical wellbeing. This satire of Jamaica engages with these understandings of climate, geography, and morality, but Ward's poems undermine the difference. Everywhere vice Ward describes in Port Royale is connected to its equivalent and more extreme example in London. In what follows, I argue that by eroding the distance between the colonies and the Metropolis, Ward also undermines the moral, sexual, and medical differences implied by choosing subjects in a southern climate.

Within this perspective is the question of Ward's audience and genre in these Jamaica writings. Both *A Trip to Jamaica* (1798) and *A Barbeque Feast* (1707) are connected to early travel writing, but Ward's satire in his proto-travel writing reverses the relationship between home and away typically found in travel writing. Comparing the early novel to travel writing, J. Paul Hunter writes:

> Travel books offer clues about [narrative] direction, provide a feature here and there, and offer novelists general encouragement, but mostly they just provide readers of novels with the comfortable feeling that they have been here—or somewhere very like it—before. (*Before*

Novels 354)

While travel writing aims to provide the novelty of travel with the comfort and familiarity of home, connecting home experiences to new situations abroad in a way typical of the colonial mindset, Ward's satirical trips connect the vices of the colonies to the vices of London. If Ward's writing gives the impression of a "comfortable feeling that they have been here before," it may be a feeling most familiar to those with the greatest appetite for vice and deception. Ward's portrait of Jamaica is designed to show London to be the origin for all that is wrong with Port Royal. Because of the difference this critique of colonial Jamaica makes to Ward's audience and to the targets of his satire, travel writing is less relevant to Ward's Jamaica writings than critical accounts of the colonies in theatre and later-eighteenth-century literature.

Ward's criticism of the colonies becomes a weak point Pope uses to rewrite Ward's career. Pope does this by claiming that Ward was only popular in the colonies and not in London.. Jamaica is the subject of Ward's first successful commercial product, and his Jamaica writing offers a critique of imperial expansion and global commerce in a way that is elided by Pope's critique. At the same time, to the extent that the success of *A Trip to Jamaica* was made possible by a popular interest in the colonies, it could be argued that Ward's literary reputation relies on the history of colonization; however, Ward is consistently critical of the economic system which supports the development and maintenance of the colony. The satiric strategy and technique of Ward's Jamaica writing is used toward a critique of the colonial project, and toward a politicized attack on the economy's reliance on imperial expansion for growth. It prompted quick sequels in the form of other (much less politicized) "Trips" to Holland and New England. "By the author of *A Trip to Jamaica*" was also used on the title page of counterfeit travel tales. Ward's *A Trip to Jamaica* is concerned with global trade and the literary print cultural context of an emergent author in London. David Oakleaf's digital edition of *A Trip to Jamaica* outlines the way

Ward frames his early writing, the companions with whom he shared this emergent trade of Hackney writing, and Ward's fate, which was to be sent to the Pillory for *Hudibras Redivivius* (1705-1707). Oakleaf characterizes Ward's description of Jamaica as one that is both "Celebrating England as a Paradise" and which "represents Jamaica as a hell on earth in which the criminal dregs of English society now unfairly prosper" ("Introduction" to *A Trip to Jamaica*). The recoinage of 1696 took place after the need to pay soldiers' wages depleted and degraded the currency, and Oakleaf suggests this process left less coin in circulation for everyday purchases of food and drink or Grub Street pamphlets. According to Oakleaf, "It is not fanciful to connect Ward's struggle to live by his pen in London with England's emergence as an imperial power" (Oakleaf, "Introduction" to *A Trip to Jamaica*). Ward frames the troubling economics of his moral argument in the preface; his complaint, and the reason for this fictional/autobiographical trip to Jamaica, is that he is writing at a time "When Pens were valu'd less than Swords, / And Blows got Money more than Words" (5).[15] With the rise of journals covering political economy, government spending was a topic in vogue in the public discourse. This is precisely what the preface to *A Trip to Jamaica* relies on. What makes the *A Trip to Jamaica* marketable and entertaining is the discourses it draws on: Jamaica's capture, public spending, and the global economic realities of an increasingly complex economy.

There is an implicit critique of England's imperial activity in the way Ward introduced *A Trip to Jamaica*, which I will extend to the way the spaces and moral activity of the island are described—always in relation to London. From this perspective, the narrator's plight as a starving artist in an age that would prefer to give public funds to soldiers is not used to frame Jamaica as degraded morally and

[15] In fact, the English government was at times contributing between 61-74 percent of its public spending to fund wars of the seventeenth century: Sir John Sinclair, *The History of Public Revenue of the British Empire* (London: W. and A. Strahan, 1785-90, 1:4-5; Brewer, *Sinews of Power,* 40. Cited in Stephen Pincus, *The Heart of the Declaration,* 12; See also John Houghton, "Essay on the Interest of the Crown in American Plantations and Trade, 1685, BL, ADD 47131, cited in Stephen Pincus, *The Heart of the Declaration,* 12.

culturally, as the poem might suggest, but rather to show the ways in which the state of affairs in London privileges military might over literary culture. It remains ambiguous in this text whether the trip is taken by choice, that is, whether Ward travelled purposefully because of the difficulty professional writing presented or whether accumulated debt or other crimes led to punishment in the form of transportation. This problem represents two ways in which colonies are necessary for the maintenance of life in London, for private financial gain and for the public export of vice through the transportation of criminals, both of which support the imperial machine through labour and by enriching the metropolis. Jamaica is vilified in this writing, and the problems of Jamaica are compared with and ascribed to London *The Barbacue Feast*, which follows this discussion, attributes similar vices to a feast by Peckham where the Caribbean culture is practised and caricatured in and around London, coded as a colonial practise re-imported from the colonies, but which remains on the periphery of the city. In *A Trip to Jamaica,* Ward uses his knowledge of London to describe the corruption and vice he depicts in Jamaica. As the colonies are increasingly relied on for activities at home, Ward understands them through their impact on the trades he is familiar with: Jamaica is Grub Street in Ned Ward's literary imagination.

A Trip to Jamaica uses exaggerated and hyperbolic descriptions of Jamaica. These descriptions establish a degree of excess that make it far better in relation to London. The following descriptions rely on assumptions that the appetites and desires of colonies and tropical climates are excessive and unrestrained, and this portrait of excess is an important part of the way Jamaica is used, throughout Ward's career, to critique imperialist commerce. The particulars of how this works in *A Trip to Jamaica*, however, are absurd and diverting: the natural world is made to appear extreme and more frightening than England, which pales in all categories of comparison. Small observations, such as sightings of the "Land-Tortoise . . . as numerous as Frogs in England," intensify, suggest natural profligacy, and

emphasize the difference in size of creatures on the island (14). Fecundity and vitality are on display in this description, but there is an element of danger as well, since the most common species of the island are much larger than those at home. In another example, the colony hosts "From all Corners of the Skie . . . Beams of *Lightning"* and Ward's comparison of the lightning to "*Fire-works* in *St. Iames's-Square*" can be "no more to be compar'd to't, than a Gloworms Arse to a Cotten Candle" (12). This is a reversal of the initial view of Jamaica as the "dung-hill of the universe," since here it is London's fireworks compared to a "Gloworms Arse": like the frogs, the fireworks here pale in comparison to the thunders of the Caribbean. The "Vollys of *Thunder*" are not compared to activities at home but to the products of war, so vigorous that "you would have thought the Clouds had been Fortifi'd with Whole Canon, and weary of being tost about with every Wind, were Fighting their way into a Calmer Region to enjoy their Rest" (12). Ward cannot resist comparing the island to England. He does so across a vast distance and these comparisons intensify the natural features of the island in comparison to the landscape of England. The descriptions of this travel to the colony are not made to seem like a comfortable experience, familiarto something at home. Rather, they are a heightened, frightening version. By likening Jamaica's natural phenomena to canons of war, the *Trip* makes a bold connection to its earlier concern about money being spent on war rather than on the product of his pen. The *Trip* cannot avoid the topic of war and its comparison to literary writing; in fact, the interjection of the language of war into these intensified descriptions of nature opens up the possibility that this intensification is part of the *Trip's* critique of the military rather than the climate, and that these comparisons are being used to provide moral commentary on the military's excess rather than on the intensity of the natural features of the island. The argument of Ward's *Trip* is that England's economy at home is weak, not its fireworks or the size of its most prolific animal species. The contention is this: with a shift in priorities for government spending away from military expansion and toward more domestic stimulus, life at home would be

better for writers and other citizens of London.

The two islands are explicitly compared in economic terms; gendered and domestic language is used to cast the agricultural aspirations for Jamaica as a failed and expensive drain on the economy. But where Jamaica's scarcity is accompanied by unflattering comparisons to England. Disguised as a comment on the agricultural practices of the Island, Ward observes, "There is very little Veal, and that Lean; for in England you may Nurse four Children much cheaper than you can one Calf in Jamaica" (14). This striking comparison between raising imported cattle on Jamaica and raising children at home is suggestive of Swift's later *A Modest Proposal* (1729), with violent implications. The most plausible suggestion in light of the explicit aims of the Preface is that the cost of transporting and raising cattle on this Caribbean island is an excessive and obscene expense, especially in light of what that investment could do at home. . Carla Pestana accounts for Jamaica's slow economic growth under Cromwell's government (139, 153). But Ward's comparison to England, posited through this implied male subject ostensibly with a wife raising four children at home, is not an innocent comparison, opening itself to the realities of the violent, masculine, economic system at place in this colonial context. If Jamaica is the "child" in this context, as the metaphor suggests, what does that imply? Does the assumption that four children closer to home would be more advantageous actually promote more violence toward England's Irish, Scottish, and Welsh neighbours? What does Ward's criticism offer in exchange for the continued expense of control over this Caribbean island? If Ward's analogy of the cow threatens to replace one colony with another, it places *A Trip to Jamaica* at odds with Swift's writing that more clearly offers a criticism of English exploitation of Ireland, as it does in *A Modest Proposal*. On the other hand, Carol Fabricant's discussion of whether to consider Swift a colonizer or the colonized offers another way to view Ward's perspective (*Swift's Irish Writings* xvii). Regarding the economics of colonization, Ward is quite critical, but his identity is still aligned with England. In short, Ward exposes the failures of colonial

economics by suggesting that Jamaica is "lean veal" compared to the fattened calf close at hand. His calf analogy is a good illustration of the way Ward is critical of one aspect of colonization, spending, but not of the process of colonization in genera. as a whole. Instead, Ward suggests that the capitalist expansion of colonization is regressive and that its logic is faulty.

The *Trip's* commentary on the island's architecture in comparison to London is exceptionally specific, referencing particular places in London to connect Port Royal to a familiar part of the city. "The Houses are low, little, and irregular" he says, "and if I compare the Best of their Streets in Port Royal, to the Fag-End of Kent-street, where the Broom-men live, I do them more than Justice" (15). This comparison extends the assumption that the colonies are the empire's latrine, a "Receptacle of Vagabonds, the Sanctuary of Bankrupts, and a Close-stool for the Purges of our Prisons," to one that includes not just the criminality of the metroplolis, but also its poverty (14). It makes this association between the poverty of Jamaica and the poverty of London through an observation of architecture. By comparing the houses in each city, the reader is meant to understand the class distinction implied by the "Fag-End of Kentstreet" and the type of worker who lives there, along with any other moral associations with the neighbourhood in general. As disparaging and hyperbolic as this description of the island might be, there is a part of London that rivals it. This distinction reminds Ward's public of poverty in London, and like the previous example of raising cattle on the island, it is designed to illustrate how economic scarcity persists despite and because of military success abroad.

In Ward's depiction of the island's sexuality, the moral comparisons between Port Royal and London are even more explicit. And as the vice of the island becomes the focus of the fictional journey, the assertion is that vice is worn as a badge of honor and even the most despicable of cheats in London can make their way as a respectable in the colony by virtue of the fact that vice is borne casually and without shame. The whores of the island (to whom Ward has already compared poets at the beginning of

this work), bear their nicknames with pride:

> They are Stigmatiz'd with Nick-Names, which they bear, not with Patience only, but with Pride, as Unconscionable Nan, Salt-Beef Peg, Buttock-de-Clink Jenny, [etc.]. Swearing, Drinking and Obscene Talk are the principal Qualifications that render them acceptable to Male Conversation, and she that wants a perfection in these admirable acquirments, shall be as much Redicul'd for her Modesty, as a Plain-dealing Man a-mongst a Gang of Knaves, for his Honesty. (16)

Hypersexualized representations of colonial women continue throughout the eighteenth century. Brooke Newman's chapter on "Enslaved Women and British Comic Culture" shows how the title of certain visual satire in 1798 Jamaica—"tit bits"—has connotations of both food and sex, similar to the "salt-beef Peg" reference in this passage (Newman 180). The fact that honesty is ridiculed and nicknames worn with honour enables the pretenders and cheats from home to profit and pretend to an honest occupation; this cheating thrives in London as well, but the point is that this is the logic of the empire—through opportunity, social mobility, and corrupt methods, skills, status, and virtue are negotiable. Thus, "A Broken Apothecary will make there a Topping Physician; a Barbers Prentice, a good Surgeon; a Bailiffs Follower, a passable Lawyer, and an English Knave, a very Honest Fellow" (16). The preface to *A Trip to Jamaica* is explicitly compares literary writing with sexual labour, the celebration of canting language, and accomplished drinking. An abhorrence for modesty in this description of Jamaican women surely applies to many Grub Street writers. Ward's moral comparisons between Jamaica and England, then, should also be read through the lens of print culture by looking at the role of the author in relation to trade in the colonies. Ward's account of Jamaica criticizes the Commonwealth government and the City of London, but he is particularly critical that government wealth does not support authors.. If professional writing is impeded by debt-fueled war, *A Trip to Jamaica* suggests that the literary marketplace mirrors the difficulties faced in colony. Like Ward's satire of the public sphere, his satire of

colonial spending is positioned from within the literary marketplace to criticize its similarity to the problems he articulates about the colonies. In other words, the problems of Jamaica are also the problems of Grub Street, and in both cases Ward blames the Commonwealth government and London's administration.

Ward's other work on apothecaries and astrologers also considers the tendency for a lesser trade to claim the status and profits of its respectable counterparts, so this phenomenon is not exclusive to Jamaica in Ward's *oeuvre.* Ward's aim here is to exaggerate the difference between moral character and the possibilities for profit and success in the colonies, which are supported by the fact that wages were at times higher in the colonies than back home (Pincus, *The Heart of the Declaration,* 8). The difference between "low" moral character and "high" status is a favourite technique in Ward's satire, one he returns to often. Ward uses this type of rhetoric elsewhere to describe ambitious apprentice apothecaries setting themselves up as physicians while giving people their fortunes on the side. Ward's narrative of upward social mobility through morally corrupt schemes is as possible in Moorfields as it is in Jamaica. These are the observations that lead him to conclude that "Virtue is so Despis'd, and all sorts of Vice Encourag'd, by both Sexes" and to consign Port Royal to the dung-heap as "the very Sodom of the Universe" (16). London is surely implicated in such a description of Jamaica; however, considering it is the origin of this vice is in those who have been exported (as sexual and managerial labour) and exiled from London to begin with.

A Trip to Jamaica does as much to connect the colony to the city as it does to draw distinctions between them. Continually comparing London to Port-Royal, this travel narrative serves to remind the reader repeatedly of profits reaped from the colony and the vices exported there. Ward's critique of the imperial machine of British colonial rule is not meant to educate his readers on the processes of colonialism. Ward's initial frustration —is with the difficulty of developing a writing career while the

country goes to war and maintains an extensive empire, and his *Trip to Jamaica* satirizes both the foreign British colony and the underlying reasons someone in his position might be sent there. The similarities between his moralized description of the island's whores and his own profession, may also suggest that Grub Street is cashing in on the imperial spending by participating in the colonial project by representing its activity. Grub Street is aligned with this military project in the sense that Ward is doing the same thing: trying to carve out a piece of the opportunities offered by literary labour and make a name for himself as a writer in this emergent market.

Ward's description of the advantages of the colony mirrors his ambition as a hack writer. He wants to establish himself in a respectable profession but he is coming from nothing. Ward has little status, no advantage of family, and little learning. With the advantage of his gender, Ward forces his way into a successful literary career. This is an emergent profession that is easily compared to life and imperial violence in the colonies; professional literary writing develops alongside the growth of the colonial enterprise, and opportunity in both instances is about seizing the advantage of power available in a newly established commercial system.

In 1707, nine years after the success of *A Trip to Jamaica*, Ned Ward wrote his intriguing poem, *The Barbacue Feast* (1707). The feast was planned well in advance, the pigs are purchased on their way to auction and then fattened up to rival the roasts of Smithfield and St. Barts. The feast's guests and the ingredients represent the colonial structure that has enabled the feast: the body is governed mostly by tradesmen and seamen with some relationship to foreign trade, and the ingredients, habits, and traditions are drawn from all reaches of the globe.

The poem takes issue with the excess of this feast; the primary criticism levelled at these revelers is that they have too much and go too far. This criticism cannot be understood as a whole-hearted criticism simply of the consumption of food and drink—which is, now and increasingly in his late life,

as we have seen, Ward's stock-and-trade. Rather, we can read this excessive feasting as a larger criticism of the imperial structures that bring together this incongruous group of people, ingredients, and manners. As we do so, the ostensible moral criticism of the feast—its excessive consumption—is not about the individuals; the target is the larger system, its excess and unsustainable expansion.

Where this feast takes place—in Peckham and away from the city—is of significant relevance to the spatial problem of Ned Ward's rhetoric about this feast. Recently, in a discussion of Ned Ward's writing on the "Molly's Club," Kennith McGraw argues that "While Ward denies the mollies urban and linguistic agency, he must also keep the reader at a safe distance to negotiate the issue of proximity" (65). McGraw suggests Ward's choice of language to describe the mollies is designed to undermine their agency in the space they gather in, He argues that Ward does this to negotiate a distance between the club, himself, and his readership. Negotiating this distance between his target and audience is important throughout Ward's work, but it becomes more acutely necessary in the case of his discussions of London clubs and vice than it does in his proto-travel writing in *A Trip to Jamaica,* where such distance already exists between London and the colonies; however, somewhere between these two cases, *A Barbeque Feast* establishes implicit boundaries to ensure that the feast takes place outside the city. The feast does not carry the same explicit negotiations and distancing that set the spatial limits of Ward's account of the Mollies, but its location outside the city is a meaningful negotiation as well, coding the feast as something outside the city's norms, boundaries, and limits.

Why does the feast, which relies on products from the colonial centres and from London, take place outside of the Metropolis and not in a tavern, marketplace, or home within it? Ward's other work about London is written with a familiarity and closeness so why does he create such a distance between himself and the feast? *The Barbacue Feast* takes place outside the city because the the tradesmen's annual gathering is represented as a Caribbean tradition. That this gathering for punch-drinking and a pig

roast takes place in the country rather than in a city public house or private dwelling is, like Ward's discussion of the mollies, a negotiation of distance and proximity to his readership. Although these events are much closer to the city now than Jamaica was in *A Trip to Jamaica,* they stay resolutely outside and south of the city and at a distance from Ward and his readers. Apart from a brief journey across the water in *The London Spy*, I know of no other case in Ward's London writing where an event takes place south of the Thames. Structuring the feast in this way keeps the activities of southern climes isolated south of the city.

The products consumed in the feast offer a different view of consumption than they do in Alexander Pope's work. In her reading of Pope's *The Rape of the Lock,* Laura Brown argues "Belinda stands for the products of mercantilism" and "her story in turn enacts the violence of imperial war," going so far as to say that "of all the major works of the period, *The Rape of the Lock* does the most to match imperialism and commodity fetishism" (22). While Belinda's iconic arming herself with "cosmetic powers" will appear less than ten years after *The Barbacue Feast,* the crass mixture of global ingredients, racial slurs, and the rigid, officious, militant ceremony of Ward's feast rivals Pope's hero and offers an antecedent for its depiction of the imperialist structure enabling the consumption of colonial products. But where in Pope's poem consumption of the products of trade are feminine and the products are luxuries, Ward's representation is of men in Peckham who subscribe each year to the feast ahead of time. Through the feast's excess, veiled under a pretense to rigid structure, this satire offers a critique of militant, imperialist power made explicit in its reference to ingredients and images of the colonies.

The critique of trade and imperialist power offered by this barbeque oscillates between hot-blooded excess and stolid, nonsensical ceremony. The idea for the feast is conceived when a group of men are so drunk on rum that their appetites are insatiable, and rum continues to fuel their appetites and

passion throughout their annual gathering. The language Ward uses to describe the feast is enveloped in the language he uses to vilify Jamaica in *A Trip to Jamaica. The Barbacue Feast* was marketed on his success with his previous work: the title page markets the book as from "the Author of The Trip to Jamaica." Alongside this excess, however, this barbecue society is also exceptionally officious about the ceremony of its feast, and the contradiction between restrained, rigid ceremony and excessive consumption is the centre of the poem's critique.

The barbecue pretends to respectability through its customs and offices, and this play between the low practice imported from the colony and the "high" procedure of the organization of the society is a central irony at work in the description of the club, shared with other descriptions of clubs in London. But unlike descriptions of London clubs, the absurdly organized nature of the Barbecue society is envied, bringing "all Pork-headed Mortals within Scent of the Device to behold the Wonder, and the rest of their Bretheren, to put in for a Snack" (10). This spit-roast pleases a select few. It inspires envy, but its ceremony and celebration are exclusive to this private club. And although the feast is outside of festivals of the city, it gives offence to Jewish exurban communities nearby. The entire aim of the barbecue, it seems, is to give offence, and but Ward's description of ingredients and images of the colonies and nearby countries are also offensive.

The excess of *The Barbacue Feast* is established first as a symptom of influence from the colonies and then compared to common practise in the city. Rum is defined as "That West-India-Diapente, call'd Kill-Devil-Punch, for the Reader's better instructions, made of that odoriferous evil Spirit, according to the Language of the Small-coal-colour'd Heathen, most learnedly distinguished by the Name of Rum" (3). Using this racialized moral language to vilify the drink of the colony, this account explains the unnatural appetite as a symptom of the company's time in the colonies. The merchants who make up this company brought their intemperate and insatiable appetite with them on

their return. The distance between the city and this feast in Peckham is justified, then, by the way in which the blame for this intemperate excess is consigned to the influence of the colonies.

The actions of the feast are continually described as being in excess of anything that can be found in the traditional feast days and regular fare of the city, beginning with the way the pigs are fed. They eat "more Variety of Fritters, than a London-'Prentice upon a Shrove-Tuesday" and by the time they are ready for slaughter, they are "no Smithfield Porker against St. Bartholomew's Revels, fatted Bear-like, with Guts and Garbish, was ever such incomparable Food for a nice Appetite, as these were likely to prove" (6). The barbecue society has gone beyond the regular fattening of an animal for festivals in Smithfield or Bartholomew's fair, and this is a private event, not a public one. While the excess of this barbecue is always contrasted with a regular event in the city, it takes place outside of the city, in Peckham.

The criticism of excess, then, is framed from these two perspectives: the excess is framed as the influence of the colonies, but it is also measured in relation to the norms of city. This strategy cannot rely only on the question of degrees—on how much the feast consumes—but on the fact that it exists outside and extraneous to the feasts and traditions of the city. That the feasters stand in for the colonies, and that their traditions are outside of and in excess to those of the city is communicated through comparison with the city's feasts and through their being situated outside the city, in Peckham.

The proceedings of this "Barbacue Society" are absurdly officious, due to the company of tradesmen, which includes: "A mathemetician, a Cooper, and four Stewards who are ship-wrights, assigned to oversee ticketing and take care of any leftovers. The structured nature of this society becomes more than a simple joke as the account continues, despite the ridiculous creation of a "Stick-Pig in Ordinary to the Barbacue Society" (7). Read against the freedom and excess of the inception of the idea for the feast, the structured organization of a society for barbecue reflects the ways in which the

products and practices of the colonies are absorbed into the traditions of this society outside London. The process of punch-drinking in this description of the barbecue is similar to whisky-drinking in Swift's *A Description of an Irish Feast* (1720):

> *Usquebagh* to our Feast
> In Pails was brought up,
> An Hundred at least,
> And a Madder our cup. (195)

In Ward's text, punch is served in pails and when the reason for this is called into question, one of the "Commissaries" says, "for it is a Pig-Feast, the more Hoggishly we are serv'd, the more agreeable." (19). They consume the punch, however, with precision, according to the commands of the "right hand Commisary":

> Handle your Hat, advance your hat from your Head, ground your Hat, quit your Hat; handle your Cup with your right Hand, join your left hand to your Cup, advance your Cup Mouth-high, join your cup to your under Lip, recover your Cup, open your Mouth, cleanse your upper Lip with the Tip of your Tongue, gape wide, the Queen's Health, swallow, recover your Cup, face your Cup, extend your Cup, ground your Cup, quit your Cup; Fill a Bumper to your left Hand Man.

Step-by-step, the gathering performs this ritualistic, repetitive drinking ceremony until the punch is gone. It is itself a model of imperial expansion and consumption, repeating the steps "advance" and "quit" before each drink. The affected pomp and ceremony of consumption is set against the way the punch consumed in excessive pails The rigid order with which the punch is taken by all at the table does little to calm the absurd antics and songs that follow, where a nautical "Humours of a Sea-fight" is sung and the company is sent home. Before the company can actually leave, it is solicited to double down on

their investment. They must give 12d more than the tickets, with the threat of being excluded from next years' feast if they don't comply (27-8). The continual circulation of wealth through the imperialist machine here figures as a subscription service for next year's feast.

Ward's description of this barbecue leaves few targets outside of London unsullied by language disagreeable to modern discourse around colonization and empire, and is racist, perhaps even by the standards of the day. It takes aim at Scotland, Wales, the Netherlands, France, and Indigenous America in quick succession. Most damningly, the roast pig is compared to the "tawny Belly of an Indian Squaw, just painted over with yellow Oker and Bears-grease," which manages to be offensive while conflating all Americas into one epithet. The Taino people this passage refers to lived in Jamaica through Spanish rule and under British administration of the island (Newman 35; Rouse 160-161). These epithets compare far reaches of the globe to this trivial barbecue in Peckham. Like the interplay between the excess and ceremony of the feast, the colonial ingredients and cooking traditions from outside of England damn the feasts' participants by showing them to be participants in every tradition, while belonging nowhere Building from Jill Casid's arguments in *Sowing Empire: Landscape and Colonization*, that an essential colonization strategy was mastering and cultivating local plants, Joanna Gohmann's recent extended study of the Pineapple, "Colonizing through Clay: A Case Study of the Pineapple in British Material Culture," demonstrates the popularity of attempts to grow the fruit in England and the many ways that it was commemorated, both in art and through consumption as a delicacy. Ward's integration of colonial ingredients in his barbecue poem references this colonial practice and makes it excessive.

The connection between the excesses of the feast and of the colonies is strengthened because each ingredient is located and identified with a particular region. The pig is prepared under Scottish tradition so they can use the stomach after the roast, and the cooks are compared to "Welsh Cooks at a

Cambrian Feast" (11). The hedge bonfire is a "Heathenish Coquination" (11). The language of Peckham's rural setting is the language of the colonies: the table-cloth is a patchwork, described variously as "white as snow," "yellow as Saffron," "brown as Sack-Cloth," "blue as Indigo" (13) In this way, Ward's description encompasses North America, India, West Indies Indigo plantations and any region where sack-cloth might be bearing spices, coffee, or grains from. The impatient group is also described as Dutch whittlers, while they wait for the food to be cooked (14). In its attempt to code this group as heathens and their practice as foreign, even though the barbecue is taking place just outside the city, the feast is described as American, Scottish, Welsh, and Dutch.

Even with racialized language and attempts to distance the events by aligning them to anywhere else in the world through custom and ingredients, the events of the feast are still compared to language in London. When the pig is dropped in fire, the clumsy mistake is met with language that is not assigned to the colonies or to neighbouring countries, but it is said to be rather suited to "course Complements among Water-men, or foul Works at Billingsgate." After the preparations, a pretentious cook steps in and prepares the pig with "Green Virginia Pepper, and Madera Wine, with many other palatable Ingredients" which are said to be unknown to anyone except the fashionable cooks of the Town, from "Drury-Lane to St James Chappel." Although the cook attempts to elevate and moderate the cooking with these high-brow ingredients, the rustic setting is used to undermine this pretension and make him seem more like a Smithfield cook (12). The quality of the food and spices, and the language used in the company, are not defined in relation to the colonies or continental neighbours, but in relation to areas of London that quickly identify the class of people involved. The indicators of class are pretense, though—they are a definitively roguish crowd.

The language of imperialism and of colonies in *The Barbacue Feast* is at times aligned with foreign elements and at others connected to people and activities within the city. But throughout, the

oscillation between riotous excess and officious ceremony shows the group to be foolish in a way that is meant to criticize the excess of the imperial machine that enabled their feast. Its excess, rather than that of the feast, is the real target of this satire, and like the feast, colonial intregients are consumed in the city just as they are outside its limits.

A Trip to Jamaica was formative for Ned Ward's career, and his worked continued to be advertised as "from the author of A Trip to Jamaica" late into his career. *A Trip to Jamaica's* success and Ward's use of Caribbean culture in his late writing make this paring an ideal opportunity to reflect on the connection between emergent professional literary writing in a society that was increasingly dependent on the colonies for financing its imperial expansion. Ward's description of the colonies relies on spatial equivalencies drawn across the great distance between London and Jamaica, collapsing the distance by finding equivalent scenarios in London with which to illustrate his journey. Describing the Caribbean "Barbacue" late in his career, Ward is careful to depict the gluttonous scene in the country south of the city, and this proximity from the city allows for just enough distance between himself, the reader, and the actions of tradesmen there. In both cases, the proximity from London plays an important part in the description of vice. Distance from the excess allows enough space for such a description without creating a moral link to either Ward or his reader.

Together with his trade dialogues, Ward's Jamaica writing is a criticism of local and global trade made possible by inhabiting places of trade and employing knowledge of trade to expose the excess, greed, and deception of trading centres. The apparent contradiction, the thing Pope latches onto and uses in his attacks, is that Ward viewed his literary career in opposition to the type of trade he criticized, but he ultimately ended up as the proprietor of taverns. The implication is that Ward succumbed to the trade and life of business he critiques when he became a purveyor, the source of the excess that he targeted throughout his life. In both cases, Pope deliberately misses the point. As this chapter shows, these two

works on Jamaica contradict Pope's attack, because their focus is on the excesses of the empire rather than on feasting in general; and in Ward's trade dialogues, his target is always the worst type of dishonest and greedy trading practices, not the honest tavern life he had settled into at the time of Pope's attack.

I have taken the occasion of this short-lived conflict between Ned Ward and Alexander Pope as an opportunity to expand on the ways Ned Ward's established business and literary profession was targeted; and as I have looked at the ways Ned Ward discussed local and global trade throughout his career, I have focused on the spatiality of his discussion of trade, because this perspective best illustrates his moral position on the subject--against the excess, greed, and duplicitous practices he targets in his satire. This brings us back to the question of Pope's attack on Ward, not only in terms of what was really at issue or what was offensive about Ward's position in 1712 that precipitated such an attack from Pope, but also in terms of how Pope's attack on Ward disguises and subverts the aims and focus of Ward's career. By placing Ward and his business in the city, Pope implies that Ward is at the centre of everything he critiqued throughout his life, undermining the thread of his criticism, upholding the target of Ward's satire, which remained consistent despite his move into a Moorfields tavern life at the end of his career. Ward's moral position against trade is best expressed, demonstrated, and subverted with spatial strategies: By focusing on Ward's tavern, Pope undermines the literary reputation Ward had built up, dismissing his literary career; and by painting Ward as a poet popular only in the colonies, Pope undermines Ward's argument against the excess, greed, and violence of global trade and imperial expansion.

If Ward's position against London's trade and against colonial spending is the reason for Pope's attack, I want to end this chapter considering the implications of the perspective I read in Ward's writing. First, this satire is a critique of colonization and emergent capitalism that ranges from the global

to the local in its focus, but its critique is different from a Marxist critique of these structures and different from the critique of empire and capital that might be expected from a reading of Restoration satire. Ned Ward's satire does not critique how the margins are used to enrich the centre or how the role of the consumption and commoditization of colonial goods in its exploitation to enrich the metropolis. Instead, the point articulated in the prefatory material of *A Trip to Jamaica*, which I have connected to Ward's work on London's trade and *The Barbacue Feast*, is that the colonies and imperial spending fails to benefit impoverished people in London.. Instead of abstracting this and explaining it away by saying that yes, it enriches the city, but only a few people there, I want to think about the way that Ward's preface connects his position as a writer to this problem. First, there is the sense that Ward needs to write about the colonies because they are in the public consciousness and in the news since Jamaica's capture from Spain. In Pestana's account of *The English Conquest of Jamaica,* he explains that the public discourse was optimistic and assumed that the English would manage the island better than the Spanish had (139, 151). Pestana also confirms some of the difficulties that undermine the public optimism, and also discusses how English campaigns in the West Indies were used to sent away Royalists during Cromwell's rule (252). This politicized assignment of Royalists to the Jamaican campaign could have been part of Ward's motivation for writing *A Trip to Jamaica*, though his primary concern seems to be that taking the colony was misguided and that since 1655 it was not being managed well. In short, it is a waste—excessive spending that fails to benefit those without an economic "Interest" in the island. This excess is illustrated in the *The Barbacue Feast*, where it is not the accumulation and circulation of capital that fuels the feast, but a regular subscription of individuals to next year's feast—it is a private commitment to excess that is unsustainable without the ongoing commitment of these men and thus it is figured as a moral decision rather than an economic condition. Perhaps this is also a good way to address one of Pope's critiques of Ward—his popularity in the colonies. Pope's implications that Ward was

popular in the colonies (his wish that his works not "Sail with Ward to Ape and Monkey Climes") are an insult based on a relationship between the literary success and quality of England vs the depravity of literary production and tastes in the colonies. This relationship does not exist for Ward, whose career was based on popular writing and whose writing about the colonies did not primarily focus on Jamaica's vices but on the depravity of London and its influence on the colonies. Further, the subscription to the *The Barbacue Feast* calls to mind subscription sales of literary works, of which Pope was a master. Ward, however, did not sell his works by subscription, relying instead on a popular audience and a more topical focus which necessitates being in tune with the issues and preoccupations of any given moment. My focus on trade in Ward's career and on his view of the literary profession has been to set up a connection between his view of the literary profession as an honest endeavor which is neglected and gets little support. This chapter has taken Ward's claim that professional writers are not supported as readily as soldiers and asked how Ward, in his capacity as an author outside of London, argued not just for the interests of authors, but of other citizens who failed to benefit from the increasingly costly investments in global trade and warfare. A suspicious reading of this sentiment might simply conclude that Ward is self-centred or indulging in this story strategically to sell his work, but given Ward's focus on local impacts and collective welfare, I suggest Ward offers a sincere argument for the economic and moral impacts on local places: the negative moral and economic influence of imperial expansion on the colonies are a failure of colonial enterprises to benefit the people Ward encountered and wrote about who were disenfranchised.

V. Conclusion

To rule the World, and what he rul'd to Sing,
And be at once the Poet, and the King.
Whether his Learning with his Breath he drew,
And saw the depth of Nature at a view:
Or, new descending from th' Angelick Race,
Retain'd some Tincture of his native place. (*Poetae Britannici* 3)

Ned Ward and Tom Brown's satire is focused on a critique of individualism, a defense of the state, the established church, and the monarchy, but there is also a literary dimension to this critique that posits a form of literary authority based in community. As a cohort of Tory journalists who want to defend the authority of the state before appealing to personal authority and reputation, these writers offer a model of authorship that resists the narrative of individual genius. This way of thinking about literary production and the role of the professional writer presents problems for literary history because it disrupts the narratives of literary history and the development of the individual author figure.

Spaces of London in the satire I have discussed are fundamental to the way they make their moral arguments, and the effectiveness of these strategies is due to the way they embody familiar places and draw on the authority of those places. The literature of these authors is founded on an embodied representation of particular places, and it defends the interests and authority of the state; however, their writing does not fit with the type of nationalist project that espouses the reputation of a national literature based on the iconic reputations of individual authors. This is the type of argument made by the poem I chose for these epigraphs, *Poetae Britannici* (1700), which argues for a national literature and reputation of English poetry more in

line with the monuments to the poets in Westminster, and this type of individualist view of authorship is something Ned Ward and Tom Brown actively work against in their careers. Their work is less about retaining the "tincture" of some metaphysical inspiration or genius and more about expressing the realities of their own "native place"—the spaces and streets they live and work in. This literary position against the individualist author corresponds to the critique of individualism in economics: that is, private profit.

I have been using space and morality as a way to bring together this Tory satire of religious conversion and dissent (in Chapters One and Two) and economics and trade (in Chapters Three and Four), to which literary authority and reputation is central. Collectively, the satire of Ward and Brown suggests an antipathy for a nationalist identity built from the individual author in exchange for a collective authorship model founded in more local identities. Given the religious and economic subjects these authors write about, I want to consider Srinivas Aravmudan's rejoinder in *Tropicopolitans* to Linda Colley's argument about the role of the Protestant formation of national identity in *Britons*. Aravmudan suggests that "Xenophobia, colonialism, orientalism, and racism had just as large a role to play in the constitution of national identity as the admittedly important category of religion," (10). Ward and Brown's satire targets both models of the formation of national identity at the end of the seventeenth-century. Both approaches to national identity—the Protestant formation of national identity posited by Colley and the colonialist national identity of Aravmudan's *Tropicopolitans*—are in opposition to Ward and Brown's focus on local communities that I have argued for using the spaces they write about.

I.

Lampoon and Satyr different skill betray,

Much as nice Fencing, and Bear-Garden-Play.

The Satyr's push is Artful and Polite;

You must a pointed Hudibras indite,

A Fleckno, or a Dispensary write. (7)

Ward and Brown's writing has suffered a poor reputation, but it has a politics and a commitment that is worth reclaiming and that is possible because it is impolite. I have argued that Ward's work is skeptical and pyrrhonistic, and as such it does not offer up alternatives to the things it ridicules. His writing is often more descriptive than argumentative, and this can make it difficult to approach. Additionally, Ward and Brown's work can be lewd, the vocabulary can be esoteric, and the writing so topical that it is difficult to approach with the context it needs. They were prolific and varied in quality by traditional standards of literary production, or in comparison to later authors, in the eighteenth century. But the very qualities that make their writing difficult, ephemeral, or "poor" also make their writing politically engaged and committed to their readership. I approach their ephemerality as a commitment to issues of the present, their bawdy and impolite writing as a commitment to physical realities and lack of pretensions. These qualities, such as they are, enable a political critique of the public sphere, trade, religion, and imperialism during the development of the professional writer. It is difficult to conceive of literary discourse as political in any meaningful way from the traditional view of the writer as a single authoritative genius, from the polite discourse of eighteenth-century Scriblerian journals, or from a literary history that is concerned with the trajectory from classical writing and continually looking to the present in its assessment of early modern writing. I have taken Ward and Brown's writing on its own terms because it resists traditional narratives of literary history, is impolite, and rejects classical authority. In the place of these things, and because it rejects

these categories, this writing is politically engaged in the present in a way that was undoubtedly valuable to readers, but which is, today, worth considering for its contributions to our understanding of literary history. In other words, Ward's writing gives me pause and has provoked challenging questions for my understanding of early modern authorship: what would literary history and our understanding of authorship look like if we focused not on individual authors? What if we were concerned less with individual genius and formal excellence and more with the level of engagement and commitment writers had to their communities?

II.

Some stuff'd in Garrets dream for wicked Rhyme,
Where nothing but their Lodging is sublime,
Observe their twenty Faces, how they strain
To void forth Nonsense from their costive Brain▪
O'er Darby-Ale maliciously they sit,
And, mellow, rail at VVoman, or at VVit. (7)

One of the ways I have begun to work from these questions is by examining the work of these Tory authors alongside the political communities they wrote with and for. Their Tory allegiances are not always the straightforward defense of the state from the satire of Westminster in Chapter One: in Chapter Two, Tom Brown's attack on Dryden is an argument for Tory literature and the authority of the laureate position; in Chapter Three, Ned Ward's satire of London is an attack on Whig trade; and Ward's defense of wine stands in for a Tory model of business over the Whig trade with which Pope tries to identify him. Tory journalism and professional writing at the end of the seventeenth century comprised a tight-knight community in an otherwise factious and challenging print culture. Ward and Brown model literary community;

however, their posturing and positioning, and Brown's attempt to make his own literary reputation at the expense of Dryden, undermine the very thing they attempt to model. Compared to male authors of the Restoration, women playwrights had a more successful literary community.

Ward and Brown's work provokes possibilities of literary community, and I am interested in identifying other writers who model the community more successfully. In the communities of female authors of Restoration theatre, playwrights came together to support and celebrate their members' success. Fidelis Morgan, in her collection *The Female Wits: Women Playwrights on the London Stage 1660-1720,* introduces the title play by including the elegiac poems to Delarivier Manley by Mary Pix and Catherine Trotter on the success of Manley's *The Royal Mischief* (1696) and explains that the satire of female authors in *The Female Wits* was written to undermine the camaraderie shown by these women playwrights (390-391). In another example that undercuts the posturing and infighting of male authorship, Eliza Haywood promoted her *Poems on Several Occasions* (1724), by applying to Samuel Garth for patronage, something Ward and Brown were never willing to do.[16] Despite promoting her work in such a polite way, Haywood was still targeted and lumped in with other Grub Street writers as one of Pope's dunces in the *Dunciad.* I have argued that Ward and Brown are concerned with collective interests, faiths, and literary communities throughout their careers, but these examples suggest the masculine posturing Brown performed at the beginning of his career, and the feuding between Ward and Pope, works against efforts toward literary community.

With this limitation in mind, I argue it would not be possible to write this sort of embodied, politically engaged satire without the influence and inspiration of like-minded writers,

[16] Sloane MS 4059. (Appendix I)

or without the ability to occupy and embody the streets and haunts of London as these authors did. The community that Ward and Brown relied on was a network of Tory journalists and printers who shared political and literary interests. They looked out for each other and built on each other's work. When Tom Brown had difficulty with a bookseller and engaged in a dispute that resulted in physical violence, Abel Roper, a prominent Tory printer, wrote a pamphlet in his defense. The community was closely bound together and Ned Ward and Tom Brown remediated journalism from papers such as the *Post-Boy* (1695-1728). By reworking the political events and intrigues into embodied poetry set in recognizable territory on the streets of London, they offer another way to engage with political issues, not while events happen but imaginatively and humorously through poetic and narrative description of how those events affect people.

Works Cited

Primary Sources

A Pulpit to Let. London, 1665.
A Short Account of the Proceedings of the College of Physicians. Royal College of Physicians of London, 1697. BL 550.b.4
Addison, Joseph, and Richard Steele. *Spectator.* London, 1711-1712.
Astell, Mary. *A Serious Proposal to the Ladies for the Advancement of their True and Greatest Interest.* London, 1694-1697.
Bergerac, Cyrano de. *Histoire Comique: contenant les états et empires de la Lune.* Paris, 1657.
Brooke and Hellier, A Satyr. London, 1712.
Brown, Thomas (Tom). *Amusements Serious and Comical, Calculated for the Meridian of London.* London, 1700.
---. *A Walk through London and Westminster*. in *Works,* Vol. 3. London, 1715.
---. *A Dialogue in St. James Park.* in *Works,* vol.
---. *The Reasons of Mr. Bayes Changing his Religion.* London, 1688 (1691).
---. *Tom Brown's Works in Prose and Verse.* 4 vols. London, 1715.
Butler, Samuel. *Hudibras; Written in the Time of the Late Wars. The Text Edited by A. R. Waller*. 1905.
Cavendish, Margaret (Duchess of Newcastle). *Poems, and Fancies.* London: 1653. BMC 79.h.10.
Defoe, Daniel. *A Hymn to the Pillory.* in *Poems on Affairs of State: Augustan Satirical Verse, 1660-1714,* edited by F. H. Ellis, Vol 6: 1697-1704, Yale UP, 1970, 588-605
---. *Colonel Jack.* London, 1722.
---. *Annus Mirabilis.* London, 1667. in *Works.* Vol. 15.
---. *Absalom and Achitophel* London, 1681-2. in *Works.* Vol. 2.
---. *Essay of Dramatic Poesie.* London, 1688.
---. *Mac Flecknoe* London, 1682. in *Poems on Affairs of State.* Vol. 6. Eds. George de Forest Lord, et al.
---. *The True-Born Englishman.* London, 1701.
Dryden, John. *The Hind and the Panther.* London, 1687. in *Works.* Vol. 3.
---. *The Indian Emperor.* London, 1665.
---. *The Medal.* London, 1682.
---. *The Works of John Dryden*, ed. H. T. Swedenberg, Jr., et al. 20 vols. Berkeley and Los Angeles: U of California P, 1956-2000.
Dunton, John. *Athenian Mercury.* London, 1691-1697.
Eddy, William A. "Tom Brown and Tristram Shandy." *Modern Language Notes*, vol. 44, no. 6, 1929, pp. 379–81. *JSTOR*, doi:10.2307/2913221.
Garth, Samuel. *The Dispensary.* London, 1699.
Ferguson, Adam. *Essay on the History of Civil Society* London, 1767.
Francklin, Thomas. *The Works of Lucian.* London, 1780 (1781).
Haywood, Eliza. *Poems on Several Occasions.* London, 1724.
Houghton, John. "Essay on the Interest of the Crown in American Plantations and Trade," 1685, BMC ADD 47131
Hume, David. *Remarks on the Influence of Climate*, London, 1781.
Littleton, George. *Dialogues of the Dead.* London, 1760 (1768).
Lord, George de Forest, et al. *Poems on Affairs of State; Augustan Satirical Verse, 1660-1714.*

Vols. 1-7. New Haven, Yale UP, 1963-75.
Mandeville, Sir John. *A Modest Defense of Public Stews*. London, 1724.
Manley, Delrivier. *The New Atlantis*. London, 1709.
Marana, Giovanni Paolo. *Letters Writ by a Turkish Spy.* Translated by William Bradshaw. London, 1687.
Marvell, Andrew. *A Dialogue Between Two Horses* London, 1676. in *Poems on Affairs of State*. Vol. 1. Eds. George de Forest Lord, et al.
---. *On the Statue Erected by Sir Robert Viner* London, 1675. in *Poems on Affairs of State*. Vol. 1. Eds. George de Forest Lord, et al.
---. *The Statue at Charing Cross* (1675) in *Poems on Affairs of State.* Vol. 1. Eds. George de Forest Lord, et al.
Millar, John. *Origin of the Distinction of Ranks* London, 1771.
Montesquieu, *De l'esprit des lois*. Geneva, 1748.
Pope, Alexander. *The Dunciad Variorum.*London, 1732. in *The Poems of Alexander Pope : A One-Volume Edition of the Twickenham Text with Selected Annotations.*Ed. John Butt. London : Methuen, 1963.
Pope, Alexander, and John Butt. *The Poems of Alexander Pope : A One-Volume Edition of the Twickenham Text with Selected Annotations.* London : Methuen, 1963.
Philips, Katherine. *Poems.* London, 1664. BMC 994.g.28.
Pulpit Tyrrany: or, Observations upon Four High-Church Sermons London, 1710.
Roper, Abel. *The Post-Boy.* London, 1695-1728.
Rowe, Elizabeth. *Friendship in Death; in twenty letters from the dead to the living.* London, 1750.
Rowe, Elizabeth. *Poems.* London, 1746.
Sinclair, Sir John. *The History of Public Revenue of the British Empire* London: W. and A. Strahan, 1785-90.
Siris in the Shades: a Dialogue concerning tar water between Mr. Benjamin Smith, Lately deceased, Dr. Hancock, and Dr. Garth, at their meeting upon the banks of the River Styx. London, 1744.
Shiells, Robert. *The Lives of the Poets of Great Britain and Ireland, to the Time of Dean Swift. Compiled from Ample Materials Scattered in a Variety of Books, and Especially from the Ms. Notes of the Late Ingenious Mr. Coxeter and Others, Collected for this Design, by Mr. Cibber* Vol. 4 London, 1753Swift, Jonathan. *A Description of an Irish Feast* (1720) in *Swift's Irish Writings: Selected Prose and Poetry* .Carol Fabricant and Robert Mahoney, eds. Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.
Sloane, Sir Hans. *A Voyage to the Islands of Madera, Barbadoes, Nieves, S. Christophers, and Jamaica*. London, 1707.
Swift, Jonathan. *A Tale of a Tub and Other Works.* Ed. Marcus Walsh. Cambridge UP, 2010. Print. *The Cambridge Edition of the Works of Jonathan Swift*: 1.
The Case of the City of London, in Reference to the Debt to the Orphans, and Others. London, 1693.
The Dispensary, a Farce. London, 1697.
The Pulpit-Fool. London, 1707.
The Pulpit Lunaticks London, 1717.
Thompson, Elbert N. S. "Tom Brown and Eighteenth-Century Satirists." *Modern Language Notes,* vol. 32, no. 2, 1917, pp. 90–94. *JSTOR,* doi:10.2307/2915749.

Trapham, Thomas. *A Discourse of the State of Health in the Island of Jamaica* London, 1679.
Tutchin, John. *A Description of Mr. D---'s Funeral*. London, 1700.
Tutchin, John. *The Foreigners.* London, 1700.
Upon the Burning of Dr. Burgess' Pulpit London, 1710.
Villiers, George (Second Duke of Buckingham). *The Rehersal.* London, 1672.
Waller, Edmund. *On St. James' Park, as Lately Improved by His Majesty.* London, 1661.
Ward, Edward (Ned). *A Collection of Historical and State Poems, Satyrs, Songs, and Epigrams. Being the Fifth Volume of Miscellanies.* London, 1717.
Ward, Edward (Ned). *Apollo's Maggot in his Cups*. London, 1729.
---. *A Trip to Jamaica*. London, 1698.
---. *Ecclesia & Factio: A Dialogue between Bow-Steeple Dragon and the Exchange Grasshopper.* London, 1698.
---. *The Barbacue Feast: Or, The Three Pigs of Peckham, Broil'd under an Apple-Tree: Where The Cooks were Numberless; The Company Masterless; The Meat Carv'd with Hatchets; And Punch drank by Pail-fulls. By the Author of The Trip to Jamaica.* London, 1707. BM C. 123 ff.
---. *The London Spy Compleat*, in Eighteen Parts. Ed. Benjamin Neudorf and Allison Muri. *Grubstreetproject.net.* Web.
---. *The Quack-Vintners: Or, A Satyr against Bad wine. With Directions where to have Good.* London, 1712.
---. *The World Bewitch'd: A Dialogue between two astrologers and the Author* London, 1699.
---. *Hudibras Redivivus.* London, 1705-07.
Wilmot, John. (Earl of Rochester). *A Ramble in St. James Park.* London, 1680.
Wollstonecraft, Mary. *A Vindication of the Rights of Women*. London, 1792.

Secondary Sources

Aravamudan, Srinivas. *Tropicopolitans: Colonialism and Agency, 1688-1804*. Duke UP, 1999
Anselment, Raymond A. "Martin Marprelate: A New Source for Dryden's Fable of the Martin and the Swallows." *The Review of English Studies*, vol. 17, no. 67, Oxford UP, 1966, pp. 256–67. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/511983
Baucom, Ian. *Specters of the Atlantic: Finance Capital, Slavery, and the Philosophy of History*. Duke UP, 2005.
Bayer, Gerd. "Negotiating Ethnic Difference in Restoration Travel Fiction." *Arcadia*, vol. 47, no. 1, 2012, pp. 34–53. *DeGruyter*, doi:10.1515/arcadia-2012-0005.
Beckford, William. *A Descriptive Account of the Island of Jamaica: With Remarks upon the Cultivation of the Sugar-Cane, throughout the Different Seasons of the Year, and Chiefly Considered in a Picturesque Point of View; Also Observations and Reflections upon What Would Probably Be the Consequences of an Abolition of the Slave-Trade, and of the Emancipation of the Slaves*. London, Printed for T. and J. Egerton, 1790. *Internet Archive*, http://archive.org/details/adescriptiveacc00beckgoog.
"Bow Street and Russell Street Area: Bow Street." Survey of London: Volume 36, Covent Garden. Ed. F H W Sheppard. London: London County Council, 1970. pp. 185-192. *British History Online.* http://www.british-history.ac.uk/survey-london/vol36/pp185-192.
Boyce, Benjamin. *Tom Brown of Facetious Memory: Grub Street in the Age of Dryden.* Harvard UP, 1939.
---. "Two Debts for Tom Brown, With a Credit From Joseph Addison." *Philological Quarterly*,

vol. 14, no. 3, 1935, pp. 263-269.
Brand, Paul. "Hengham, Ralph (b. in or before 1235, d. 1311), justice." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. January 03, 2008. Oxford UP. https://www-oxforddnb-com.login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-12924
Brewer, John. *The Pleasures of the Imagination: English Culture in the Eighteenth Century*. Farrar Straus Giroux, 1997.
---. *The Sinews of Power: War, Money, and the English State, 1688-1783*. Knopf, 1989.
Briggs, P. M. "Satiric Strategy in Ned Ward's London Writings." *Eighteenth-Century Life*, vol. 35, no. 2, 2011, pp. 76–101. *CrossRef*, doi:10.1215/00982601-1214063.
Brorby, Joshua. "Seeming as Believing: Epistemological Uncertainty and the World of Annus Mirabilis." *Restoration: Studies in English Literary Culture, 1660-1700*, vol. 43, no. 1, July 2019, pp. 29–50. *Project MUSE*, doi:10.1353/rst.2019.0007.
Brown, Laura. *Alexander Pope.* Terry Eagleton, ed. *Rereading Literature: Alexander Pope.* Basil Blackwell, 1985.
---. *Ends of Empire: Women and ideology in Early Eighteenth-Century English Literature.* Cornell UP, 1993.
Carnes, Geremy. "Catholic Conversion and Incest in Dryden's *Don Sebastian*," *Restoration: Studies in English Literary Culture, 1660-1700*, vol. 38, no. 2, 2014, pp. 3-19. *Project Muse.* doi:10.1353/rst.2014.0016
---. "Tyrannick Faith: Martyr Drama, the Heroic Mode, and Dryden's Tyrannick Love." *Restoration: Studies in English Literary Culture, 1660-1700*, vol. 42 no. 1, 2018, pp. 31-54. *Project MUSE*, doi:10.1353/rst.2018.0001.
Casid, Jill H. *Sowing Empire: Landscape and Colonization*. U of Minnesota P, 2005.
Chua, Brandon. "Representing Religious Toleration in Dryden's The Hind and the Panther (1687)." *Restoration: Studies in English Literary Culture, 1660-1700*, vol. 43 no. 2, 2019, pp. 29-47.
Clark, John R. *Form and Frenzy in Swift's Tale of a Tub*. Cornell UP, 1970.
Colomb, Gregory G. *Designs on Truth : The Poetics of the Augustan Mock-Epic*. Pennsylvania State UP, 1992.
Cook, Harold. *The Decline of the Old Medical Regime in Stuart London.* Ithica, 1986.
Crull, Jodocus. *The Antiquities of St Peter's, Or, The Abbey-Church of Westminster: Containing All the Inscriptions and Epitaphs Upon the Tombs and Grave-Stones; with the Lives, Marriages, and Issue of the Most Eminent Personages Therein Reposited; and Their Coats of Arms Truly Emblazoned*. J. N. and sold by John Morphew near Stationers-Hall, 1711.
Doolittle, I. G. "The City of London's Debt to Its Orphans, 1694–1767." *Historical Research*, vol. 56, no. 133, Oxford Academic,1983, pp. 46–59. academic-oup-com.login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca, doi:10.1111/j.1468-2281.1983.tb01758.x
Eddy, William A. "Tom Brown and Tristram Shandy." *Modern Language Notes*, vol. 44, no. 6, 1929, pp. 379–81. *JSTOR*, doi:10.2307/2913221.
Ellis, Markman. *The Coffee House: A Cultural History*. Phoenix, 2005.
Fabricant, Carol, and R. Mahony. *Swift's Irish Writings: Selected Prose and Poetry*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.
---. *Swift's Landscape.* Johns Hopkins UP, 1983.

Gohmann, Joanna M. “Colonizing through Clay: A Case Study of the Pineapple in British Material Culture.” *Eighteenth-Century Fiction*, vol. 31, no. 1, 2018, pp. 143-161. *Project Muse,* muse.jhu.edu/article/704846.

Hammond, Brean S. *Professional Imaginative Writing in England, 1670-1740: `Hackney for Bread'*. Clarendon Press, 1997.

Hammond, Paul. "Dryden, John (1631–1700), poet, playwright, and critic." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. October 08, 2009. Oxford UP. https://www-oxforddnb-com.login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-8108

Harding, Vanessa. “Controlling a Complex Metropolis, 1650–1750: Politics, Parishes and Powers.” *The London Journal*, vol. 26, no. 1, May 2001, pp. 29–37

Harris, Tim. “The Bawdy House Riots of 1668.” *The Historical Journal*, vol. 29, no. 3, 1986, pp. 537–56. *JSTOR*.

Harth, Phillip. *Pen for a Party: Dryden's Tory Propaganda in Its Contexts*. Princeton UP, 1993.

---. *Swift and Anglican Rationalism: The Religious Background of A Tale of a Tub*. U of Chicago P, 1961.

Hoppit, Julian. “The Contexts and Contours of British Economic Literature, 1660-1760.” *The Historical Journal*, vol. 49, no. 1, 2006, pp. 79–110. *JSTOR*.

Horowitz, James. “Partisan Bodies: John Dryden, Jacobite Camp, and the Queering of 1688.” *Restoration: Studies in English Literary Culture, 1660-1700,* vol. 39, no. 1, Nov. 2015, pp. 17–60. *Project MUSE*, doi:10.1353/rst.2015.0007.

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

Hultquist, Aleksondra. “Creole Space: Jamaica, Fallen Women, and British Literature” in Narain, Mona, and Karen Gevirtz. *Gender and Space in British Literature, 1660–1820*. Routledge, 2014.

Kent, Eddy, and Terri Tomsky, editors. *Negative Cosmopolitanism: Cultures and Politics of World Citizenship after Globalization*. McGill-Queen's UP, 2017. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt1w0ddq5.

Knights, Mark. “The Tory Interpretation of History in the Rage of Parties.” *Huntington Library Quarterly*, vol. 68, no. 1–2, Mar. 2005, pp. 353–73. *JSTOR*, doi:10.1525/hlq.2005.68.issue-1-2.

Kimberly Latta. “‘Wandering Ghosts of Trade Whymsies’: Projects, Gender, Commerce, and Imagination in the Mind of Daniel Defoe,” in *The Age of Projects*. Edited by Maximillian Novak, U of Toronto P, 2008. pp. 141-165.

Lefebvre, Henri. *The Production of Space*, translated by Donald Nicolson-Smith. Blackwell, 1991.

Lindsay, Alexander. "Cowley, Abraham (1618–1667), poet." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. September 23, 2004. Oxford UP., <https://www-oxforddnb-com.login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-6499>

Long, Ralph Bernard. “Dryden’s Importance as a Spokesman of the Tories.” *Studies in English*, no. 21, U of Texas P, 1941, pp. 79–99. *JSTOR*.

Mack, Robert L. *The Genius of Parody: Imitation and Originality in Seventeenth- and Eighteenth-Century English Literature*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.

Marshall, Dorothy. *The English Poor in the Eighteenth Century: A Study in Social and*

Administrative History. Academy Chicago, 2000.
McBride, Ian. "Ulster Presbyterians and the Confessional State, c. 1688-1733" in *Political Discourse in Seventeenth- and Eighteenth-Century Ireland.* D. George Boyce, Robert Eccleshall, and Vincent Geoghegan, eds. Palgrave McMillan, 2001, pp. 169-192
McDowell, Paula. *The Women of Grub Street : Press, Politics, and Gender in the London Literary Marketplace, 1678-1730.* Clarendon Press, 1998.
McGraw, Kennith. "The Treachery of Space: Discursive Reclamation in Ned Ward's 'The Mollies Club,'" *CEA Critic* vol. 74 no. 2/3. http://www.jstor.org/stable/44378470
McCue, G. S. "A Seventeenth-Century Gulliver." *Modern Language Notes*, vol. 50, no. 1, 1935, pp. 32–34.
Molineux, Catherine. "Hogarth's Fashionable Slaves: Moral Corruption in Eighteenth-Century London." *ELH*, vol. 72, no. 2, 2005, pp. 495–520. *Project MUSE*, doi:10.1353/elh.2005.0020
Molz, Jennie Germann. "Cosmopolitan Bodies: Fit to Travel and Travelling to Fit." *Body & Society*, vol. 12, no. 3, Sept. 2006, pp. 1–21. *SAGE Journals*, doi:10.1177/1357034X06067153.
Moore, John E. "The Monument, or, Christopher Wren's Roman Accent." *The Art Bulletin*, vol. 80, no. 3, (1998), pp. 498-533.
Murray, Molly. *The Poetics of Conversion in Early Modern English Literature: Verse and Change from Donne to Dryden*. Cambridge UP, 2009
Nathan, Edward P. "The Bench and the Pulpit: Conflicting Elements in the Augustan Apology for Satire." *ELH*, vol. 52, no. 2, 1985, pp. 375–96. *JSTOR*, doi:10.2307/2872842.
Neudorf, Benjamin. "The Satirical Topography of Ned Ward's The London Spy. " Paper presented at the Canadian Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies conference, Montreal, QC, Oct. 16, 2014.
---. *Two Spectators: The Double Vision of Ned Ward's* The London Spy. MA Project. 2014.
Nussbaum, Felicity. *The Brink of All We Hate: English Satires on Women, 1660--1750*. The UP of Kentucky, 2015.
---. *Torrid Zones : Maternity, Sexuality, and Empire in Eighteenth-Century English Narratives*. Johns Hopkins UP, 1995.
Newman, Brooke. "Enslaved Women and British Comic Culture" in *Dark Inheritance: Blood, Race, and Sex in Colonial Jamaica.* Yale UP, 2018: pp. 179-228
---. "The Birthright of Freeborn Subjects" in Dark Inheritance: Blood, Race, and Sex in Colonial Jamaica. Yale UP, 2018: pp. 27-66
Nicholls, James. "Healths, Toasts and Pledges: Political Drinking in the Seventeenth Century." in *The Politics of Alcohol: A History of the Drink Question in England.* Manchester UP, 2009. doi: 10.7765/9781847793324.00005
Oakleaf, David. "Introduction" to *A Trip to Jamaica.* Grubstreetproject.net.
Osmond, Rosalie. "Body and Soul Dialogues in the Seventeenth Century." English Literary Renaissance, vol. 4, no. 3, Sept. 1974, pp. 364–403.
Orihel, Michelle. "'Treacherous Memories' of Regicide: The Calves-Head Club in the Age of Anne." *The Historian*, vol. 73, no. 3, 2011, p. 435.
Pestana, Carla Gardina. *The English Conquest of Jamaica: Oliver Cromwell's Bid for Empire.* The Belknap Press of Harvard UP, 2017.
Pincus, Stephen. *The Heart of the Declaration: The Founders' Case for an Activist Government.* Yale UP, 2016.

Pritchard, Jonathan. “Pope, John Rackett, and the Slave Trade.” *SEL Studies in English Literature 1500-1900*, vol. 45, no. 3, 2005, pp. 579–601. doi:10.1353/sel.2005.0032.
Pollock, Anthony. *Gender and the Fictions of the Public Sphere, 1690-1755*. Routledge, 2009.
---. *Cities of the Dead: Circum-Atlantic Performance.* NY: Columbia UP, 1996
Raven, James. *Bookscape : Geographies of Printing and Publishing in London before 1800.* The British Library, 2014.
---. *The Business of Books: Booksellers and the English Book Trade, 1450-1850.* Yale UP, 2007.
Reuben Sanchez, Jr. *Persona and Decorum in Milton’s Prose*, Fairleigh Dickinson UP, 1997.
Roach, Joseph. *It*. U of Michicgan P, 2007.
Rogers, Pat. *Grub Street: Studies in a Subculture.* Methuen, 1972.
---. *Hacks and Dunces: Swift, Pope, and Grub Street.* Methuen, 1980.
Rouse, Irving. *The Tainos: Rise and Decline of the People Who Greeted Columbus.* Yale UP, 1992
Ryan, William J. “‘A New Strange Disease’: The Feeling of Form in Hans Sloane’s Case Studies of English Jamaica” *The Eighteenth Century*, vol. 59, no. 3, 2018, pp. 305-324. *Project MUSE*, doi:10.1353/ecy.2018.0 017.
Said, Edward W. “Swift’s Tory Anarchy.” *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, vol. 3, no. 1, 1969, pp. 48–66. *JSTOR*, doi:10.2307/2737698.
Salvaggio, Ruth. “Verses on the Death of Mr. Dryden.” *The Journal of Popular Culture*, vol. 21, no. 1, 1987, pp. 75–91. *Wiley Online Library,* doi:10.1111/j.0022-3840.1987.00075.x.
Shiells, Robert. *The Lives of the Poets of Great Britain and Ireland, to the Time of Dean Swift. Compiled from Ample Materials Scattered in a Variety of Books, and Especially from the Ms. Notes of the Late Ingenious Mr. Coxeter and Others, Collected for this Design, by Mr. Cibber volume 4.* London: printed for R. Griffiths at the Dunciad in St. Paul’s Churchyard, 1753.
Stephanson, Ray. *The Yard of Wit: Male Creativity and Sexuality 1650-1750.* U of Pennsylvania P, 2004.
Survey of London: Volume 36, Covent Garden. Ed. F H W Sheppard. London: London County Council, 1970. *British History Online*. Web. 6 January 2020. http://www.british-history.ac.uk/survey-london/vol36
Thompson, Elbert N. S. “Tom Brown and Eighteenth-Century Satirists.” *Modern Language Notes*, vol. 32, no. 2, 1917, pp. 90–94. *JSTOR*, doi:10.2307/2915749.
Trolander, Paul, and Zeynep Tenger. “Criticism Against Itself: Subverting Critical Authority in Late-Seventeenth-Century England.” *Philological Quarterly*, vol. 75, no. 3, University of Iowa., 1996, pp. 311–338.
Troyer, Howard W. *Ned Ward of Grubstreet: A Study of Sub-Literary London in the Eighteenth Century*. Harvard UP, 1946.
Varey, Simon. *Space and the Eighteenth-Century English Novel.* Cambridge UP, 1990. Cambridge *Studies in Eighteenth Century English Literature and Thought*, 7.
Waddell, Brodie. *God, Duty and Community in English Economic Life, 1660-1720*. Boydell Press, 2012.
Walcot, Clare. “Hogarth’s The South Sea Scheme and the Topography of Speculative Finance.” *Oxford Art Journal* vol. 35, no. 3 (2012): 413–432.
Walford, Edward. “Camberwell.” *Old and New London: Volume 6.* Cassell, Petter, & Galpin, 1878. 269-289, Par. 15. *British History Online.* 18 December 2019. http://www.british-history.ac.uk/old-new-london/vol6/pp269-286.

Ward, Joseph. *Metropolitan Communities: Trade Guilds, Identity, and Change in Early Modern London.* Stanford, 1997.

Weinbrot, Howard D. *Britannia's Issue: The Rise of British Literature from Dryden to Ossian*. Cambridge UP, 1993.

"Whitehall Palace: Buildings." *Survey of London: Volume 13, St Margaret, Westminster, Part II: Whitehall I.* Eds. Montagu H Cox, and Philip Norman. London: London County Council, 1930. 41-115. *British History Online.* Web. 23 August 2019. http://www.british-history.ac.uk/survey-london/vol13/pt2/pp41-115

Williams, Abigail. *Poetry and the Creation of a Whig Literary Culture 1681-1714.* Oxford UP, 2005.

Williams, Raymond. *The Country and the City.* Oxford UP, 1975.

Wrightson, Keith. "Mutualities and Obligations: Changing Social Relationships in Early Modern England: Raleigh Lecture On History." *Proceedings of the British Academy,* volume 139, *2005 Lectures:* British Academy, 2012. *British Academy Scholarship Online*, https://britishacademy.universitypressscholarship.com/view/10.5871/bacad/9780197263945.001.0001/upso-9780197263945-chapter-7

Zwicker, Steven N. *Politics and Language in Dryden's Poetry: The Arts of Disguise*. Princeton UP, 1984.

---. "Why Are They Saying These Terrible Things about John Dryden? The Uses of Gossip and Scandal." *Essays in Criticism*, vol. 64, no. 2, Apr. 2014, pp. 158–79. doi:10.1093/escrit/cgu004.

Bibliography

Allen, Robert J. "Ned Ward and The Weekly Comedy." *Harvard Studies and Notes in Philology and Literature*, vol. 17, 1935, pp. 1–13.

---. *Clubs of Augustan London.* Harvard UP, 1933. *Harvard Studies in English: 7.*

Anselment, Raymond A. *"Betwixt Jest and Earnest": Marprelate, Milton, Marvell,Swift & the Decorum of Religious Ridicule*. University of Toronto Press, 1979.

Armistead, J. M. "The Mythic Dimension of Dryden's The Hind and the Panther." *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900,* vol. 16, no. 3, Johns Hopkins UP, 1976, pp. 377–86. *JSTOR*, doi:10.2307/449721

Augustine, Matthew C. "Dryden's 'Mysterious Writ' and the Empire of Signs." *Huntington Library Quarterly*, vol. 74, no. 1, U of Pennsylvania P, 2011, pp. 1–22. *JSTOR*, doi:10.1525/hlq.2011.74.1.1;

Augustine, Matthew C., and Steven N. Zwicker, eds. *Lord Rochester in the Restoration World*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2015.

Backscheider, Paula, editor. *Probability, Time, and Space in Eighteenth-century Literature.* AMS, 1979.

Bakhtin, Mikhail M., and Michael Holquist. *Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. U of Texas P, 1981. *ProQuest Ebook Central*, http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/ualberta/detail.action?docID=3443524.

Ballaster, Ross. "Rochester, Behn and Enlightenment Liberty." in *Lord Rochester in the Restoration World.* Eds. Matthew C. Augustine and Steven N. Zwicker. Cambridge UP. 2015. 207-230.

Beier, A. L. and Roger Finlay. *London 1500-1700: The Making of the Metropolis*. Longman, 1986.

Beckford, William. *A Descriptive Account of the Island of Jamaica: With Remarks upon the Cultivation of the Sugar-Cane, throughout the Different Seasons of the Year, and Chiefly Considered in a Picturesque Point of View; Also Observations and Reflections upon What Would Probably Be the Consequences of an Abolition of the Slave-Trade, and of the Emancipation of the Slaves*. London, Printed for T. and J. Egerton, 1790. *Internet Archive*, http://archive.org/details/adescriptiveacc00beckgoog.

Bennett, Paul A. *Books and Printing; a Treasury for Typophiles, Edited by Paul A. Bennett. [1st Ed.]*. Rev. ed.

Benson, Donald R. "Dryden's The Hind and the Panther: Transubstantiation and Figurative Language." *Journal of the History of Ideas*, vol. 43, no. 2, U of Pennsylvania P, 1982, pp. 195–208. *JSTOR*, doi:10.2307/2709199

---. "Theology and Politics in Dryden's Conversion." *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*, vol. 4, no. 3, Johns Hopkins UP, 1964, pp. 393–412. *JSTOR*, doi:10.2307/449490

Bergner, Heinz. *English Character-Writing*, Ed. by Heinz Bergner. 1971.

Berwick, Donald M. *Reputation of Jonathan Swift (1781-1882).* Haskell House, 1965.

Black, Jeremy. *Eighteenth-Century Britain, 1688-1783*. 2nd ed, Palgrave Macmillan, 2008.

Boucé, Paul-Gabriel. "The Secret Nexus: Sex and Literature in Eighteenth-Century Britain." *The Sexual Dimension in Literature*. Barnes & Noble, 1982, pp. 70–89.

Bowers, Toni. *The Problem of Resistance in Old-Tory Ideology: Passive Obedience, Seduction Plots, and the Five Love-Letters*. Oxford UP, 2011. *EBSCOhost*, doi:10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199592135.003.0003.

Boyce, Benjamin. "The Dispensary, Sir Richard Blackmore, and the Captain of the Wits." *The Review of English Studies*, vol. 14, no. 56, 1938, pp. 453–58.

Brant, Clare, and Susan E. Whyman. *Walking the Streets of Eighteenth-Century London*. Oxford UP, 2009. *CrossRef*, http://www.oxfordscholarship.com/view/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199280728.001.0001/acprof-9780199280728.

Bredvold, Louis I. "Dryden, Hobbes, and the Royal Society." *Modern Philology*, vol. 25, no. 4, 1928, pp. 417–438. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/433266.

---. *The Intellectual Milieu of John Dryden*. U Michigan P, 1934.

Brenner, Neil et al., eds. *State/Space: A Reader.* Wiley-Blackwell, 2003.

Bricker, Andrew Benjamin. "Libel and Satire: The Problem with Naming." *ELH*, vol. 81, no. 3, 2014, pp. 889–921. *Project MUSE*, doi:10.1353/elh.2014.0026.

Broich, Ulrich. *The Eighteenth-Century Mock-Heroic Poem,* translated by David Henry Wilson, Cambridge UP, 1990. *Euroopean Studies in English Literature.*

Bucknell, Clare. "The Roman Adversarial Dialogue in Eighteenth-Century Political Satire." *Translation & Literature*, vol. 24, no. 3, 2015, pp. 291–318. *EBSCOhost*, doi:10.3366/tal.2015.0219.

Budick, Sanford. "The Demythological Mode in Augustan Verse." *ELH*, vol. 37, no. 3, 1970, pp. 389–414. *JSTOR*, doi:10.2307/2872312.

---. *Dryden and the Abyss of Light; a Study of Religio Laici and The Hind and the Panther*. Yale UP, 1970.

Bullitt, John Marshall. *Jonathan Swift and the Anatomy of Satire: A Study of Satiric Technique*. 1966.

Bulman, William J. *Anglican Enlightenment: Orientalism, Religion and Politics in England and Its Empire, 1648-1715*. Cambridge UP, 2015.

---. *Anglican Enlightenment*. Cambridge UP, 2015.

Burgess, Miranda J. *British Fiction and the Production of Social Order, 1740-1830.* Cambridge UP, 2000. *Cambridge Studies in Romanticism 43*.

Butler, Samuel. *Hudibras; Written in the Time of the Late Wars. The Text Edited by A. R. Waller*. 1905.

Butterfield, Herbert. *The Whig Interpretation of History*. W. W. Norton, 1965.

Byrd, Max. *London Transformed: Images of the City in the Eighteenth Century.* Yale UP, 1978

Casanova, Jose. *Public Religions in the Modern World.* U Chicago P, 1994.

Carlisle, Janice. *John Stuart Mill and the Writing of Character*. U of Georgia P, 1991.

Carretta, Vincent. *The Snarling Muse : Verbal and Visual Political Satire from Pope to*

Churchill. U of Pennsylvania P, 1983.

Cavill, P. R. "Anticlericalism and the Early Tudor Parliament: Anticlericalism and the Early Tudor Parliament." *Parliamentary History*, vol. 34, no. 1, 2015, pp. 14–29. doi:10.1111/1750-0206.12115.

Censorship & the Control of Print: In England and France1600-1910. St Paul's Bibliographies, 1992.

Champion, Justin. "Violence, Protest and Resistance:: Marvell and the Experience of Dissent after 1670." *Politics, Religion and Ideas in Seventeenth- and Eighteenth-Century Britain : Essays in Honour of Mark Goldie*, edited by Justin Champion et al., New edition, Boydell and Brewer, 2019, pp. 59–80. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctvfrxrx4.10.

Clark, John R. *Form and Frenzy in Swift's Tale of a Tub*. Cornell UP, 1970.

Cohen, Murray. *Sensible Words: Linguistic Practice in England, 1640-1785*. Johns Hopkins UP, 1977.

Coleman, D. C. "Mercantilism Revisited." *The Historical Journal*, vol. 23, no. 4, 1980, pp. 773–91. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/2638725

Condren, Conal. *Satire, Lies, and Politics: The Case of Dr Arbuthnot*. Macmillan Press, 1997.

Cook, Richard I. *Jonathan Swift as a Tory Pamphleteer, by Richard I. Cook*. 1967.

Cotterill, Anne. "Parenthesis at the Center: The Complex Embrace of 'The Hind and the Panther.'" *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, vol. 30, no. 2, 1996, pp. 139–58.

Deutsch, Helen. "Living at This Hour: Jonathan Swift, Edward Said, and the Profession of Literature." *Boundary 2*, vol. 46, no. 4, Duke UP, Nov. 2019, pp. 31–62. *read-dukeupress-edu.login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca*, doi:10.1215/01903659-7859129.

Dickie, Simon. "Hilarity and Pitilessness in the Mid-Eighteenth Century: English Jestbook Humor." *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, vol. 37, no. 1, 2003, pp. 1–22. *Project MUSE*, doi:10.1353/ecs.2003.0060.

Dolan, Frances. "Gender and the Lost Spaces of Catholicism," *The Journal of Interdisciplinary History,* vol. 32, no. 4, 2002, pp. 641-65.

Domingo, D. P. "Unbending the Mind: Or, Commercialized Leisure and the Rhetoric of Eighteenth-Century Diversion." *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, vol. 45, no. 2, 2012, pp. 207–236.

Eddy, William A. "Ned Ward and 'Lilliput.'" *Notes and Queries*, vol. 158, 1930, pp. 148–49.

Elkin, Peter Kingsley. *The Augustan Defense of Satire*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973.

Elliott, Robert C. *The Literary Persona*. U of Chicago P, 1982.

---.. *The Power of Satire: Magic, Ritual, Art*. Princeton, N.J., Princeton UP, 1960. Print.

Ellis, Frank H. "The Background of the London Dispensary." *Journal of the History of Medicine and Allied Sciences*, vol. 20, no. 3, 1965, pp. 197–212. *JSTOR*.

Engel, Wilson F. "John Oldham and the Threat of Building Pauls: A Note." *Notes & Queries*, vol. 24, 1977, pp. 552–53.

Ezell, Margaret J. M. *Kit-Cats and Scriblerians: Clubs, Wits, the Tatler, the Spectator, and The Memoirs of Martin Scriblerus*. Oxford UP, 2017. *EBSCOhost*,

doi:10.1093/oso/9780198183112.003.0026.

Fabricant, Carol. *"The Literature of Domestic Tourism and the Public Consumption of Private Property."* in *The New Eighteenth Century: Theory, Politics, English Literature,* edited by Felicity Nussbaum and Laura Brown. Methuen, 1987.

Feinberg, Leonard. *The Satirist: His Temperament, Motivation, and Influence.* Iowa State UP, 1963.

Felicity A. Nussbaum. *The Brink of All We Hate: English Satires on Women, 1660--1750*. The University Press of Kentucky, 2015.

Fletcher, Angus. *Allegory: The Theory of a Symbolic Mode.* Cornell UP, 1964.

Foucault, Michel. "Of Other Spaces." *Diacritics* vol. 16 no. 1 (1986): 22-27.

Foxon, David F. David Fairweather. *Libertine Literature in England, 1660-1745*. The Book Collector, 1964.

Freedman, William. "The Grotesque Body in the Hollow Tub: Swift's Tale." *Texas Studies in Literature and Language*, vol. 51, no. 3, 2009, pp. 294–316. *Project MUSE*, doi:10.1353/tsl.0.0030.

Frost, William. "Dryden and 'Satire'." *Studies in English Literature* vol. 11 no. 3, 1971, pp. 401-16. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/449903.

Frow, John. *Character and Person*. First edition, Oxford UP, 2014.

Frye, Northrop. "The Nature of Satire." *University of Toronto Quarterly*, vol. 14, no. 1, Oct. 1944, pp. 75–89. *CrossRef*, doi:10.3138/utq.14.1.75.

---. "The Nature of Satire." University of Toronto Quarterly, vol. 14 no. 1, 1944: 75–89.

Fujimura, Thomas H. "The Personal Drama of Dryden's the Hind and the Panther." *PMLA*, vol. 87, no. 3, 1972, pp. 406–16. *JSTOR*, doi:10.2307/460899.

Gabbard, D. Christopher. "Gender Stereotyping in Early Modern Travel Writing on Holland." *SEL Studies in English Literature 1500-1900*, vol. 43, no. 1, 2003, pp. 83–100. *CrossRef*, doi:10.1353/sel.2003.0004.

Gardiner, Anne Barbeau. "The Roots of Authority: Fidelity to Inherited Laws in Dryden's 'the Hind and the Panther.'" *Clio,* vol. 11, no. 1, 1981, pp. 15–28.

Gatrell, Vic. *City of Laughter: Sex and Satire in Eighteenth-century London.* Walker & Co., 2006

George, M. Dorothy Mary Dorothy. *London Life in the 18th Century*. 1966. Academy Chicago, 2000.

Gillespie, Katharine. *Domesticity and Dissent in the Seventeenth-Century: English Women Writers and the Public Sphere*. Cambridge UP, 2004.

Gillespie, Katherine. *Women Writing the English Republic, 1625–1681*. Cambridge UP, 2017.

Gordon, Andrew and Bernhard Klein, editors. *Literature, Mapping, and the Politics of Space in Early Modern Britain.* Cambridge UP, 2001.

Gorman-Murray, Andrew, and Peter Hopkins. *Masculinities and Place.* Ashgate, 2014.

Gray, Catharine. *Women Writers and Public Debate in 17th-Century Britain*. 1st ed, Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.

Greene, Donald. *The Age of Exuberance: Backgrounds to Eighteenth-Century English Literature.* Random House, 1970.

Greene, Jody. *The Trouble with Ownership: Literary Property and Authorial Liability in England, 1660-1730*. U of Pennsylvania P, 2005.

Griffin, Dustin H. *Satire: A Critical Reintroduction*. UP of Kentucky, 1994.

Griffin, Robert J. "Anonymity and Authorship." *New Literary History*, vol. 30, no. 4, 1999, pp. 877–95.

Habermas, Jürgen. *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*. MIT Press, 1991.

Hammond, Brean and Shaun Regan. *Making the Novel: Fiction and Society in Britain, 1660-1789.* Palgrave Macmillan, 2006.

Hammond, Brean S. "The Dunciad and the City: Pope and Heterotopia." *Studies in the Literary Imagination*, vol. 38, no. 1, 2005, p. 219-233.

---. *Pope Amongst the Satirists 1660-1750.* Northcote, 2005.

---. *Professional Imaginative Writing in England, 1670-1740: `Hackney for Bread'*. Clarendon Press, 1997.

Hammond, Paul. "The Circulation of Dryden's Poetry." *The Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America*, vol. 86, no. 4, 1992, pp. 379–409.

Hanson, Laurence. *Government and the Press, 1695-1763*. 1st ed, Clarendon Press, 1936.

Harding, Vanessa. "Controlling a Complex Metropolis, 1650–1750: Politics, Parishes and Powers." *The London Journal*, vol. 26, no. 1, 2001, pp. 29–37. *CrossRef*, doi:10.1179/ldn.2001.26.1.29.

Harris, Tim. "The Bawdy House Riots of 1668." *The Historical Journal*, vol. 29, no. 3, 1986, pp. 537–56. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/2639047.

Harth, Philip. *Contexts of Dryden's Thought.* U Chicago P, 1968.

Harvey, David. *Spaces of Hope.* U of California P, 2000. Print.

---. *The Limits to Capital.* New York: Verso, 2007. Print.

Hooker, Helene Maxwell. "Charles Montagu's Reply to the Hind and the Panther." *ELH*, vol. 8, no. 1, 1941, pp. 51–73. *JSTOR*, doi:10.2307/2871738.

Hoxby, Blair. "The Government of Trade: Commerce, Politics, and the Courtly Art of the Restoration." *ELH*, vol. 66, no. 3, 1999, pp. 591–627. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/30032087.

Hudson, Nicholas. "Samuel Johnson, Urban Culture, and the Geography of Postfire London." *SEL Studies in English Literature 1500-1900*, vol. 42, no. 3, 2002, pp. 577–600. *Project MUSE*, doi:10.1353/sel.2002.0028.

Hunter, J. Paul. "Missing Years: On Casualties in English Literary History, Prior to Pope." *Common Knowledge*, vol. 14, no. 3, 2008, pp. 434–44.

Hurl-Eamon, Jennine. "Policing Male Heterosexuality: The Reformation of Manners Societies' Campaign against the Brothels in Westminster, 1690-1720." *Journal of Social History*, vol. 37, no. 4, 2004, pp. 1017–35. *JSTOR*. www.jstor.org/stable/3790076.

Jack, Ian Robert James. *Augustan Satire; Intention and Idiom in English Poetry, 1660-1750*. 1952.

Jefferson, D. W. "The Poetry of 'The Hind and the Panther.'" *The Modern Language Review*, vol. 79, no. 1, 1984, pp. 32–44. *JSTOR*, doi:10.2307/3730323.

Jenner, Mark. "Print Culture and the Rebuilding of London after the Fire: The Presumptuous Proposals of Valentine Knight." *Journal of British Studies*, vol. 56, no. 1, Jan. 2017, pp. 1–26. doi:10.1017/jbr.2016.115.

---. "The Politics of London Air John Evelyn's Fumifugium and the Restoration." *The Historical Journal*, vol. 38, no. 3, 1995, pp. 535–51. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/2640001.

---. "The Roasting of the Rump: Scatology and the Body Politic in Restoration England." *Past & Present*, no. 177, 2002, pp. 84–120. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/3600879

Johns, Adrian. *The Nature of the Book: Print and Knowledge in the Making*. U of Chicago P, 1998.

Johnston, Warren. "The Anglican Apocalypse in Restoration England." *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, vol. 55, no. 3, 2004, pp. 467–501. *Cambridge Core*, doi:10.1017/S0022046904009984.

Keating, Erin. "In the Bedroom of the King: Affective Politics in the Restoration Secret History." *Journal for Early Modern Cultural Studies*, vol. 15, no. 2, 2015: 58–82.

Keeble, N. H. *The Restoration: England in the 1660s*. Blackwell, 2002.

Kelleher, Paul. "Reason, Madness, and Sexuality in the British Public Sphere." *The Eighteenth Century*, vol. 53, no. 3, 2012, pp. 291–315.

Keller, Vera, and Ted McCormick. "Towards a History of Projects." *Early Science & Medicine*, vol. 21, no. 5, 2016, pp. 423–44. *EBSCOhost*, doi:10.1163/15733823-00215p01.

Kinsley, James and Hellen Kinsley, eds. *Dryden: The Critical Heritage.* Routledge, 1971.

Knight, Charles A. *The Literature of Satire*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2004. Print.

Knights, Mark, and Adam Morton. *The Power of Laughter and Satire in Early Modern Britain: Political and Religious Culture, 1500-1820*. Boydell & Brewer, 2017.

Knights, Mark. "The Tory Interpretation of History in the Rage of Parties." *Huntington Library Quarterly*, vol. 68, no. 1–2, Mar. 2005, pp. 353–73. *JSTOR*, doi:10.1525/hlq.2005.68.

Lefebvre, Henri. *The Production of Space*. Blackwell, 1991.

"Life and Works of Sir Christopher Wren. From the Parentalia; or Memoirs : Wren, Christopher, 1675-1747" *Internet Archive*, https://archive.org/details/cu31924015672920. Accessed 28 July 2015.

Lord, George de Forest, et al, eds. *Poems on Affairs of State; Augustan Satirical Verse, 1660-1714.* New Haven, Yale UP, 1963-75. Print.

Love, Harold. *English Clandestine Satire, 1660-1702.* Oxford UP, 2004. Print.

Lund, Roger D. "Laughing at Cripples: Ridicule, Deformity and the Argument from Design." *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, vol. 39, no. 1, 2005, pp. 91–114. *Project MUSE*, doi:10.1353/ecs.2005.0051.

Luttrell, Narcissus. *A Brief Historical Relation of State Affairs from September 1678 to April 1714.* Oxford UP, 1857.

Macdonald, Hugh. “Another Aspect of Seventeenth-Century Prose.” *The Review of English Studies*, vol. 19, no. 73, 1943, pp. 33–43.

Mack, Maynard. “The Muse of Satire,” in *Collected in Himself : Essays Critical, Biographical, and Bibliographical on Pope and Some of His Contemporaries.* Newark : U of Delaware P, 1982. Print.

Mack, Robert L. *The Genius of Parody: Imitation and Originality in Seventeenth- and Eighteenth-Century English Literature*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.

Marshall, Ashley. “Construing and Deconstructing Swift’s A Tale of a Tub.” *Eighteenth-Century Life*, vol. 37, no. 2, 2013, pp. 110–19.

---. *The Practice of Satire in England, 1658–1770.* Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins UP, 2013. Print.

Marshall, Dorothy. *Eighteenth Century England*. 2nd ed, Longman, 1974.

Marshall, John. “London, Locke and 1690s Provisions for the Poor in Context:: Beggars, Spinners and Slaves.” *Politics, Religion and Ideas in Seventeenth- and Eighteenth-Century Britain*, edited by John Marshall et al., New edition, Boydell and Brewer, 2019, pp. 181–200. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctvfrxrx4.16.

Matthews, W. “The Character-Writings of Edward Ward.” *Neophilologus*, vol. 21, no. 1, 1936, pp. 116–134.

Matz, Aaron. *Satire in an Age of Realism*. Cambridge UP, 2010. Print.

McRae, Andrew. “Farting in the House of Commons:: Popular Humour and Political Discourse in Early Modern England.” *The Power of Laughter and Satire in Early Modern Britain*, edited by Mark Knights and Adam Morton, Boydell and Brewer, 2017, pp. 67–83. *JSTOR*, https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.7722/j.ctt1t6p528.10

McRae, Andrew. *Literature, Satire, and the Early Stuart State*. Cambridge UP, 2004.

Michelle Orihel. “‘Treacherous Memories’ of Regicide: The Calves-Head Club in the Age of Anne.” *The Historian*, vol. 73, no. 3, 2011, p. 435.

Milburn, Daniel Judson. *The Age of Wit, 1650-1750*. Macmillan, 1966.

Miner, Earl. “Some Characteristics of Dryden’s Use of Metaphor.” *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*, vol. 2, no. 3, 1962, pp. 309–20. *JSTOR*, doi:10.2307/449481.

Molz, Jennie Germann. “Cosmopolitan Bodies: Fit to Travel and Travelling to Fit.” *Body & Society*, vol. 12, no. 3, 2006, pp. 1–21. *SAGE Journals*, doi:10.1177/1357034X06067153.

Moore, John E. “The Monument, or, Christopher Wren’s Roman Accent.” *The Art Bulletin*, vol. 80, no. 3, Sept. 1998, pp. 498–533. *JSTOR*, doi:10.2307/3051302.

Moretti, Franco. *Graphs, Maps, Trees: Abstract Models for a Literary History*. Verso, 2007.

Morgan, Fidelis. *The Female Wits: Women Playwrights on the London Stage 1660-1720.* Virago, 1981.

Mullan, John. *Anonymity: A Secret History of English Literature*. Faber and Faber, 2007.

Muri, Allison, Catherine Nygren, and Benjamin Neudorf. “The Grub Street Project: A Digital Social Edition of London in the Long 18th Century.” *Digital Scholarship in the Humanities*, vol. 31, no. 4, 2016, pp. 829-849. doi:10.1093/llc/fqw003

Muri, Allison. *The Grub Street Project.* Grubstreetproject.net.

Murphy, Anne L. "Lotteries in the 1690s: Investment or Gamble?" *Financial History Review*, vol. 12, no. 2, Oct. 2005, pp. 227–46. doi:10.1017/S0968565005000119.

Narain, Mona, and Gevirtz, Karen. *Gender and Space in British Literature, 1660-1820*. Ashgate: 2014.

Narain, Mona. "Libertine Spaces and the Female Body in the Poetry of Rochester and Ned Ward." *ELH*, vol. 72, pp. 553–76.

Nathan, Edward P. "The Bench and the Pulpit: Conflicting Elements in the Augustan Apology for Satire." *ELH*, vol. 52, no. 2, 1985, pp. 375–96. *JSTOR*, doi:10.2307/2872842.

Neumann, Fritz-Wilhelm. "Ned Ward's The Rise and Fall of Madam Coming-Sir: The Evolution of Character-Writing." *Recherches Anglaises et Nord-Americaines*, vol. 26, 1993, pp. 51–61.

New, Melvyn. "Laurence Sterne's Sermons and 'The Pulpit-Fool.'" *Eighteenth-Century Life*, vol. 35, no. 2, 2011, pp. 1–17. *EBSCOhost*, doi:10.1215/00982601-1214072.

Nussbaum, Felicity and Laura Brown, eds. *The New 18th Century: Theory, Politics, English Literature.* Methuen, 1987.

Nussbaum, Felicity. *The Brink of All We Hate: English Satires on Women, 1660-1750*. UP of Kentucky, 1984.

O'Byrne, Alison. "The Art of Walking in London: Representing Urban Pedestrianism in the Early Nineteenth Century." *Romanticism*, vol. 14, no. 2, 2008, pp. 94–107.

Orihel, Michelle. "'Treacherous Memories'of Regicide: The Calves-Head Club in the Age of Anne." *Historian*, vol. 73, no. 3, 2011, pp. 435–462. *Wiley Online Library*, doi:10.1111/j.1540-6563.2011.00296.x.

Palmeri, Frank. *Satire, History, Novel : Narrative Forms, 1665-1815*. U of Delaware P, 2003.

Paul Stevens, "Lament for a Nation? Milton's Readie and Easie Way and the Turn to Satire," *The Oxford Handbook of Literature & The English Revolution*, ed. Laura Lunger Knoppers Oxford UP, 2012, 593-610.

Paulson, Ronald. *Breaking and Remaking : Aesthetic Practice in England*, 1700-1820. Rutgers UP, 1989.

Paulson, Ronald. *Popular and Polite Art in the Age of Hogarth and Fielding.* U NotreDame P, 1979.

---. *Satire and the Novel in Eighteenth-Century England.* New Haven, Yale UP, 1967. Print.

---. *Sin and Evil* Yale UP, 2007.

---. *The Fictions of Satire*. Baltimore Johns Hopkins Press, 1967.

---. *Theme and Structure in Swift's Tale of a Tub.* Yale UP, 1960.

Pellicer, Juan Christian. "'A Dry Consumptive Smoaking Sot': Ned Ward's Epigram on John Philips?" *Notes and Queries*, vol. 52 (250), no. 3, 2005, pp. 346–49.

Perenič, Urška. "An Overview of Literary Mapping Projects on Cities: Literary Spaces, Literary Maps and Sociological (re)conceptualisations of Space." *Neohelicon* vol. 41 no. 1, 2014, pp. 13–25. Print.

Pincus, Steve. "'Coffee Politicians Does Create': Coffeehouses and Restoration Political Culture." *The Journal of Modern History*, vol. 67, no. 4, 1995, pp. 807-834. *CrossRef*, doi:10.1086/245229.

Pittock, M. *Material Culture and Sedition, 1688-1760: Treacherous Objects, Secret Places*. Springer, 2013.

Plumb, John Harold. *England in the Eighteenth Century, by J. H. Plumb*. 1950.

---. *The Growth of Political Stability in England: 1675-1725*. Humanities Press, 1967.

Pollock, Anthony. *Gender and the Fictions of the Public Sphere, 1690-1755*. Routledge, 2009.

Power, Henry. *Epic into Novel: Henry Fielding, Scriblerian Satire, and the Consumption of Classical Literature*. Oxford UP, 2015.

Pritchard, Jonathan. "Pope, John Rackett, and the Slave Trade." *SEL Studies in English Literature 1500-1900*, vol. 45, no. 3, 2005, pp. 579–601. *CrossRef*, doi:10.1353/sel.2005.0032.

Quehen, A. H. de. "Lucretius and Swift's Tale of a Tub." *University of Toronto Quarterly*, vol. 63, no. 2, 1993, pp. 287–307.

Quilligen, Maureen. *The Language of Allegory: Defining the Genre.* Cornell UP, 1979.

Quintero, Ruben, editor. *A Companion to Satire: Ancient and Modern*. Blackwell Publishing Ltd, 2007. *CrossRef*, http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/b.9781405119559.2007.x.

Randolph, Mary Claire. "Structural Design of the Formal Verse Satire." *Philological Quarterly*, vol. 21, Oct. 1942, pp. 368–84.

Ratcliff, Jessica. "Art to Cheat the Common-Weale: Inventors, Projectors, and Patentees in English Satire, ca. 1630-70." *Technology and Culture*, vol. 53, no. 2, 2012, pp. 337–65. *JSTOR*, https://www.jstor.org/stable/41475502

Rawson, Claude Julien. *Satire and Sentiment, 1660-1830: Stress Points in the English Augustan Tradition*. Yale UP, 2000.

Reay, Barry. *Popular Cultures in England 1550-1750.* Longman, 1998. *Themes in British Social History.* Edited by John Stevenson.

Resenberg, Albert. "The London Dispensary for the Sick-Poor." *Journal of the History of Medicine and Allied Sciences*, vol. 14, no. 1, 1959, pp. 41–56. *JSTOR*, https://www.jstor.org/stable/24620922

Richards, Cynthia. "Wit at War: The Poetry of John Wilmot and the Trauma of War." *Eighteenth-Century Fiction* vol. 27, no. 1 (2014): 25–54.

Roberts, Stephen K. "Public or Private? Revenge and Recovery at the Restoration of Charles II." *Historical Research*, vol. 59, no. 140, 1986, pp. 172–88. *Wiley Online Library*, doi:10.1111/j.1468-2281.1986.tb01190.x.

Robertson, Randy. *Censorship and Conflict in Seventeenth-Century England: The Subtle Art of Division*. Pennsylvania State UP, 2009.

Rogers, Pat. *Grub Street : Studies in a Subculture.* Methuen, 1972

Romaniello, Matthew P., and Charles Lipp. *Contested Spaces of Nobility in Early Modern Europe*. Ashgate, 2011. *EBSCOhost*,

http://login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=nlebk&AN=390085&site=ehost-live&scope=site.

Rose, Mark. *Authors and Owners: The Invention of Copyright*. Harvard UP, 1993.

Rudy, Seth. "Pope, Swift, and the Poetics of Posterity." *Eighteenth-Century Life*, vol. 35, no. 3, 2011, pp. 1–28.

Rumbold, Valerie. *Women's Place in Pope's World.* Cambridge UP, 1989. *Cambridge Studies in Eighteenth-Century English Literature and Thought 2*

Salvaggio, Ruth. "Verses on the Death of Mr. Dryden." *The Journal of Popular Culture*, vol. 21, no. 1, June 1987, pp. 75–91. *Wiley Online Library*, doi:10.1111/j.0022-3840.1987.00075.x.

Sánchez, Reuben. *Persona and Decorum in Milton's Prose*. Fairleigh Dickinson UP; Associated University Presses, 1997.

Sena, John F. "Samuel Garth's The Dispensary." *Texas Studies in Literature and Language*, vol. 15, no. 4, 1974, pp. 639–48.

Sitter, John E. *Arguments of Augustan Wit*. 1991.

Soja, Edward W. *Postmodern Geographies: The Reassertion of Space in Critical Social Theory.* Verso, 1990. Print.

Sorensen, Janet. "Vulgar Tongues: Canting Dictionaries and the Language of the People in Eighteenth-Century Britain." *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, vol. 37, no. 3, 2004, pp. 435–54. *Project MUSE*, doi:10.1353/ecs.2004.0035.

Sowerby, Robin. "Augustan Dryden." *Translation and Literature*, vol. 10, no. 1, 2001, pp. 51–66.

Starkman, Miriam Kosh. *Swift's Satire on Learning in A Tale of a Tub*. Princeton UP, 1950.

Stephen, Lauren Craig. "'Preternatural Pollutions': Nature, Culture, and Same-Sex Desire in Edward Ward's 'Of the Mollies Club.'" *Indigenes and Exoticism/Indigènes et Exotisme*, Academic, for Canadian Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies, 2005, pp. 105–20.

Summerson, John. *The Architecture of the Eighteenth Century.* 1969. Thames and Hudson, 1986.

Sutherland, James. *English Satire.* Cambridge UP. 1956.

Sutherland, William O. S. *The Art of the Satirist: Essays on the Satire of Augustan England*. University of Texas, 1965.

Sweet, R. H. "Topographies of Politeness." *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, vol. 12, 2002, pp. 355–74. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/3679352.

Tally, Robert T. *Spatiality*. Routledge, 2013. *The New Critical Idiom*.

Test, George A. *Satire: Spirit and Art.* U of South Florida P, 1991.

Thompson, Peggy. "Duck, Collier, and the Ideology of Verse Forms." *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*, vol. 44, no. 3, 2004, pp. 505–23.

Thompson, Roger. *Unfit for Modest Ears: A Study of Pornographic, Obscene, and Bawdy Works Written or Published in England in the Second Half of the Seventeenth Century*. Macmillan, 1979.

Thouret, Clotilde. "Between Jest and Earnest: Ironical Defenses of Theatre in Seventeenth-

Century England and France." *Restoration & 18th Century Theatre Research*, vol. 29, no. 1, Summer 2014, pp. 35–55.

Treadwell, J. M. "Jonathan Swift: The Satirist as Projector." *Texas Studies in Literature and Language*, vol. 17, no. 2, 1975, pp. 439–60. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/40754389.

Waddell, Brodie. *God, Duty and Community in English Economic Life, 1660-1720*. Boydell Press, 2012.

Walker, Matthew F. "The Limits of Collaboration: Robert Hooke, Christopher Wren and the Designing of the Monument to the Great Fire of London." *Notes and Records of the Royal Society*, vol. 65, no. 2, June 2011, pp. 121–43. doi:10.1098/rsnr.2010.0092.

Wall, Cynthia. *The Literary and Cultural Spaces of Restoration London*. Cambridge UP, 1999.

---. *The Prose of Things: Transformations of Description in the Eighteenth Century*. U of Chicago P, 2006.

Ward, Joseph P. *Metropolitan Communities: Trade Guilds, Identity, and Change in Early Modern London*. Stanford UP, 1997.

Webster, C. M. "A Possible Source for a Tale of a Tub." *Modern Language Notes*, vol. 48, no. 4, 1933, pp. 251–53, doi:10.2307/2912238.

Webster, C. M. "The Satiric Background of the Attack on the Puritans in Swift's a Tale of a Tub." *PMLA*, vol. 50, no. 1, 1935, pp. 210–23. *JSTOR*, doi:10.2307/458290.

Weinbrot, Howard D. *Eighteenth-Century Satire: Essays on Text and Context from Dryden to Peter Pindar*. Cambridge UP, 1988.

---. *Literature, Religion, and the Evolution of Culture, 1660-1780*. Johns Hopkins UP, 2013.

---. "Masked Men and Satire and Pope: Toward a Historical Basis for the Eighteenth-Century Persona." *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, vol. 16, no. 3, 1983, pp. 265–89. *JSTOR*, doi:10.2307/2738349.

Whitford R. C. "Juvenal in England." *Philological Quarterly*, vol. VII, 1928, pp. 9–16.

Withington, Phil. "Citizens, Soldiers and Urban Culture in Restoration England." *The English Historical Review*, vol. 123, no. 502, 2008, pp. 587–610. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/20108542.

Yachnin, Paul Edward and Marlene Eberhart. 1953. *Forms of Association: Making Publics in Early Modern Europe*. U of Massachusetts P, 2015.

Yamamoto, Koji. *Taming Capitalism before Its Triumph: Public Service, Distrust, and "projecting" in Early Modern England.* Oxford UP, 2018. *Oxford Scholarship Online.*

Zagorin, Perez. *How the Idea of Religious Toleration Came to the West*. Princeton UP, 2003. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt5hhpt3

Zook, Melinda S. *Radical Whigs and Conspiratorial Politics in Late Stuart England.* Pennsylvania State UP, 1999.

Zwicker, Steven. "How Many Religions Did John Dryden Have?" *Enchanted Ground*, Jan. 2005, pp. 171-82.

---. *Lines of Authority: Politics and English Literary Culture, 1649-1689*. Cornell UP, 1993.

---. "The Paradoxes of Tender Conscience." *ELH*, vol. 63, no. 4, 1996, pp. 851–69.

---. *Politics and Language in Dryden's Poetry: The Arts of Disguise*. Princeton UP, 1984.
---. "That Alluding 'Son of Mine' in Dryden's 'The Hind and the Panther.'" *Notes and Queries*, vol. 65, no. 2, June 2018, pp. 223–25. *Crossref.* doi:10.1093/notesj/gjy042.
---. "Why Are They Saying These Terrible Things about John Dryden? The Uses of Gossip and Scandal." *Essays in Criticism*, vol. 64, no. 2, Apr. 2014, pp. 158–79. *Crossref*. doi:10.1093/escrit/cgu004.

Appendix I: Sloane MS 4059 f. 144

A letter to Sir Hans Sloane from Eliza Haywood

Sir,

I should not presume to Intreat the favour of your name to this Subscription, were all the Work as little worthy of your Notice as most of those things published of late under the Title of Poems. I therefore beg leave to assure you, that these Volumes are the productions of the best Genius's of the present Age, and that nothing will be Contained in them less becoming the closet of the philosopher and Divine, than the fine gentleman.
These motives alone emboldened me to lay this proposal before you and can alone deserve your Pardon.

I am,
with all Respect,
sir
your most humble and most
Obedient servant,
Eliza Haywood

Appendix II: Tom Brown's Epitaph

Juxta depositæ sunt Reliquiae
THOMÆ BROWN,
Poetae inter celeberrimos non postremi,
Quorum plerisque Ingenio cum non cederet
Variâ Eruditione longè, præstitit
Viventi Natura multum indulsit,
Fortuna parum.
Livore & Injuriis Malevolorum, quos Vivens expertus est,,
Ipsa nec mors eripuit.
Luxuriantis reus Ingenii,
Scurrorum Juridice pœnas dedit,
Non quod Meritò, sed quod impunè.
Dialogorum Conditor miras,
Lepidissimos complures reliquit Salibus, facetiisq; refertos
Quin & Poematia & Epistolas;
Leviuscula quidem, sed quae Indolem Authoris redoleant
Pari Musarum Indulgentid,
Tam Latiis, quam Britannis familiaris:
Hunc fructum retulit unicum
Cultor Sororum egregius;
Quod ob earum fautoribus honestè repositus
Inter Concelebres requiestcat
Agro Staffordiensioriundus, Obiit 16 die Junii, Anno 1701
Abi Lector, Ingenio assequere, Fortunà anteverte.

Crull, Jodocus. *The Antiquities of St Peter's, Or, The Abbey-Church of Westminster: Containing All the Inscriptions and Epitaphs Upon the Tombs and Grave-Stones; with the Lives, Marriages, and Issue of the Most Eminent Personages Therein Reposited; and Their Coats of Arms Truly Emblazoned.* J. N. and sold by John Morphew near Stationers-Hall, 1711, p. 346

Tom Brown's Epitaph

Here lies the remains of
Thomas Brown
Held in some regard by more celebrated poets,
He yielded no small genius,
Applied himself to great learning,
Lived life freely,
with little help from Fortune.
He ran from greedy creditors all his life,
even after death.
He gave us witty poetry
Offensive to the critics,
He wrote not for approval, but with impunity.
The creator of marvelous dialogues,
Wonderfully entertaining, provocative, and clever,
He wrote poems and letters too;
His subjects were trivial, but that suited his nature,
He indulged all Muses equally,
and was as familiar with Latin as he was with English:
He lived only by the fruits of this labour.
He was a great poet
but he received only one benefit:
that he was buried here by his patrons
to rest with those he celebrated.
d. June 16, 1701, in Staffordshire.
Go, reader, chase wit and learning instead of fortune.

Translated by Benjamin Neudorf

Crull, Jodocus. *The Antiquities of St Peter's, Or, The Abbey-Church of Westminster: Containing All the Inscriptions and Epitaphs Upon the Tombs and Grave-Stones; with the Lives, Marriages, and Issue of the Most Eminent Personages Therein Reposited; and Their Coats of Arms Truly Emblazoned*. J. N. and sold by John Morphew near Stationers-Hall, 1711, p. 346