

1650-1850: Ideas, Aesthetics, and Inquiries in the Early Modern Era

Volume 19

Article 8

2012

THE SECRET HISTORY OF ELIZA HAYWOOD'S WORKS The Early Novel and the Book Trade

Al Coppola

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/sixteenfifty>



Part of the [Aesthetics Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Al Coppola (2012) "THE SECRET HISTORY OF ELIZA HAYWOOD'S WORKS The Early Novel and the Book Trade," *1650-1850: Ideas, Aesthetics, and Inquiries in the Early Modern Era*: Vol. 19, Article 8.

Available at: <https://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/sixteenfifty/vol19/iss1/8>

THE SECRET HISTORY OF ELIZA HAYWOOD'S WORKS

The Early Novel and the Book Trade

Al Coppola

The 1720s saw the apotheosis of Eliza Haywood. Forged in an unprecedented burst of activity, during which she published over forty novels, plays, translations, and other writings in the space of a decade, the “Haywood” that was called into being after the success *Love in Excess* (1719–20) was marked by that work’s intriguing synthesis of high-flown sentiment and salacious eroticism. In her persona as the “great arbitress of passion,”¹ Eliza Haywood specialized in and became synonymous with the production of popular prose fictions that offered a winning amalgam of

¹ The appellation is from James Sterling’s panegyric, *To Mrs. Eliza Haywood on Her Writings*, which was first inserted in the fourth volume of the 1732 edition of Haywood’s *Secret Histories, Novels and Poems*.

“high” and “low” pleasures. Titillating narratives of frank sexuality and insider gossip among the urban rich, these racy amatory fictions were rendered in a language that was both saturated with affect and attuned to the most refined delicacy of the emotions, all of which was calculated, ostensibly, to instruct how *not* to behave when in the thrall of the irresistible force of love. The best examples of the spate of recent Haywood criticism have called attention to the ambiguities and tensions inherent in these textual strategies that pit prurience against propriety. Just as it no longer seems appropriate to speak of an early, smutty “Haywood” as opposed to the later moralist, neither does it seem sufficient to view any of her texts as uni-dimensional,² whether those works be construed as liberating evocations of feminine subjectivity, contested sites for the negotiation of new forms of psychological interiority, or pure pulp for mass consumption.³ Closer readings of her fictions, and closer attention to the material, political, and intellectual contexts in which her work was produced, has led us to appreciate Eliza Haywood as a far more ironic, more knowing, and more deliberate writer than we’d assumed.⁴ So much of this re-

² Alexander Pettit, “Our Fictions and Haywood’s Fictions” in Kevin Cope and Rüdiger Ahrens, eds., *Talking Forward, Talking Back: Critical Dialogues with the Enlightenment* (New York: AMS Press, 2002), 145–66.

³ For Haywood’s fictions as form of resistance to patriarchy, see particularly Ros Ballaster, *Seductive Forms: Women’s Amatory Fiction from 1684 to 1740* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992) and “A Gender of Opposition: Eliza Haywood’s Scandal Fiction,” in Kirsten T. Saxton and Rebecca P. Bocchicchio, eds., *The Passionate Fictions of Eliza Haywood* (Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 2000), 143–67; and Cynthia Richards, “The Pleasures of Complicity: Sympathetic Identification and the Female Reader in Early Eighteenth-Century Women’s Amatory Fiction,” *The Eighteenth Century: Theory and Interpretation* 36.2 (1995): 220–33. For the view that amatory fiction provided an early site for the negotiation of psychological realism, see John Richetti, *The Novel in History 1700–1780* (London: Routledge, 1999) and *Popular Fiction Before Richardson* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992). For a reading of Haywood’s texts as “formula fiction” for serial consumption by the “general reader” who has been called into being by “media culture,” see William Warner, *Licensing Entertainment: The Elevation of Novel Reading in England 1684–1750* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998).

⁴ Although Kathryn King’s *Political History of Eliza Haywood* (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2012) was published too late for consideration here, see the contributors in Saxton and Bocchicchio, *Passionate Fictions*, and in Lynne Marie Wright and Donald J. Newman, eds., *Fair Philosopher: Eliza Haywood and the Female Spectator* (Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press, 2006). Since Saxton and Bocchicchio, critics have worked to replace the older, simplistic and often hostile view of Haywood as a rudderless hack with readings of her work that emphasize its complex engagement with its political, intellectual, aesthetic, and social contexts. Drawing on Haywood’s theatrical background, Emily Hodgson Anderson sees a “self-conscious female performance” of selfhood in Haywood’s fictions, “Performing the Passions in Eliza Haywood’s *Fantomina* and *Miss Betsy Thoughtless*” *The Eighteenth Century: Theory and Interpretation* 46.1 (2005): 1–15. Robert W. Jones has argued that

cent work assumes that Eliza Haywood was deliberately producing texts that played off the "Haywood" that was already circulating in the market, but we would do well to ask just what that "Haywood" was and where it came from. In fact, in the first years after *Love in Excess*, as Haywood produced text after text, and as her booksellers experimented with novel ways of commodifying her texts' novel pleasures, it was not immediately clear exactly what the formula was for replicating her fiction's first success.

Perhaps the most powerful sites for understanding the early construction of Haywood's authorial persona—but also, just as signally, for appreciating the influence that the book trade had on Haywood's literary production—are the two collected editions of her works that appear, in rapid succession, in the middle of the decade. Though issued a little more than a year apart, these collections were quite distinct. Comprised of very different sets of texts, they each presented a very different Eliza Haywood to the public. To a great extent, these editions took the form they did due to financial pressures placed on the owners of Haywood's copyrights, and in doing so they also marked an important shift both in the kinds of fictions she produced and in the way that "Haywood" (both the author and her texts) was marketed to the public. The story of these two collections points toward a critical reassessment of how we must understand Haywood's transactions in the literary marketplace,⁵ and

the regulatory discourse of taste in Haywood's work did not repress but rather allowed women a point of entry into wider spheres of (masculine) intellectual activity, "Eliza Haywood and the Discourse of Taste" in Caroline Franklin, E. J. Clery, and Peter Garside, eds., *Authorship, Commerce and the Public: Scenes of Writing, 1750–1850* (Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan, 2002), 103–19. Helen Thompson has situated Haywood's masquerade fiction in the context of Lockean empiricism and the late seventeenth-century revival of Epicureanism, "Plotting Materialism: W. Charleton's *The Ephesian Matron*, E. Haywood's *Fantomina*, and Feminine Consistency" *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 35.2 (2002): 195–214, while Kathryn R. King has made a persuasive case that the first readers of *Love in Excess* understood it in the context of the Longinian sublime, "New Contexts for Early Novels by Women: The Case of Eliza Haywood, Aaron Hill, and the Hillarians, 1719–1725," in Paula R. Backscheider and Catherine Ingrassia, eds., *A Companion to the Eighteenth-Century Novel and Culture* (London: Blackwell, 2005), 261–75. A number of commentators have recently complicated our understanding of the political engagement of Haywood's texts, particularly Melissa Mowry, "Eliza Haywood's Defense of London's Body Politic" *Studies in English Literature* 43.3 (2003): 645–65, and Earla A. Wilputte, "Parody in Eliza Haywood's *A Letter from H—G—G, Esq.*" *Eighteenth-Century Fiction* 17.1 (2005): 207–30; and King, "Patriot or Opportunist? Eliza Haywood and the Politics of the *Female Spectator*" in Wright and Newman, *Fair Philosopher*, 104–21.

⁵ The best critical study of Haywood's negotiation of the print market is Catherine Ingrassia, *Authorship, Commerce and Gender in Early Eighteenth-Century England: A Culture of Paper Credit* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998). Ingrassia's analysis of Haywood's exploitation of new forms of cultural authority tied to credit wealth and professional authorship

perhaps how we can better understand the kinds of pleasures offered by the early novel.

The two collections of Haywood's literary output appear roughly within the space of two years. The first such collection—*The Works of Mrs. Eliza Haywood; Consisting of Novels, Letters, Poems and Plays. In Four Volumes*—appeared in octavo format and bore an imprint date of 1724. Then, the same booksellers responsible for the collection, Dan Browne Jr. and Samuel Chapman, published an entirely new duodecimo impression containing a largely different corpus of texts—*Secret Histories, Novels and Poems. In Four Volumes. Written by Mrs. Eliza Haywood*—which was billed as a “second edition” and bore an imprint date of 1725. As Patrick Spedding has established in his groundbreaking Haywood bibliography, the first three volumes of the *Works* edition were advertised for sale in August of 1723, while the final volume was not assembled and offered to the public until the end of January 1724.⁶ The four volume edition of *Secret Histories, Novels and Poems*, while dated 1725, was advertised for sale “in Four Neat Pocket Volumes” as early as December 23, 1724, but the “second edition” of this duodecimo—most likely the first one actually printed—was not offered to sale until 2 August 1725.⁷ In the two years that elapsed between the first offering of the *Works* and the eventual emergence of the *Secret Histories* collection, there was a sea change in how “Haywood” signified in the market.

Spedding has authoritatively traced the bibliographic life cycle of these well-known collections of Haywood's texts, which are unprecedented in the attention they draw to a living female author and in the bid they make for

is hampered, however, by her reliance on flawed earlier studies of Haywood's dealings with her booksellers. The work she draws upon, Cheryl Turner, *Living by the Pen: Women Writers in the Eighteenth Century* (New York: Routledge, 1992), as well as Karen Hollis, “Eliza Haywood and the Gender of Print,” *Eighteenth Century* 38.1 (1997): 43–62, fundamentally misunderstand the nature of copyright ownership and transfer, the role of “trade publisher” resellers, and other key aspects of the book trade, leading to a wildly inaccurate view of Haywood as a radically independent free agent selling her texts to the highest bidder. Ingrassia's book was published before Patrick Spedding's groundbreaking study *A Bibliography of Eliza Haywood* (London: Pickering and Chatto, 2007), which lays such myths to rest, and which supplants the problematic bibliography that G. F. Whicher appended to his critical biography *The Life and Romances of Mrs. Eliza Haywood* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1915).

⁶ Spedding, *Bibliography*, 57–8, argues that the three-volume edition constitutes a separate imprint that was never actually issued since no three-volume title page survives, but it seems just as likely that the August 1723 advertisements announce the pre-release of a planned four-volume set. In either case, Browne and Chapman were advertising a *Works* collection as early as August.

⁷ Spedding, *Bibliography*, 57, 67–74.

her work's cultural capital.⁸ Not only has Spedding established a clear timeline for the emergence and gestation of these collections—which share seven texts but differ in eight more—but for the first time we have a clear picture of how the *Works* project grew out of an earlier attempt to market a “collected” Haywood in the unissued collection, *The Danger of Giving Way to Passion, in Five Exemplary Novels*, which Haywood's booksellers first advertised on 26 December 1720, less than a year after Haywood published the last part of *Love in Excess*, and which Haywood began writing immediately after producing a costly prestige edition of letters translated out of the French that was published by subscription. My intention in this paper is to build upon Spedding's genealogy in order to draw out the implications of this complicated bibliographical story for our understanding of Haywood's role as an author early in her career.⁹ Specifically, this article will show how an early attempt to market Haywood as a prestigious author of high-culture belles-lettres—a project particularly associated with her first publisher, William Chetwood—was scaled back and reconfigured by Browne and Chapman, the more established booksellers who consolidated control over Haywood's copyrights, and who increasingly came to market Haywood as a rather different kind of writer specializing in amatory intrigue and thinly veiled scandal.¹⁰

The try-and-try-again quality of these collections would seem to be partly motivated by the booksellers' desire to recoup their apparently miscalculated investment in the expensive (and indifferently received) *Letters from a Lady of Quality to a Chevalier* (1720) that was the immediate follow-up to Haywood's success with *Love in Excess*. However, the starkly different characters of the two collections—a shift that is clearly delineated in their very titles, in the move from offering one's “Works” to producing “Secret Histories”—suggests that Haywood and her printers were feeling their way

⁸ On the prestige of collected editions, and the rarity of their issue for a living author and/or a woman in the eighteenth century, see Andrew Nash, ed., *The Culture of Collected Editions* (Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan, 2003), particularly James McLaverty's contribution, “For Who So Fond as Youthful Bards of Fame? Pope's *Works* of 1717,” 49–68.

⁹ My debt to Patrick Spedding's bibliography is evident throughout this article, although I began work on this project before that book was available in print. An early version of this article was presented at the 2004 annual meeting of the South-Central Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies in Santa Fe, NM, wherein a number of my claims anticipated Spedding's; on other points, I am grateful for having been corrected.

¹⁰ Confirming this trend, but lying outside the scope of this article, a third nonce collection was advertised and published by Browne in 1727–28: *Secret Histories, Novels, &c. In Two Volumes Written, or translated, by Mrs. Eliza Haywood; Printed since the Publication of the Four Volumes of her Works*.

around a new and uncertain market for prose fiction in the 1720s, trying to articulate something like a brand identity for Haywood that would best capitalize on the success she'd already had as an author and best exploit the interests and appetites of the readership her prose experiment (and others like it) had called into being. Thus, the recovery of what I am calling the "secret history" of Eliza Haywood's *Works* ultimately has important implications for our understanding of the early novel, offering a window onto the unique pleasures offered by this new form. Particularly, it would seem that the appetite for 1720s amatory fiction was more closely bound up with an appetite for secret histories than we have fully recognized—that is, early novel readers read not just for the stimulation of auto-erotic pleasure and the enjoyment highly charged affective states, but just as surely for the consumption of scandal, whether real or merely imagined.¹¹

* I *

The bibliographic story behind the assembly of the *Works* and *Secret Histories, Novels and Poems* collections is considerably more complex than generally assumed. Rather than simply a second, revised edition of the *Works*, *SHNP* is very much its own entity, as one can see from the tables appended below. Table 1 compares the titles included in each set, italicizing all of the individual works that are excluded in the move from the first to the second collection, as well as those works that are newly included in the second. Seven titles carry over between the collections, but eight more only appear in one or the other. Table 2 analyzes the selection of the texts that make up the two collections, and Table 3 lists the texts that were excluded from the later collection, classified by authorial status, date of first publication, genre and bookseller.¹² It

¹¹ As such, this article broadly coordinates with Lennard J. Davis's thesis that the eighteenth-century English novel has its roots in an "news/novel discourse" which claims to represent true events, in contrast to the imaginary worlds evoked in continental "romance." *Factual Fictions: The Origins of the English Novel* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1983). However, Davis, 121–22, views Haywood's fictions as lacking real-world referent and thus more akin to romance.

¹² Here I follow Spedding's account of extant Haywood titles at this time. For a challenge to many of Spedding's attributions, see Leah Orr, "The Basis for Attribution in the Canon of Eliza Haywood," *The Library* ser. 7, 12.4 (2011): 335–75, who asserts that a number of titles, such as *Bath-Intrigues* and *The Dumb Projector*, are merely "possible" or "doubtful" Haywood productions. Orr's scheme is provocative, but many of her own claims are unpersuasive. For example,

is the story of these inclusions, exclusions and emendations that this article will explore.

While the first collection included all of Haywood's published work up to that point, a cursory glance at these tables shows that Haywood and her publishers exerted a great deal of care in the selection of just five out of a possible seventeen available works of Haywood for inclusion in *SHNP*. As noted by Spedding, the *Works* were a nonce collection—a reissue of stand-alone imprints that were originally intended to be sold separately—and the backbone of that set was the group of novels originally commissioned by Browne and Chapman in 1720 that were to have made up, with *Love in Excess*, the never-released collection, *The Danger of Giving Way to Passion: In Five Exemplary Novels: The British Recluse, Idalia, The Rash Resolve, and The Injured Husband*. First contracted after the success of *Love in Excess*, these novels apparently took longer to produce than originally intended, taking Haywood some three years to finish the set while she was working on other projects, including the writing and production of two plays. In some sense, the *Works* collection is the belated and altered execution of this original plan, but this would hardly tell the full story.¹³ Insofar as Browne and Chapman chose to include all of Haywood's outstanding work in the 1724 collection—including some titles they themselves had not brought to the press originally—the *Works* dramatically altered the scope and character of the collection Haywood and her booksellers had originally projected. We need to ask, then, why Browne and Chapman didn't simply issue the *Danger of Giving Way to Passion* collection as planned once it was finally completed in 1724.

The reason for this seems clear, due to the fact that a number of the texts included in the *Works* collection appear to be old stock—some of which devolved from booksellers no longer in the trade—that were repackaged in an apparently brand new collected “edition” for marketing purposes. Browne and Chapman, the prime movers behind this collection, were consolidating their control of Haywood's copyrights at this time, even as they were seeking to offload their own Haywood back catalog and recoup their investment in an earlier venture that does not appear to have answered expectations. That

Orr lists *The Arragonian Queen* as merely “possible” because the attribution to Haywood is only “listed in advertisement for unprinted collection” (363). In fact, a copy of the second volume of this heretofore unseen collection, *Secret Histories, Novels, &c* (London: D. Browne, 1727–28), has since been located (Patrick Spedding, private correspondence, August 20, 2012).

¹³ Spedding, for example, tends to emphasize the continuity between the *Works* and the *Secret Histories* collection, noting that most of the former is included in the latter. This minimizes considerable differences in the address and texture of the two collections.

Table 1: Texts included in the Haywood collections issued in the 1720s.

1723/4 <i>Works</i> (August 1723)	1725 <i>Secret Histories, Novels and Poems</i> (August 1725)
Vol. I Love in Excess; or The Fatal Enquiry: A Novel. In Three Parts.	Vol. I Love in Excess; or The Fatal Enquiry: A Novel. In Three Parts.
Vol. II i. The British Recluse; or Secret History of Cleomira, supposed dead: A Novel. ii. The Injured Husband; or Mistaken Resentment: A Novel. iii. <i>The Fair Captive: A Tragedy.</i>	Vol. II i. The British Recluse; or Secret History of Cleomira, supposed dead: A Novel. ii. The Injured Husband; or Mistaken Resentment: A Novel. iii. Poems on Several Occasions.
Vol. III i. Idalia; or, The Unfortunate Mistress: A Novel. In Three Parts. ii. <i>Letters from a Lady of Quality to a Chevalier. Translated from the French. To which is added, A Discourse concerning Writings of that Nature, by way of Essay.</i>	Vol. III i. Idalia; or, The Unfortunate Mistress. A Novel. ii. <i>The Surprise, or Constancy Rewarded.</i> iii. <i>The Fatal Secret, or Constancy in Distress.</i> iv. <i>Fantomina, or Love in a Maze. Being a Secret History of an Amour Between Two Persons of Condition.</i>
Vol. IV (January 1724) i. Lasselia; or the Self Abandon'd: A Novel. ii. The Rash Resolve; or, The Untimely Discovery: A Novel. In two Parts. iii. <i>A Wife to be Lett. A Comedy.</i> iv. Poems on Several Occasions.	Vol. IV i. The Rash Resolve; or, The Untimely Discovery: A Novel. In two Parts. ii. <i>The Masqueraders; or, Fatal Curiosity; being the Secret History of a late Amour.</i> iii. Lasselia; or the Self Abandon'd. A Novel. iv. <i>The Force of Nature; or, The Lucky Disappointment. A Novel.</i>

Table 2: Analysis of the selection of texts for both collections.

Texts printed before <i>Works</i> and excluded from that collection:	0
Texts printed after <i>Works</i> and before <i>Secret Histories, Novels and Poems</i> :	17
New texts included in <i>SHNP</i> :	5
New texts excluded from <i>SHNP</i> , published anonymously:	8
New texts excluded from <i>SHNP</i> , acknowledged:	4

Table 3: Texts Excluded from SHNP.

<u>Anonymous</u>			
<i>Spy on the Conjuror</i>	Secret History	15 Mar. 1724	Subscription for Duncan Campbell
<i>Arragonian Queen</i>	Secret History	11 Aug. 1724	J. Roberts (Browne)*
<i>La Belle Assemblée</i>	Translation	26 Aug. 1724	Browne, Chapman, and others
<i>Memoirs of a Certain Island</i> (pt.1)	Secret History	8 Sept. 1724	(Browne, J. Pote and T. Astley)
<i>Bath-Intrigues</i>	Secret History	16 Oct. 1724	J. Roberts (Browne)
<i>Memoirs of Barone de Brosse</i>	Popular History	23 Dec. 1724	Browne and Chapman
<i>Lady's Philosophy Stone</i>	Translation	22 Jan. 1725	Browne and Chapman
<i>The Dumb Projector</i>	Secret History	10 May 1725	W. Ellis, J. Roberts, A. Dod, J. Fox
<u>Acknowledged</u>			
<i>The Unequal Conflict</i>	Novel	10 Mar. 1725	Walthoe and Crockatt
<i>The Fatal Fondness</i>	Novel	19 May 1725	Walthoe and Crockatt
<i>The Tea-Table</i> (Pt. 1)	Miscellany	7 May 1725	J. Roberts (James McEuen)
<i>History of Mary Queen of Scots</i>	Popular History	2 July 1725	Browne and Chapman

* Booksellers in parentheses owned copyright but did not appear on first edition imprint.

text, a lavish edition of *Letters from a Lady of Quality to a Chevalier* (1720) published by subscription, epitomized the earliest efforts to build upon the success of *Love in Excess*, but, as Spedding persuasively argues, by mid-1723 it had become clear that this first gambit was miscalculated. Thus, the *Works* collection is best understood as a stop-gap measure—a doubling-down, so to speak, of an initial bet. Whereas the booksellers appear to have remained committed to marketing Haywood texts as highbrow belles-lettres for conspicuous consumption, they now believed that their best chance of doing so would be to reissue their old stock in the guise of a prestigious collected edition of “Works,” in the hope that this stratagem might succeed where a deluxe subscription project failed.

To make this claim about the *Works* necessarily requires a more sober appreciation of Haywood's popularity in the 1720s than has traditionally been the case. While the centerpiece of the *Works* collection is the celebrated Haywood novel which was the catalyst for a number of booksellers to make considerable investments in her future literary productions, we must be cautious not to overestimate the popularity of *Love in Excess* or of Haywood's marketability in the years following this hit. It has been a critical commonplace that the novel was a runaway bestseller, one of the three most popular prose fictions before *Pamela*, and it appeared in the 1723/4 collection billed as

no less than the “fifth edition.”¹⁴ Although critics generally have been inclined to read this imprint statement credulously, Spedding’s careful investigation of the true edition history of this novel shows that it was, at best, a solid success, selling out two London editions in five years—hardly a top book of the decade and not even one of Haywood’s most popular titles.¹⁵

Love in Excess was the product of Haywood’s first bookselling arrangement: the first edition’s imprint indicates that it was printed for William Chetwood, a theatrical impresario that Haywood first become acquainted with in Dublin when she was performing as an actress in Smock Alley in 1714, and with whom she likely migrated to the Drury Lane Theatre for the 1715–16 season. While Haywood pursued a career on the stage, Chetwood took up duties as prompter at that theatre, an important position in the management of Drury Lane that he held for over twenty years. However, he also seems to have attempted to break into book trade as a bookseller and sometime author shortly after his arrival in London.¹⁶ Operating a book-shop in Covent Garden in the years 1718–1724, he specialized in high-end pleasure reading—novels, new plays, translations of French romances, maps, continental tour guides, and adventure narratives—most of which were written by contemporary authors, including a few, such as the popular “Captain Falconer” titles, written by himself.

During this time, he appears on the imprint of some 133 titles in the *ESTC*, frequently under the “printed for” and/or “sold by” designations. Accordingly, he seems to have operated as a “trade publisher”—that is, as a kind of retail middleman who chiefly resold other bookseller’s titles—but the kinds of texts he was associated with seem to have been quite deliberately chosen. Unlike the major trade publisher of the day, James Roberts, whose

¹⁴ *Love in Excess*, with *Robinson Crusoe*, has long been assumed to be one of the two most popular prose fictions of the 1720s. This false assertion, commonly repeated, is an exaggeration of William H. McBurney, “Mrs. Penelope Aubin and the Eighteenth Century Novel,” *Huntington Library Quarterly* 20 (1957): 101–23.

¹⁵ Spedding, *Bibliography*, 88–99. Cf. also Spedding’s Appendix J, which ranks the popularity of Haywood titles according to a variety of criteria. Haywood’s *La Belle Assemblée*, for example, a multivolume translation of Madam de Gomez’s letters begun in 1724, was a far more successful title from this period by nearly every measure; *Love in Excess* leads none of the lists.

¹⁶ Cf. Christine Blouch, “Eliza Haywood,” in Alexander Pettit, ed., *Selected Works of Eliza Haywood* (London: Pickering and Chatto, 2000), vol. 1, xviii; and “Chetwood, William Rufus” in Phillip H. Highfill Jr., Kalman A. Burnim and Edward Langhans *A Biographical Dictionary of Actors, Actresses, Musicians, Dancers, Managers, and Other Stage Personnel in London, 1660–1800*, 16 vols. (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1973–93). Chetwood assisted Joseph Ashbury, the proprietor of the Dublin theater, in 1714 before becoming prompter at Drury Lane from 1715 to 1741, except for the 1721–22 theatrical season when he moved to Lincoln’s Inn Fields.

sprawling shop near Stationer's Hall was a clearinghouse for a highly miscellaneous assortment of hundreds of titles per year, Chetwood's shop just steps away from the Drury Lane theatre seems to have specialized in high-brow belles-lettres.¹⁷ *Love in Excess* was one of the very first texts produced by Chetwood, and it seems entirely plausible that this upstart bookseller had staked both his money and his reputation on its success, publishing the book in a bid to establish himself as a fashion-forward purveyor of literate erotica and other Epicurean textual pleasures to the beau-monde in Westminster.¹⁸

¹⁷ According to the *English Short Title Catalog*, Chetwood only appears as a London bookseller on imprints between 1718 and 1724, and generally as a reseller of titles printed and/or owned by other booksellers and printers. Accordingly, Spedding, *Bibliography*, 55, identifies Chetwood as a "trade publisher," assuming that Browne and Chapman were the booksellers who actually owned Haywood's copyrights and who used Chetwood merely as a distributor of their stock. To support the conclusion that Chetwood was only a functionary, Spedding cites Michael Treadwell, "London Trade Publishers 1675–1750," *The Library* ser. 6, 4.2 (1982): 99–134, but Chetwood's activities diverge in significant ways from those of J. Roberts, for example. According to Treadwell, trade publishers like Roberts were comparatively few (no more than four seem to have operated on his scale at any one time between 1680 and 1744); all had been made free and become well established in the book trades, often as book binders, long before turning to trade publishing; and virtually all of the trade publishers in the period were linked via inheritance to just a few closely held family enterprises located in and around St. Paul's, the geographic center of the book trade. Chetwood, on the other hand, ran a much smaller niche operation in the fashionable West End, specializing in high-brow belles-lettres (as opposed to the pamphlets and periodicals that formed the backbone of the major trade publishers). Although Spedding is right to correct those critics who have misunderstood Chetwood's role in the publication of Haywood and overstated his influence, I will argue below that Chetwood, particularly in the first years of Haywood's career, seems to have been instrumental in getting her work to market, and was likely the initial holder of her first copyrights.

¹⁸ Spedding does not cite any definitive evidence for who initially owned the *Love in Excess* copyright. By the second edition of 1722 ("the Fourth Edition, Corrected"), it is clear that Browne and Chapman have at least a majority stake in the copyright due to the position of their names in the imprint. However, while Chetwood's name appears second in the imprint on the general title page, it comes first in the title pages to the second and third parts, suggesting that Chetwood had a greater financial stake than simply that of a reseller. It seems likely that he originally owned the copyright for the title, with Brown and Chapman only later getting involved. The evidence for this claim is fragmentary but various. First, there is the dedication of *Love in Excess* to Anne Oldfield that Chetwood wrote on Haywood's behalf, which suggests that he had a direct financial stake in the book's success. Second, there is the imprint to the original edition of Part I: "Printed for W. Chetwood, at Cato's-Head in Russel-Court, near the Theatre-Royal and R. Francklin at the Sun against St. Dunstan's Church in Fleet-Street." According to D. F. McKenzie, *Stationer's Company Apprentices 1701–1800* (Oxford: Oxford Bibliographic Society, 1978), Richard Francklin or Franklyn was only recently apprenticed to the bookseller William Hunter (bound 2 Feb. 1719) and remained an apprentice until after 1725; H. R. Plomer, *A Dictionary of the Printers and Booksellers Who Were at Work in England,*

Chetwood did in fact write the book's dedication to the eminent actress and patron Anne Oldfield in Haywood's stead—suggesting his instrumentality in bringing it to the press—and the whole tenor of the production is in keeping with one who was intimately associated with the fashionable world of the theater. Indeed, the first part of *Love in Excess*, especially, is finely printed and shows far from mean production values: a short text of just fifty-six pages with some few leaves of prefatory matter, it was sold for a full shilling, and its pages were liberally graced with printers' ornaments and white space that set off the embedded amatory letters that drive the protagonists' intrigues.

Emboldened by the solid success of this first venture, and seeking to capitalize on the appetite for high-brow amatory fiction that her first novel seemed to have whetted, Haywood attracted the backing of more established booksellers—notably Dan Browne Jr., son of a prominent Stationer and shareholder in the English stock, and Samuel Chapman, who was most likely a relation of Thomas and William Chapman, who had been in business as booksellers since the Restoration.¹⁹ Browne and Chapman involved themselves in the publication of the second edition of *Love and Excess* in 1722, and they appear to have been the prime movers behind Haywood's follow-up venture, the *Letters*, which promised to deliver, in an even yet more genteel and prestigious formulation, a further installment of the narrative pleasures she had offered her readers in *Love in Excess*.

A loose translation of amatory letters purported to have been circulated among persons of quality, which were first written in French by Edme Boursault in the style of the then-fashionable genre that was inaugurated by the *Portuguese Letters*, the work was undertaken as a relatively luxurious subscription project in 1721.²⁰ Chetwood was listed on the imprint of the first edition, but Browne

Scotland and Ireland from 1668 to 1725 (Oxford: Oxford Bibliographic Society, 1922), 121, lists him as being active as a bookseller for only 1720–21, attributing just two books to him. It would seem that Franklin was the conduit by which the outsider Chetwood gained access to the logistical infrastructure of the Stationers' Company. Notably, the imprints for the first editions of Parts II and III drop Franklin entirely and add "and Sold by J. Roberts at the Oxford Arms in Warwick Lane," suggesting that it Chetwood himself who was acting in the capacity of a bookseller, and that he contracted with Roberts to serve as a trade publisher to him. If this conjecture is correct, then sometime between Feb 1720 (when Part II was published) and February 1722 (when the second edition of the whole work appeared) all or most of the copyright passed from Chetwood to Browne and Chapman.

¹⁹ H. R. Plomer, E. R. Dix, and G. H. Bushnell. *A Dictionary of the Printers and Booksellers who were at Work in England, Scotland and Ireland from 1726 to 1775* (Oxford: Oxford Bibliographic Society, 1932).

²⁰ Haywood was soliciting subscriptions for it as early as August 1720, and it was offered for public sale in December 1720, albeit at a 33 percent discount.

and Chapman are listed as the booksellers on the title page of its reissue as a "second edition," suggesting that they were the ones who actually owned—or came to own—the copy.²¹ As Haywood notes in a letter that survives to an unnamed potential patron, the purpose of the subscription was to capitalize on the success of *Love in Excess*, and the rather high price of the edition—three shillings in quires, five shillings bound in calf—denotes both the ambition and the risk of the undertaking.²² Brought out on rich, thick paper—bound in the *Works*, the *Letters* fairly gleam next to the dingy, lightweight paper stock used for the rest of the novels and plays—and printed in a fine Elzevir letter with many elaborate printer's ornaments and a great deal of white space, the edition included a subscriber list which included some 309 names.

According to Spedding, this would have only yielded some £50 for the author, printer, and bookseller to share before costs—hardly a vast sum. Based on the relatively low subscription rate and lack of aristocratic subscribers, and based on the fact that the collection was offered to the public at less than the subscriber price, Spedding concludes that Haywood must have been "sorely disappointed" if she was hoping to "make her fortune" through subscription, and that her publisher must have been "keen to recoup his costs."²³ The fact that Haywood never again attempted to sell her work by subscription (although she did do many other translations throughout her career) would also seem to suggest that this was not, ultimately, a successful venture. Most telling, perhaps, is the fact that there was no attempt to reprint the *Letters* in the SHNP duodecimo collection the following year. This kind of project—high end, prestige editions of highbrow belles-lettres—was just the kind of product that Haywood and her booksellers were betting on early in her career, but, as can be judged by its remaindering in the 1724 *Works* and then its subsequent consignment to obscurity, the *Letters* were a bet that did not pay off as expected.

²¹ Spedding, *Bibliography*, 94; 53–56 and 99–106.

²² Ingrassia, *Authorship*, 80–18; Spedding, *Bibliography*, 99–106.

²³ Spedding, *Bibliography*, 101, thinks it reasonable to assume that the booksellers commissioned a standard print-run of 1000, and it was this 700 copy overage that we find Browne and the others advertising for sale throughout the 1720s. If all the copies sold at list price—not a likely scenario, given the book's immediate discounting when it was placed on sale to the public—the most they might have taken in would have been £150. It is likely that not all copies sold, and that those that did were significantly discounted. Moreover, as likely as it is that some subscribers paid much more than their ticket price as a means of patronizing Haywood, it is also possible that not all the original subscribers fulfilled their obligations and paid the remainder of their subscription after paying the initial deposit—a practice not infrequent in the period.

Indeed, the move to associate Haywood with a more prestigious style of publication—a strategy epitomized in the decision to release nothing less than her “works”—seems to define the early marketing strategy of Haywood by her booksellers. The final outcome of the *Letters* venture demonstrates the ultimate failure of this approach, I believe, but it is important to see that as late as December 1723/January 1724, it still seemed like a good strategy, even if by that time it might well have been clear that the large capital outlay of the subscription project was miscalculated and overly ambitious. Indeed, at this time we can see Browne and Chapman actually seeking to obtain more of Haywood’s copyrights in order to pull together an appropriately comprehensive works edition. Presumably, they thought that such a ploy might just do the trick—that a prestigious-looking collection of “works” might stimulate enough interest in all of her texts that the booksellers could offload remaining copies of not just the successful novels like *Love in Excess* but also moribund titles like the *Letters*.

This would seem to explain the inclusion of Haywood’s play, *The Fair Captive*, in the collection. A tragedy in rehearsal in John Rich’s company that was originally written by another author, it was first given to Haywood for revision and then substantially rewritten by her. The play had its premier in Lincoln’s Inn Fields on 4 March 1721, and was first published shortly thereafter. The play ran for a total of four nights, two of which were benefits—a passable, if not triumphant, achievement. Originally printed for T. Jauncy and H. Cole, a reissue of the play (falsely proclaimed as the second edition) appears in the *Works* collection. It seems likely that a substantial percentage of the original stock of the play—first published in 1721—had languished unsold for two or three years and were acquired for very little cash by Browne and Chapman from the owners under distressed circumstances.²⁴

²⁴ Spedding, *Bibliography*, 107–8, is silent on apparent change in ownership of the play. It may be Browne and Chapman worked out a reselling arrangement with Jauncy and Cole, acting as trade publishers for those booksellers due to the fact that the reissue title page in the *Works* collection notes that it was “Printed: and sold by” Browne and Chapman. However, it is also possible that Browne and Chapman simply purchased copies of the play at the standard wholesale trade price (generally seven copies for the price of six) in order to fill out their edition in the hope that the play’s marketability would drive retail sales of their collection. This scenario seems likeliest because the bookseller Jauncy, who was involved in the publication of 92 imprints between 1719 and 1721, virtually disappears from the London bookselling scene after that year. The *ESTC* lists Jauncy as the bookseller on a single imprint after this period, a poetic miscellany from 1726. Cole, an even more marginal figure, is involved in only one other imprint according to the *ESTC*.

The acquisition of a moribund play, at little or no capital risk, would have provided a cheap way to fill out a light volume, and its inclusion would ensure the exhaustiveness of the collected *Works*. Moreover, it is conceivable that the inclusion of a little-noticed "serious" tragedy in a retrospective anthology of a woman writer most famous for her light prose fictions might have elevated the prestige of such a collection, even if *The Fair Captive* had little or no market value on its own in 1724.²⁵

Indeed, tracing the story of how the *Works* collection came to take the form it did reveals, above all else, a pattern of calculated marketing choices made by Chetwood, and then increasingly by Browne and Chapman, that were intended to build and exploit the Haywood brand. Encoded in the bibliographic paper trail of canceled title pages, repackaged imprints and consolidated copyrights are the maneuverings of two linked bookselling enterprises of a self-consciously new character. On the one hand, there was Chetwood's operation in Covent Garden, a boutique emporium of belles-lettres, amatory fiction, diverting travel narratives and recent plays that the newcomer Chetwood appears to have bootstrapped into a going concern for a few years in the early 1720s by reselling other dealers' stock and in some cases even undertaking to publish his own titles. Launched by his judicious promotion and patronage of new kinds of authors like Eliza Haywood, Chetwood's business likely owed its viability to the way in which it could serve as a conduit for the flow of money, fashions and texts between the theater subculture of Westminster and the booksellers of the City. What success Chetwood did find seems to owe to his forging and exploiting relationships with ambitious members of the rising generation of booksellers like Brown and Chapman. Their enterprise, on the other hand, appears to

²⁵ An indifferent reception is corroborated by what we know of the play's theatrical fortunes. Spedding, *Bibliography*, 107–8, notes that the play took in £168 17s in four nights, including £30 8s in tickets for the two author benefits. This is a good sum in total, but the take for the play's fourth and final performance on 16 November 1721 was poor. Offered at the beginning of the following theatrical season, it was a specially organized author's benefit "At the Desire of several Persons of Quality." One is tempted to see this event as an act of charity organized by some patron(s) of Haywood's, particularly since it comes well before the typical benefit season of March/April. The performance recorded lackluster receipts—a bit more than £27, which was about the business that a revival of Shakespeare's *Merry Wives of Windsor* did the night before, though well off the mark of Farquhar's *Stratagem* two nights later (£51). However, the sale of benefit tickets was dismal: only £5 5s as opposed to £25 3s on the third night benefit of 7 March 1721. Emmett L. Avery ed., *The London Stage, 1660–1800. A Calendar of Plays, Entertainments, and Afterpieces*, part 2, vol. 2 (1701–1729) (Carbondale: University of Southern Illinois, 1968), 647 and 618.

have been a shrewd and well-capitalized partnership of two young stationers hailing from established and successful bookselling families, who appear to have been casting about for a niche of their own.²⁶ At least initially, judging from their dealings with Chetwood, Browne and Chapman's strategy was to follow Chetwood's lead and market upscale literary works for conspicuous consumption in order to tap into a new formation of taste that was coming into being in the 1720s. That new formation of taste, judging from the kinds of texts Browne, Chapman and Chetwood were publishing and advertising in this period, firmly centered on Haywood.²⁷

* II *

It is in this context, then, that we must recognize the radical choice to entitle Haywood's retrospective anthology her "works." The publication of an author's *Works* was a choice that was freighted with cultural significance in the 1720s. Important authors—generally those who were deceased and generally those who were male—tended to receive the tribute of a multivolume *Works* edition. In the years around the publication of Haywood's *Works* in 1723/4, editions of the *Works* of Addison (1721 four volumes quarto), Suckling (1719 one duodecimo volume), Rowe (1728 three volumes duodecimo), Pope (1717 one volume large-format folio or quarto), and Shakespeare (1725, ed-

²⁶ Browne was still technically an apprentice to his father until gaining his freedom on 19 January 1725—right about the time the *SHNP* collection was issued. McKenzie, *London Apprentices*, 50–51.

²⁷ Consider the advertisement located on the final leaf of *The British Recluse* (April 1722), which listed some thirty-four "Books Printed for D. Browne, W. Chetwood, S. Chapman, and J. Woodman," the four booksellers listed on the imprint who seem to have been working in collaboration, if not outright partnership, in the years before Browne and Chapman took full control of Haywood's texts after the publication of the *Works*. Notably, almost all of the imprints on the list are belles-lettres—novels, plays, poems, polite letters, travelogues and tales—often translated from the Spanish or French, and occasionally offered in rich editions at considerable expense: consider the puff for "*Arabian Stories*, the last Parts, never in *English* before. 5s." or "*Cibber's Plays*, printed on Royal Paper, 4to. 2 Vol. 2l. 10s." The book getting third billing in the list, after a three shilling edition of *Cambray's Fables* and a two shilling edition of *Roma Illustrata, or a Description of Rome*, is Haywood's *Love in Excess*. Notably, the luxuriousness of the edition is emphasized; the puff states that the novel is "Printed on a fine *Elzevir* Letter, compleat, in 3 Parts...2s 3d." The next item is Haywood's *Letters*, here offered for sale at two shillings.

ited by Pope, six volumes quarto) appeared, to name just the few that are held in New York University's Fales Library.

Collected editions of women writers also appeared in roughly same period, but they tended to be positioned differently; these anthologies tend to form a single volume, they tended to be less costly to produce, and there is markedly less of an attempt to promote the prestige of the author. Fales possesses an edition of *All the Histories and Novels Written by the Late Ingenious Mrs. Behn* from 1705, for example, a single octavo volume that is roughly printed with a minimum of wasted space. Other novels collections also appear at this time, such as Manley's *The Power of Love in Seven Novels* (1720) and Jane Barker's *A Patchwork Screen for the Ladies or Love and Virtue Recommended in a Collection of Instructive Novels* (1723), but in all of these examples, these collected editions of women authors—even those, like Behn's, which were published posthumously with an eye toward fixing an important corpus of works—were single-volume collections comprised solely of novels.²⁸ The purpose, it would seem, was to offer the consumer a commodified, repeatable pleasure.

The motives behind the *Works* editions of Addison, Pope, Suckling and other established male authors are quite different. To publish one's own "works," as Pope did, as opposed to releasing a collected edition of prior works under the more conventional titles of *Poems on Several Occasions*, or *Miscellanies*, was an attempt to authorize one's self in the literary marketplace, to set the boundaries of one's textual production and to encourage that they be read as parts of a unified, literary whole. As James McLaverty has discussed, Pope's works edition was a "form of self-expression and a means of controlling the readers' perception of the author" in the face of print culture's destabilization of authorial identity. "The introduction of copyright legislation, the expansion of the market, and the publicity for literature in pamphlets and journals," writes McLaverty, "opened up new possibilities of freedom, celebrity and wealth. But they also raised the specter of an author's work, even his identity, being taken over by impersonal forces he could not control."²⁹ Authoring one's "works" was above all an assertion of artistic power and entitlement, an attempt to place one's own productions in a literary patrilineage extending from Ben Jonson, whose 1616 *Works* self-consciously aligned his

²⁸ It is for this reason that Spedding speculates that Haywood's *Danger of Giving Way to Passion* collection was originally planned to be a single volume.

²⁹ McLaverty, "Fame," 50.

literary achievements with those of revered classical authors.³⁰ Accordingly, most of the *Works* editions to appear in this period attempt to show the range and generic diversity of the author's accomplishments, often filling multiple volumes. In the case of Addison's posthumous *Works*, for instance, his editors were careful to include not only his celebrated plays and *Tatler* and *Spectator* papers, but also his travel writings. Similarly, the volume of Suckling's *Works* advertises that it contains "his POEMS, LETTERS and PLAYS."

Seen in this light, Haywood's *Works* appear as a similar attempt to "shape and direct the new publicity" of print but also, crucially, as a deliberate departure from the gendered norm.³¹ Critics have generally considered her *Works* in the context of Pope's attack in the *Dunciad*, where Haywood appears as the prize in a pissing contest between Chetwood and Edmund Curll: "See in the circle next, Eliza placed, / Two babes of love close clinging to her waist; / Fair as before her works she stands confess'd, / In flow'rs and pearls by bounteous Kirkall dress'd."³² Her "works," in Pope's telling, are presented as transgressions that demand a confession by their perpetrator, where the corpus of her immodest textual production is conflated with the bodies of her illicit sexual production—the two "babes" in her arms in this scene can simultaneously be two secret histories (as suggested in a note that Pope inserted in the 1742 *Dunciad in Four Books*) or two illegitimate children (as Edmund Curll's insinuated in his *Compleat Key to the Dunciad*).³³ However, it would

³⁰ McLaverty, "Fame," 49.

³¹ McLaverty, "Fame," 50. Though Mary Davys's *Works* were published one year later, her collection appears to be the exception that proves the rule. While her *Works* makes just the sort of claim for high-culture legitimacy that Haywood's first collection did, Davys's self-published collection—which included two comedies, two novels, poems, a travelogue and "Familiar Letters betwixt a Gentleman and a Lady"—did not have a bookseller behind it and was never reprinted. Davys, in her Preface, chides that "'Tis now for some time that these sort of writings call'd Novels have been out of use and fashion, and that the ladies (for whose service they were chiefly design'd) have been taken up with amusements of more use and improvement; I mean histories and travels" (A2r). However, judging from very different character of Haywood's new collection that year, the very opposite appears to have been the case. Mary Davys, *The Works of Mrs. Davys: Consisting of, Plays, Novels, Poems, and Familiar Letters. Several of which never before publish'd. In two volumes* (London: Printed by H. Woodfall, at the Elzvir's-Head, without Temple-Bar, for the Author, 1725).

³² Alexander Pope, *The Dunciad* (1729/42), II.157–60, in Pat Rogers, ed., *Alexander Pope: A Critical Edition of the Major Works* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993), 471.

³³ Pope, *Dunciad*, 471 n. 157, noted that "this woman was the authoress of those most scandalous books called the *Court of Caramania* and the *New Utopia*" and pointed readers to Curll's key, which identified "the two Babes of Love" as "the Offspring of a Poet and a Bookseller" (Edmund Curll), *A Compleat Key to the Dunciad* (London: Printed for A. Dodd, 1728), 12.

seem that Haywood's *Works* also transgresses by aspiring to a kind of high-culture legitimacy from which it ought properly be excluded. When Pope writes that she appears as "fair as before her works she stands...by Kirkall dress'd," he's performing a complex gesture of memory and revision. Here Pope is clearly referring to the lavish portrait frontispiece that was engraved to accompany her 1725 collection, the kind of vanity job that was de rigueur for any "works" edition that had any pretension to importance (the Addison, Pope and Behn editions all had them). However, Pope commits a number of important errors of fact—perhaps intentionally—insofar as Haywood's octavo *Works* collection was issued without a portrait frontispiece (it was the 1725 *Secret Histories*), and the engraver was not Kirkall but George Vertue, the same artist who sculpted Pope's own portrait, and that of Addison.

The reference to Haywood's portrait, then—an image so formally similar to Pope's and Addison's that it appears as if it could be hung on the same gallery wall with them—serves to call attention, quite specifically, to the pretensions of *The Works of Mrs. Eliza Haywood*. It speaks to Pope's disgust that Haywood's *Works* could be placed on the shelf next to the great works of acknowledged literary masters. However, in the subtle misidentification of the artist who drew the portrait, we can perhaps also see Pope's desire to disavow an uncomfortably close kinship between himself and another ambitious, precocious author who had the temerity to publish collected "works" at scarcely mid-career.³⁴ What Pope attacks as mere grasping after literary prestige is in fact a deliberate tendency that marks at least the initial marketing approach taken by Haywood's booksellers.

* III *

The issue of the *Works*, then, appears to have been a more significant event than even critics like Spedding have assumed, there being more at stake in the project than just an attempt to drive sales through the expedient of a nonce collection. The first three volumes of Haywood's *Works* were first offered for sale on 12 August 1723, and this appears to be the high-water

³⁴ For a related assessment of the cultural politics Pope's and Haywood's *Works*, see particularly Ingrassia, *Authorship*. Also see Spedding, *Bibliography*, "Appendix L: Portraits of Eliza Haywood," 783; and Janine Barchas, *Graphic Design, Print Culture, and the Eighteenth-Century Novel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 24.

mark of this early effort to market a “prestige” Haywood. However, even in the timing of this release, one can detect that Haywood and her booksellers were already exploring a new direction in the promotion of her writings: 12 August 1723 was also the premier of the second of Haywood’s plays, a comedy entitled *A Wife to be Lett*. The acting of the play has long been reckoned a kind of publicity stunt: Haywood created something of a stir by contriving to play the role of Mrs. Graspall, the titular wife who is to be pimped by her husband. As the *Daily Post* puffed two days before the opening, Haywood (identified in the piece as the “author of *Love in Excess*”) was to “perform the Principal Woman’s Character herself,” “on the occasion of the indisposition of one of the Actresses.”³⁵ This sly piece of casting has generally been taken as an attempt to capitalize on the popularity of her writings in order to attract an audience to the theatre; the puff itself reads, “If we may judge by her writings we may reasonably expect she will bid fair to entertain the Town very agreeable.” However, the fact that this publicity stunt coincided with a reissue of her collected works makes us re-appreciate Haywood’s play as part of a diversified media campaign designed to simultaneously promote the play, the reissue of Haywood’s back catalog, and Haywood’s own celebrity.

Though only a modest success on the stage—the play ran three nights during the summer season doldrums—*A Wife to be Lett* nevertheless seems to have served a number of financially rewarding purposes. In the very least, the play’s premiere supplied a juicy news hook that helped market the first three volumes of the *Works*. Moreover, by August 20, the play was already available in an inexpensive octavo brought out by Browne and Chapman, a source of potentially more income. Then, some months later in January, a reissue of the play anchored the fourth volume of the *Works* collection, perhaps, serving to re-energize sales of the collection as a whole by reminding its potential buyers of the publicity stunt that kicked things off back in August.

Based on this, one is tempted to conjecture that a sophisticated marketing plan was worked out between Haywood, her current booksellers Browne and Chapman, and a liaison with the theater, most likely Haywood’s first bookseller, William Chetwood, who by the time of the *Works* reissue had all but completely dropped out of the bookselling business, but who remained prompter at Drury Lane. One could envision a plausible scenario

³⁵ Blouch, “Eliza Haywood” in Pettit, *Works*, xxxv; “Haywood, Elizabeth Fowler,” in Highfill, et al., *Biographical Dictionary*; Spedding, *Bibliography*, 127–28; Whicher, *Life and Romances*, 202.

where Chetwood would smooth the way for the acting of her new play, and in return he would recover some of his investment in Haywood over the years—perhaps through the selling off of whatever fractional shares he might have retained in her copyright. In return, in order to stimulate interest in Haywood's comedy that was to be produced, and in order to drive sales of the standing stock of her existing publications, Browne and Chapman would pull together a reissue of her collected works. Haywood, for her part, would agree to sell the copyright for the play to the booksellers and substitute in for the role of Mrs. Graspall. In addition to getting paid for the copyright and earning a chance at an author's benefit, Haywood also would have created an opportunity to raise the visibility of her books on the market. Unsold copies of the play would form part of a fourth volume of her *Works* which would include new material that she would write in the meantime.³⁶

The issue of her *Works*, then, must be seen as a fulcrum, or a point of emergence, where we can see the new and more successful approach to marketing Haywood emerging from the missteps of the past. Indeed, this new approach is epitomized in the 1725 collection, *Secret Histories, Novels and Poems*. Although virtually all of Haywood's modern critics have been silent about the change in the name of Haywood's collections, I would argue that the shift from advertising *Works* to advertising *Secret Histories* is of central importance. Although Spedding's painstaking bibliography will ensure that the 1725 collection will no longer be discussed as if it were the "second edition" of the *Works*—so its ambiguous title page implies, and so have Haywood commentators have tended to treat it. However, in Spedding's critical remarks on the collection, he nevertheless emphasizes the continuities between the collections.³⁷ This distracts from the fact that the works that are removed—the plays and translated letters—not only make the remaining collection less generically diverse (counter to what readers would expect from a *Works* edition), but that the texts that are included to replace them tend to make the collection considerably less highbrow in its pretensions. All of the new texts that are included are short amatory fictions of one stripe or

³⁶ Two of those texts, *Lasselia* and *The Rash Resolve*, would themselves be printed off as stand-alone imprints (released in November and December 1723 respectively) before being reissued as "second editions" in the January 1724 *Works* volume. While it is impossible to ascertain the truth of such a conjecture, owing to the lack of documentary evidence concerning Haywood's activities with her booksellers, it is hard not to view this win-win-win situation as intentional.

³⁷ Spedding, *Bibliography*, 65, notes only that "it reprints most of the titles that had been issued by Daniel Browne and Samuel Chapman" in the *Works*.

another—considerably shorter than *Love in Excess* or even *Idalia*—designed, and priced, for rapid consumption.³⁸ These five short “secret histories”—*The Masqueraders* (Part I), *The Fatal Secret*, *The Surprise*, *Fantomina*, and *The Force of Nature*—would seem to be Haywood’s (and her bookseller’s) latest best guess as to what her audience wanted. Judging from the change in the collection’s name, and from texts like *The Masqueraders* and *Fantomina*, the audience wanted secret histories, a form of fiction that traded in gossip—or at least in the suggestion that it *might* be gossip—by combining the breathless, hyper-emotionalism of her amatory novels with a whiff of real-world scandal. The two of the new texts explicitly identify themselves as “secret histories” on their title page, but all five of these new texts belong to this genre insofar as they claim to report the true-life scandals that befell actual persons whose identities are coyly veiled by pseudonyms.

It is important to note that these five texts were chosen from a considerably wider field of potential texts—as outlined in Table 3, Haywood had written seventeen new works after the last volume of the *Works* was released. In his discussion of this selection process, Spedding theorizes that the twelve anonymously published works would have been, by their very nature, excluded from such a public declaration of Haywood’s authorship, and that the four remaining acknowledged works would have been excluded by necessity—*Mary, Queen of Scots* and *The Tea-Table* would have both been too long and generically unsuitable, while the copyrights for *The Unequal Conflict* and *The Fatal Fondness* were in other booksellers’ hands. However, this makes it sound like it would have been impossible for any other text to have been included in the collection; rather, there seems to have been more discretion exercised by Browne and Chapman than this theory would allow. Particularly, we must recognize that the line between an acknowledged Haywood title, and one published “anonymously” is, as Spedding indicates elsewhere in his study, quite porous and variable.³⁹

For example, when three of the new secret histories were published—*The Masqueraders* (April 1724), *The Fatal Secret* (May 1724) and *The Surprise* (July

³⁸ Cf. Spedding, *Bibliography*, Appendix E.ii for the relative drop in sale prices of individual titles over this period. Spedding conjectures that the four volume *Works* sold for 20s (£1) bound, but *SHNP* was offered for 10s unbound.

³⁹ There is also the fact that Browne and Chapman had successfully republished other booksellers’ Haywood imprints in the past. Spedding, *Bibliography*, 66, reports there is no way to know whether or not they attempted to work out a deal with Walthoe and Crockatt for the rights to *The Unequal Conflict* and the *Fatal Fondness*.

1724)—these books were not explicitly claimed by Haywood, yet she flaunted her authorship as an open secret. *The Masqueraders* was originally issued anonymously, and the subsequent texts noted only that they were by the same author as the *Masqueraders*.⁴⁰ However, their dedications were all signed “Eliza Haywood”—the anonymity of these texts, or lack thereof, is not much more than a rhetorical device. Thus, it’s worth asking why other short secret histories, like the *Arragonian Queen*, for example, or *Bath-Intrigues*, both published anonymously, were not included as well. Was it because they were too insipid to reprint, or was it because they were too libelous to acknowledge? Furthermore, in the case of the excluded *A Spy Upon the Conjuror* (March 1724), Haywood was credited, from the second issue of the first edition onward, as having “revis’d” the letters for publication, and thus the work can’t properly be taken as a purely “anonymous” work that Haywood necessarily would have disavowed. However, there were other anonymously released texts from this period that remained anonymous for many years to come: Haywood’s *Memoirs of a Certain Island Adjacent to the Kingdom of Utopia* were issued without an author’s name (or even a publisher’s imprint) at the exceptionally high cost of 4s, and there was no acknowledgment of her authorship whatsoever until 1728, when it was only linked to her *Mercenary Lover*, which was merely signed “E.H.” Yet a month before the first volume of the *Memoirs* were published, it was prominently advertised by Browne and Chapman in their edition of Haywood’s *Works*, thereby strongly implying a link between Haywood and the *Memoirs*, even though when that work did appear it included no author’s name, nor even a bookseller.⁴¹

What we are to make of this game-playing with acknowledgment and canonization is not entirely clear. It might very well be the case that Browne and Chapman included all the “secret histories” of Haywood that were *safe* to acknowledge. Particularly, the high cost and exceptionally stealthy imprint of the *Memoirs* suggests that—whether or not it was clear to the publishers a month before it hit the presses—this imprint was just too hot to handle, and its gleeful disclosure of a “certain island’s” peccadilloes was clearly intelligible and potentially libelous. Haywood and her publishers seem to have positively

⁴⁰ Additionally, all three were issued through the trade publisher J. Roberts, with no mention of Browne or Chapman on their original title pages.

⁴¹ Spedding, *Bibliography*, 207. The title page of Haywood’s *Memoirs of a Certain Island Adjacent to the Kingdom of Utopia* stated that it was “written by a celebrated author of that country, now translated into English” and noted only that it was “Printed, and Sold by the Booksellers of London and Westminster.”

intended this, judging from the inclusion of a four-page key at the end of the volume. But this only raises more questions—truly libelous texts avoided publishing their own keys because their authors needed to be able to plausibly deny that they attacked real persons under false names. (In those cases, keys generally were supplied by other writers, who were legally unconcerned in the affair.) Thus, we're left wondering whether the *Memoirs* really were too scandalous to own. Perhaps Haywood and her booksellers merely wanted manufacture that appearance?

A similar confusion stalks other excluded titles. Why, then, should the *Arragonian Queen* have been passed over? Was it, also, too controversial to acknowledge, and have we completely missed the dangerous drift of a book that G. F. Whicher called a "peculiar blend of heroic adventures...and amorous intrigue" that, according to Spedding, "does not appear to be a scandal memoir."⁴² Or perhaps that book really was too toothless to find an audience, unlike, perhaps, the *Bath-Intrigues* (October 1724), which we know attacked real people and wasn't acknowledged until Browne advertised it as Haywood's in 1727. However, if *Bath-Intrigues* was too libelous to print in 1724, why should it nevertheless have been printed with an advertisement, facing the title page, for four other Haywood books?⁴³

There is much that we do not—and perhaps cannot—know about the logic behind the inclusions and exclusions I have assembled here. The most persuasive explanation, it would seem, is that the *Secret Histories, Novels and Poems* collection was designed to be intentionally porous, the boundaries between what was "in" and what was "out" were to be made intentionally obscure. Unlike the *Works*, which acted to fix, stabilize and legitimate "Haywood," this follow-up collection would seem to be performing a much more subtle and subversive deployment of Haywood as an author-function.⁴⁴ The *SHNP* collection, in conjunction with the other texts that Haywood was producing at the time under varying degrees of anonymity, seems to have been calculated to deploy a "Haywood" that would be synonymous with "secret history," a form of fiction-making that is intimately but ultimately unknow-

⁴² Whicher, *Life and Romances*, 73; Spedding, *Bibliography*, 160.

⁴³ Spedding, *Bibliography*, 215. The fact that Haywood adopts a male narrator's persona may have mitigated against its inclusion in the *SHNP*, all of which give the impression of having been written by a woman.

⁴⁴ Throughout I have been relying on Michele Foucault's notion of an "'author' as a function of discourse" as articulated in "What Is an Author?," *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice*, ed. Donald F. Bouchard, trans. Donald F. Bouchard and Sherry Simon (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1977), 113-38.

ably bound up with the unspeakable truths of libel, scandal and obscenity. The official "Haywood" circulated in a titillating inter-referentiality with the unofficial "Haywood," taboo texts that might owe their marginalization to truly libelous content, or merely to a mercenary false imputation of libel. Thus, the *SHNP* collection deploys the author-function of Haywood to colonize and capitalize on a wider discursive field of "secret history," and in doing so it ensures that all of Haywood's work would come participate in the frisson of the illicit and obscene.

As John Richetti first discussed in his *Popular Fiction Before Richardson*, and then elaborated in *The English Novel in History 1700–1780*, Haywood's secret histories owe much to the secret history as practiced (some twenty years earlier) by Delariviere Manley. However, where Manley offered extended exposés of the sexual peccadilloes of the ruling class in the service of partisan party politics, Haywood's secret histories functioned quite differently. Haywood did work up a number of lengthy secret histories on the scale of Manley's multivolume efforts, but only one of those, considerably later in her career, seems to have taken on explicitly political targets.⁴⁵ Richetti suggests that Haywood's reinvention of the "secret history" genre is primarily engaged in the expression of extreme emotional states. "Devoid of distracting moral complexity or social knowledge or particularized reference," he writes of Haywood's secret histories, "the effect is not scandalous exposure of a corrupt social order as in Manley but rather the effacement of the public realm and the restriction of amatory narrative to private, personal, and secret transactions."⁴⁶

Richetti's sensitively argued brief is persuasive in so far as it makes clear that the "secret history" as practiced by Haywood was a much smaller affair than the ministry-shaking attacks of Manley (who earned a brief stay in prison, and later a £50 pension, for her *New Atalantis*). When Haywood had dirt to dish, it does indeed appear that, on balance, she was trading in town gossip, spilling the secrets of some mildly well-to-do though not completely insignificant gentleman or gentlewoman, a "person of quality" not all that unlike the presumptive readers of her works. However, it would seem to be a mistake to assume that her secret histories were sham fronts, "devoid...of particularized reference," intended solely to draw the curtain on the interior psychic intensi-

⁴⁵ Richetti excludes from this formulation Haywood's *Memoirs from a Certain Island Adjacent to Utopia* (Pt. 1 1725 and Pt. 2 1726), *The Secret History of the Court of Caramania* (1727) and *The Adventures of Eovaai* (1736), which he finds more akin to Manley's oeuvre.

⁴⁶ Richetti, *Novel in History*, 42, 48.

ties of her characters, females especially. The fact that these secret histories *may or may not have been true* would seem to have been the very source of their particular pleasures. The bulk of a text like *The Masqueraders* may be taken up by lengthy descriptions of the excessive emotional states of protagonists swept up in an unavoidable maelstrom of sensation (that is, *The Masqueraders* may read much like *Love in Excess*), but it would seem that the text's need to claim that it is true—that there really “was a gentleman, whose real Name, for some reasons, I shall conceal under that of DORIMENUS”—is important. The text strives to give readers the impression that its story is, at its root, a real piece of gossip, a little bit of dirt on someone they might just know, and this admixture of credulity and curiosity inculcated by the “secret histories” then in turn amplifies and familiarizes the reading of those novels and other amatory fictions not explicitly designated as gossip.

After encountering enough “secret histories,” the reader of Haywood is encouraged to wonder if there might not be some real-world referent lurking within even the most outlandish amatory fiction,⁴⁷ in spite of (or perhaps because of) the fact that such a truth claim might only appear (if it does at all) on the first page only to be dropped once the story takes off from there. The absence of repeated references to a single satiric target opens up the field and allows for the free play of the reader's interpretive imagination: “Could this character be *that* insufferable fop?” “Could she be *that* loose widow?” As much as anything else, it was the gratification of this impulse—a drive to find out secrets—that readers sought out when consuming “Haywood,” and this would seem to account for the early novel's pleasures at least as well as the vicarious experience of a radical psychological interiority, the encounter with an authentically female subjectivity, or the serialized pursuit of commodified pleasure in print culture.

My reading of the importance of “secrets”—real or imagined—to the direction that Haywood's fiction takes in the 1720s coordinates with a growing body of criticism on the early novel that explores its imbrication in a larger network of cultural practices dedicated to the cultivation, regulation and satisfaction of curiosity.⁴⁸ In Kathryn King's discussion of

⁴⁷ King, “New Contexts,” 272, concludes that there is a “strong likelihood” that Haywood's amatory fictions “were embedded in local, immediate, and topical contexts in ways that have gone unrecognized.” I am grateful to King for sharing a version of this essay with me prior to its publication.

⁴⁸ See, particularly, Barbara M. Benedict, “The Curious Genre: Female Inquiry in Amatory Fiction,” *Studies in the Novel* 30.2 (1998): 194–210 and *Curiosity: A Cultural*

Haywood's Duncan Campbell pamphlets, she suggests that this text's insistent and self-conscious thematization of readerly curiosity is in fact an allegory for Haywood's own writing and her readers' response to it: "this close focus on the excesses of curiosity and its sometimes febrile gratifications...suggests...that vignettes of the narrator prying, spying, eavesdropping, breathing heavily over 'secret Histories' are the story—the story of the solitary novel-reader snatching at her guilty pleasures." Expanding King's analysis in suggesting that it might apply equally well to all of Haywood's fictions—novels as well as "spy" genre pieces and full-dress secret histories—Scott Black has more recently argued that Haywood's seduction scenes supply epistemological as much as erotic satisfaction and are addressed "not to a naive reader who experiences the uncanny pleasure of being ravished, but a canny reader who wittingly enjoys the pleasures of curiosity, variety, and variation, who reads *Love in Excess; Or, the Fatal Enquiry* not just for excessive love of the excesses of love, but also to indulge an inquiring mind."⁴⁹

The new focus critics are bringing to the play of curiosity in Haywood would seem to be especially apt in light of the bibliographic analysis I have pursued in this paper, yet most, like Richetti, tend to assume that all the "secrets" sought by readers of Haywood were necessarily de-particularized.⁵⁰

History of Early Modern Inquiry (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001); Kathryn King, "Spying Upon the Conjuror: Haywood, Curiosity and 'The Novel' in the 1720s," *Studies in the Novel* 30.2 (1998): 178–93; Juliette Merritt, "Spying, Writing, Authority: Eliza Haywood's *Bath Intrigues*," *Studies in Eighteenth-Century Culture* 30 (2001): 183–99 and *Beyond Spectacle: Eliza Haywood's Female Spectators* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2004); and Scott Black, "Trading Sex for Secrets in Haywood's *Love in Excess*," *Eighteenth-Century Fiction* 15.2 (2003): 207–26. In making the case that "Haywood utilizes eroticism for pedagogic ends, demanding that readers detoxify their visceral response to 'warm' description" Kathleen Lubey has similarly argued that Haywood attempts to fuse eroticism to curiosity, "Eliza Haywood's Amatory Aesthetic" *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 39.3 (2006): 309–22.

⁴⁹ King, "Spying," 187; Black, "Secrets," 218.

⁵⁰ In an excellent earlier study of the construction of Haywood's reputation for scandal, David Brewer has analyzed Pope's (likely) false attribution of the *Memoirs of the Court of Lilliput* to Haywood as a tactic to distance the personal satire of the *Dunciad* from the "libelous Memoirs and Novels" that Pope makes synonymous with the name "Haywood." "Haywood, Secret History, and the Politics of Attribution," in Saxton and Bocchicchio eds. *Passionate Fictions*, 217–39. Brewer, 225, says that the "Scriblerian's will to distinction" misrepresented Haywood's secret histories, however, which he claims show "no sustained efforts to signal topicality, much less any partisan intentions." Judging from subsequent scholarship which has recovered heretofore unrecognized satiric targets in Haywood's work, particularly King, "New

Indeed, it is just such an assumption that enables William Warner's provocative argument that Haywood's great achievement was to "abstrac[t] into generality" the novel of intrigue she inherited from Behn and Manley, to turn it into a "repeatable formula on the market, grounded in a private reading practice of a general reader."⁵¹ Warner imagines a literary marketplace where readers learn to serially consume texts saturated with "scenes of polymorphous sexual arousal" that act upon characters and readers alike to "dissolve particularized subjectivity into automatized bodies," but Warner's notion of Haywood's texts as "formula fiction" circulating in a nascent "media culture" depends on a radically ahistorical understanding of these terms.⁵² Warner assumes that the same logic governs the consumption of twentieth-century pop culture and eighteenth-century amatory fiction, yet a closer investigation of just how, exactly, Haywood was marketed to her audience, and how that strategy changed in response to localized market pressures brought to bear on specific booksellers, demonstrates the extent to which Warner's influential account of the role of "media culture" in the early novel is in need of refinement and particularization.

Warner claims that "Haywood's repositioning of the novel of amorous intrigue is both the cause and the effect of her remarkable novel production in the twenties and thirties" but formulating the problem this way begs a whole set of questions about the material realities of the "media culture" on which his argument depends. However, the story this article has been piecing together about the composition, printing and issue of Haywood's collected works in the mid-1720s suggests that the mechanisms shaping what kinds of texts could get to market and how they might be characterized are considerably more complex. The reasons why Haywood turns to "secret histories" have much to do with the shaping force of the partnership of booksellers that specialized in her texts. It is possible that more expensive editions and/or more lengthy texts could have been published, but it appears that Browne and Chapman were acting to recoup the large initial investments made in the publishing of Haywood. That meant financing

Contexts," it seems safer to assume that there may well have been topicality to Haywood's secret histories, and that audiences would have expected as much even before Pope's deformation of her reputation.

⁵¹ Warner, *Licensing Entertainment*, 113.

⁵² Warner, *Licensing Entertainment*, 121. Warner claims that Haywood's "novels of amorous intrigue have the signal traits of formula fiction on the market recognizable from the eighteenth century to the present day."

smaller, more topical, and more immediately saleable secret histories that would gratify public taste—but that also could be expected to make back their initial investment more quickly. These new pieces could then be packaged alongside the longer, more elaborate and expensive novels like *Love in Excess* in the 1725 collection, and this juxtaposition could in turn be expected to drive the sale of those novels. This could be expected to occur not only because they would be reissued with fresher, more recently popular texts, but also because the juxtaposition of her early amatory novels with the new secret histories would imbue them with that same whiff of scandal and gossip.

What the 1723/4 collection called “works,” the new, 1725 collection encouraged its audience to read as “secret history.” The turn to secret histories then, bespeaks of a certain nosiness—a distinct social embeddedness—on the part of the eighteenth-century novels and their readers, a curiosity after gossip and pseudo-gossip that existed in a complex relationship with, on the one hand, the lust for impersonal ecstasies of affect and arousal, and on the other, desire to surround one’s self with the cultural markers of taste and prestige.⁵³

⁵³ Work on this article began in Fordham University graduate seminars led by Susan Greenfield and Michael Suarez, whose mentorship I gratefully acknowledge. I also thank Kathryn King and Patrick Spedding, who lent crucial advice and support early and late in the composition of this piece.