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A Blue-Stocking Friendship
The Letters of Elizabeth Montagu and Frances Reynolds in the Princeton Collection

BY RICHARD WENDORF AND CHARLES RYSKAMP

Much is known about Elizabeth Montagu, the undisputed "Queen of the Blues," and her intellectual and social accomplishments have easily overshadowed those of most of her blue-stocking contemporaries. An important collection of autograph letters in the Princeton University Library, however, sheds new light on Mrs. Montagu's relationship with one of these ladies, Frances Reynolds—Sir Joshua's youngest sister—a friend with whom she corresponded for over 15 years. The Princeton collection of their correspondence comprises 18 letters in all: 13 letters from Mrs. Montagu to Frances Reynolds, four letters from Miss Reynolds to her friend, and an additional letter from Edmund Burke to Mrs. Montagu. The collection, formerly in the possession of Mrs. Doreen Ashworth, was purchased by Princeton in 1967; of the 17 blue-stocking letters, only three have previously been published (and none in its entirety). These manuscripts, together with the Library's holdings of 200 additional letters addressed to Mrs. Montagu and her contemporaries, constitute one of the finest collections of blue-stocking correspondence.¹

¹ The Princeton collection was purchased at the Sotheby sale of 27 November 1967 (lot 196). The letter from Burke (29 July 1768), which we have not reproduced here, is printed by Reginald Blunt, Mrs. Montagu, "Queen of the Blues": Her Letters and Friendships from 1762 to 1800 (London: Constable, 1928), 1, 50-53, and by Thomas W. Copeland, ed., The Correspondence of Edmund Burke (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1958), 1, 170-173. Letters nos. 13-15 have been
It is largely through Elizabeth Montagu's ambitious career as an author, patroness, and hostess that we know so much about the circle of literary women that also included Hannah More, Hester Chapone, Mary Delany, Frances Boscawen, Charlotte Lennox, Elizabeth Vesey, Elizabeth Carter, Hester Thrale Piozzi, and (later) Fanny Burney. The epithet bestowed upon these women was occasioned, however, by the casual dress of a male member of their group, Benjamin Stillingfleet. Boswell provides a history of blue-stocking beginnings in his discussion of Johnson's life in 1781:

About this time it was much the fashion for several ladies to have evening assemblies, where the fair sex might participate in conversation with literary and ingenious men, animated by a desire to please. These societies were denominated Blue-stockings Clubs, the origin of which title being little known, it may be worth while to relate it. One of the most eminent members of those societies, when they first commenced, was Mr. Stillingfleet, whose dress was remarkably grave, and in particular it was observed, that he wore blue stockings. Such was the excellence of his conversation, that his absence was felt as so great a loss, that it used to be said, "We can do nothing without the blue-stockings;" and thus by degrees the title was established. Miss Hannah More has admirably described a Blue-stocking Club, in her "Bas Bleu," a poem in which many of the persons who were most conspicuous there are mentioned.

Another important account of the blue-stocking assemblies emphasizes the casual social tone of their meetings; the formalities of dress were clearly secondary to the intellectual liveliness of the participants:

Mr. Stillingfleet being somewhat of an humorist in his habits and manners, and a little negligent in his dress, literally wore grey stockings; from which circumstance, Admiral Boscawen used, by way of pleasantry, to call them "The Blue-Stocking Society;" as if to indicate, that when these brilliant friends met, it was not for the purpose of forming a dressed assembly. A foreigner of distinction hearing the expression, translated it literally, "Bas bleu," by which these meetings came to be afterwards distinguished.  

It would be difficult for us to overestimate the importance of these assemblies for gifted women in the middle and late 18th century, especially if we remember how many opportunities—particularly education and publication—were normally closed to them. Brilliant talk and thoughtful letters provided the foundation for scholarly interchange among these women, and among those enlightened men who did not act condescendingly towards them. In her essay on Shakespeare, Mrs. Montagu countered Voltaire's charge of "barbarism" in England by arguing that "learning here is not confined to ecclesiastics, or a few lettered sages and academics; every English gentleman has an education, which gives him an early acquaintance with the writings of the ancients" (p. 3); and Mrs. Montagu herself was perhaps the clearest proof that learning in England was not confined to a few educated men.

Mrs. Montagu's own education was unusual. She was born in 1720, the elder daughter of Matthew and Elizabeth Robinson of West Layton, Yorkshire. She grew up, amid considerable affluence, in Cambridgeshire and Kent, and when quite young came under the influence of Conyers Middleton (her grandmother's second husband, and the biographer of Cicero), who assisted in developing her literary interests. She had copied out all of Addison's Spectator essays by the time she was eight, and began a lifelong correspondence with her friend Lady Margaret Cavendish Harley (later the Duchess of Portland) when she was twelve (the duchess's death is mentioned in letter no. 13). This precocity found new admirers when she visited London, where she met George Lyttelton (who became a close friend), and Edward Mon-
Edward Montagu, who was considerably older than his wife, owned coal mines in Denton, Northumberland, and country houses at Allerthorpe, Yorkshire, and Sandleford, Berkshire. Their marriage was an amiable one, but perhaps not much more than that. Their only child died in his first year, and there were other sorrows for Mrs. Montagu as well. Much as she admired her husband, she also realized his limitations, especially in his final years (see letter no. 9). But if her husband could not completely share her interests, he appears not to have discouraged them. Their house on Hill Street in Mayfair soon became a center for intelligent conversation and generous entertainment, and her circle of admirers grew to include Reynolds, Johnson, Garrick, and Burke. She also began a promising literary career. In 1760 she anonymously contributed three dialogues to Lyttelton's *Dialogues of the Dead* (nos. 26-28), and in 1769 she published her ambitious *Essay on the Writings and Genius of Shakespeare*, a book that found many admirers, even if Johnson was not one of them ("it does her honour, but it would do nobody else honour. . . . I will venture to say, there is not one sentence of true criticism in her book"). Although Johnson's harsh opinion of her *Essay* (and Lyttelton's *Dialogues*) provoked a separation between them, they were eventually reconciled, and Johnson remained one of her greatest admirers: "Mrs. Montagu is a very extraordinary woman; she has a constant stream of conversation, and it is always impregnated; it has always meaning" (Boswell, ii, 88, and iv, 275).

Following her husband's death in 1775, and her own serious illness later that year, Mrs. Montagu began to plan her entertainments, charities, and patronage on an even grander scale. In 1781 she commissioned James ("Athenian") Stuart to build a large house for her in Portman Square (it was destroyed in 1941). Impressive in design and execution, Montagu House was one of the first magnificent buildings to be erected on the western outskirts of London following the great Building Act of 1774. At least one of its rooms immediately became famous: breakfasts for as many as 700 guests were held in the "feather room," which was ornamented with Mrs. Montagu's own designs, constructed from the plumage of almost every kind of bird. Cowper celebrated the room and its inhabitants in his poem "On Mrs. Montagu's Feather-Hangings":

The birds put off their ev'ry hue
To dress a room for Montagu.

There Genius, Learning, Fancy, Wit,
Their ruffled plumage calm refit,
(For stormy troubles loudest roar
Around their flight who highest soar)
And in her eye, and by her aid,
Shine safe, without a fear to fade.
(ill. 1-2, 45-50)

It was at Montagu House that she also entertained the city's poor chimney sweeps each May Day morning with a breakfast of roast beef and plum pudding. Fanny Burney, who did not always have a kind opinion of her friend, acknowledged that "not to vain glory, then, but to kindness of heart, should be adjudged the publicity of that superb charity which made its jety objects, for one bright morning, cease to consider themselves as degraded outcasts from society."

In the same year (1781) she had a large country house built on her estate at Sandleford, and two years later she completed her improvements there by having "Capability" Brown redesign the estate's gardens, woods, and streams (see letter no. 10). By this date Elizabeth Montagu was the universally acknowledged "Queen of the Blues," a woman with whom—because of the force of her considerable intellect and fortune—aspiring literary women were inevitably compared. Hannah More, a much younger blue-stocking, provides an interesting glimpse of Mrs. Montagu in her prime, and her description should be compared with Frances Reynolds's portrait of their friend:

Mrs. Montagu received me with the most encouraging kindness; she is not only the finest genius, but the finest lady I ever saw: she lives in the highest style of magnificence; her apartments and table are in the most splendid taste; but what baubles are these when speaking of a Montagu! her form (for she has no body) is delicate even to fragility; her countenance the most animated in the world; the sprightly vivacity of fifteen, with the judgment and experience of a Nestor.6

---


And James Beattie, who benefited most, perhaps, from Mrs. Montagu’s patronage, wrote a similar character of his friend in 1799, upon hearing an incorrect report of her death: “I have known several ladies eminent in literature, but she excelled them all; and in conversation she had more wit than any other person, male or female, whom I have ever known” (Forbes, ii, 306). She died in 1802, at the age of 81, leaving her entire fortune to Matthew Montagu, her nephew, adopted son, and first editor of those letters that prolonged her reputation as a lively and accomplished woman.

The letters in the Princeton collection reinforce this familiar portrait of Elizabeth Montagu: they picture her during illness and lethargy, and during periods of great activity (her move, for instance, from Hill Street to Montagu House); they illustrate her attempts to assist those with misfortunes; they emphasize her good common sense and her equally valuable tact; and they reveal the importance she placed on the warmth—and even the minor formalities—of friendship. These letters, in short, depict a woman whose entire career was devoted to the improvement of her own mind and its surroundings, and of the characters and circumstances of those she knew best. What is unusual about the letters, however, is that they are not addressed to one of her closest correspondents (her sister Sarah, Elizabeth Carter, or the Duchess of Portland), but to a woman very different in her circumstances and character.

We know very little about Frances Reynolds’s life, and even less about those forces that prompted her to try her hand as a painter, poet, and literary theorist. We may well be surprised, in fact, to discover how extensive her literary and artistic ambitions were: she was a fairly well-known painter of miniatures, and exhibited at least two of her larger canvases at the Royal Academy; she wrote several poems, one of them revised by Johnson and eventually published; she completed several drafts of a memoir of Johnson, which she also intended to publish; and in 1789 she finally published her *Enquiry Concerning the Principles of Taste, and of the Origin of Our Ideas of Beauty, etc.* These achievements would seem to place her among the most accomplished of the blue-stocking circle, and yet she is almost always remembered as Sir Joshua’s companion and housekeeper, a woman easily overshadowed by the most celebrated English painter of the century.

Part of her apparent anonymity is surely due to her own un-
prepossessing character. One friend wrote that "she was an amiable woman, very simple in her manner, but possessed of much information and talent for which I do not think every one did her justice, on account of the singular naïveté which was her characteristic quality, or defect, for it often gave her the appearance of want of knowledge." 5 Johnson, who invariably referred to her as his dear "Renny," wrote at one point that he hoped her "little head begins to settle"; but for the most part his opinion of her was not condescending, especially when he spoke of her character: "whilst the company at Mr. Thrale's were speculating upon a microscope for the mind, Johnson exclaimed, 'I never saw one that would bear it, except that of my dear Miss Reynolds, and her's is very near to purity itself!'" The young Fanny Burney thought that Frances Reynolds was needlessly upset by petty matters, and that she was perhaps too upright in her manners: "I fear I have lost all reputation with her for dignity, as I laughed immoderately at her disasters." 6 She was clearly a woman who lacked the easy confidence and sociability of Mrs. Montagu; she was a complex character, eager to win her own way in the intellectual world to which her brother introduced her, and—if we can believe certain passages in her commonplace book—she nursed an unrequited love (for an unidentified "Mr B") and regretted her failure to live in harmony with her famous brother.

Frances Reynolds was born in the small town of Plympton's-Earl, Devonshire, in 1729, six years after her brother. Joshua took a house with his two youngest, unmarried sisters in 1746, and Frances later accompanied him to London in 1755 to serve as his housekeeper in St. Martin's Lane. As his prosperity grew they moved to a large house on the north side of Great Newport Street (where they lived for eight or nine years), and then to a very handsome house on the west side of the square at Leicester Fields (now Leicester Square), which contained a gallery and sitting room, and provision for a grand carriage, which Frances felt much too shy to use. Sir Joshua's fame also brought them an increasingly large acquaintance with those who came to commission por-

7 Diary and Letters of Madame D'Arblay, ed. Austin Dobson (London: Macmillan, 1904), ii. 156.
8 See Johnson's Letters, ii. 430 n.
situation of receiving the favour of living in my own house instead of conferring the favour of letting you live in it. I am your most affectionate Brother.

Her exile seems to have begun when she returned to Torrington, in Devon. She soon confided in her commonplace book that “I am incapable of painting; my faculties are all becalmed in the dead region of Torrington.” And in the draft of a letter she wrote that “the height of my desire is to be able to spend a few months in the year near the arts and sciences.” She therefore contemplated a move to Windsor, but ultimately returned to London, residing in the household of the translator John Hoole, whose portrait she painted. But the arrangement with Hoole was apparently not a permanent one, and thus we find her moving several times in the following years, each time seeking (as she informed Mrs. Montagu in letter no. 16) “some asylum for the short remnant of my Dayes.”

The remainder of her life, however, was not nearly so short as she imagined. After her brother’s death in 1792, she received an inheritance of £2500 for life (with reversion to Mary Palmer, who inherited most of her uncle’s estate), and promptly purchased a large house on Queen Square:

indeed her own works were so numerous that a large house was absolutely necessary. She afterwards moved to a larger house, and we think to a third in the same square. She was a lady of genius and learning, though with respect to painting, Goldsmith... offended her because he, who was eccentricity personified in his scrambling way, observed that she loved pictures better than she understood them. She continued to paint, we believe, as long as she could hold the pencil, and her easel used frequently to be set up near her parlour window in order advantageously to display some favourite performance to the admiring passengers. (Whitley, I, 298-299)

Artistically and financially independent at last, she continued to live by herself—and apparently for herself—until her death in 1807.

We might be led to conclude that the split between Frances and Sir Joshua was occasioned by his attitude towards her artistic aspirations, but the little information we have indicates, in fact, that the problem probably lay in her attitude towards her brother's work. She was, by all accounts, a very difficult person to live with. Fanny Burney describes her as “living in an habitual perplexity of mind and irresolution of conduct, which to herself was restlessly tormenting, and to all around her was teasingly wearisome” (Johnsonian Miscellanies, II, 455 n.). She was also a punctiliously religious person, and on that subject she knew her own mind extremely well: a major element in her separation from her brother was said to be her habit of frequently reminding him “that He was a Clergyman’s son & that it was very improper for him to set the example of painting on a Sunday.” Frances Reynolds, James Northcote reported, believed that Sir Joshua had given up both religion and society merely “to gain a name.” And another commentator thought that she was forced to relinquish her housekeeping duties because of her “abandonment to introspection.”13 Frances felt that she had been, in her own words, “thrown out of the path nature had in a peculiar manner fitted me for.” Once her brother had died, she remarked that “she saw nothing in him as a man but a gloomy tyrant.”14

It is surely interesting that, following the separation from her brother, Frances Reynolds devoted her talents to writing rather than to painting: she prepared her Enquiry in the 1780s, published her poetry (A Melancholy Tale) in 1790, and left unfinished, at her death, the different versions of her Recollections of Samuel Johnson.15 Many of the letters in the Princeton collection document her attempts to publish the Enquiry, a work that was not widely known to be hers until James Clifford edited a facsimile edition of it in 1951. She had originally turned to Johnson for an opinion of its quality and for advice on how she might have it printed, and Johnson was encouraging in both respects. He praised the book highly, claiming that it had “such depth of penetration, such nicety of observation, as Locke or Pascal might be proud of”; but he added that “it cannot be published in its present state. Many of your notions seem not to be very clear in your own mind” (Letters, II, 435). He also agreed to negotiate with the booksellers on her behalf if she promised to keep her authorship a secret, but a series of complications—and her own fear that Johnson maintained a strong “prejudice against women’s literary productions”—finally stalled their plans.

In spite of the assurances which Frances Reynolds gave both Johnson and Mrs. Montagu that she only wished to have the volume privately printed, she continued to hope that the book might actually be published. In 1785 she wrote in a draft of a letter to Mrs. Montagu that “I wish’d to leave behind me a respectable memorial of my existence, which I then flatter’d myself this would be.”16 Her letters in the Princeton collection reveal that she turned to Mrs. Montagu for assistance before Johnson’s death in 1784; and although her friend was not able to offer her either the criticism or advice she needed, she allowed Frances Reynolds to dedicate the volume to her (see letter no. 12).

If some of the complexities involved in the publication of the Enquiry are still not entirely clear, we know even less, in fact, about Frances Reynolds’s career as a painter. Northcote reports that she was successful as a painter of miniatures, often reducing the great canvases her brother produced. Sir Joshua did not approve of her painting full canvases in oil, and she was therefore forced to paint them by stealth in another room of their house while her brother was employed in the sitting room. Reynolds jested “that her pictures in that way [in oil] made other people laugh and him cry,” and even Johnson was displeased with her portrait of him, painted 1775-1783, which he called “Johnson’s grimly ghost” (Northcote, II, 160, 159).

Even in the face of this criticism, Frances Reynolds was able to complete a surprisingly large number of paintings. In addition to the portraits of Johnson and Mrs. Montagu, she painted Anna Williams, Hannah More, James “Hermes” Harris, James Beattie


14 Leslie and Taylor, I, 92 n., and The Farington Diary, I, 262. Another sister, Elizabeth Johnson, took an even harsher view of their brother in 1779: “Thy soul is a shocking spectacle of poverty. When thy outside is, as thy inside now is, as I told thee ten year since I will not shut the door against thee. But it may be, thy soul is past all recovery. If so, I shall never see thee more. Thy visitation is not yet come: and who knows in what shape it will come: or whether it will come at all. Wo be to thee if it does not come” (Johnsonian Miscellanies, II, 455-456 n.).


16 The draft, dated 12 July 1785, is in the Huntington Library.
and his wife, John Hoole, and a self-portrait that included her sister Mary. Johnson and Mrs. Montagu collected engraved prints of her portraits, and Mrs. Montagu's letter of 28 July 1783 (no. 10) is filled with her admiration for Frances Reynolds's work: "I assure you I was extremely struck with the Print of Mr. Hoole from its perfect resemblance to him: you have convey'd into his eye the celestial fire which glows in his translations." She also exhibited three paintings at the Royal Academy in 1774 and 1775: "The Garland, from Prior," "Lace Makers, miniature," and "Children going to Bed." A critic praised this last painting by stating that "we do not remember ever to have seen a prettier subject for the exercise of a lady's pencil than No. 354, nor could it perhaps be better made use of in the hands of the most experienced artist," and there are other testimonies as well to her "strong traits of originality" (Whitley, i, 208).

Mrs. Montagu sat for Frances Reynolds on 6 April 1778, an occasion chronicled by Boswell, who reports that Miss Reynolds invited a select male company to keep Mrs. Montagu entertained. At one point Mrs. Montagu remarked to her: "Very good old woman. Don't make me fifteen." To which Boswell replied: "All your friends, Ma'am, would wish she could."[27] Johnson sat for Frances Reynolds at least 10 times, even though he did not approve of her choice of portrait painting as a profession: "He thought portrait-painting an improper employment for a woman. 'Publick practice of any art, (he observed,) and staring in men's faces, is very indecent in a female.'" (Boswell, ii, 302). His observation is an interesting one, for it implies that the usually impersonal and objective relationship between painter and subject somehow does not exist if the artist is a woman. The indelicacy he imputes to it is surely akin to much contemporary reaction to Fanny Burney's Evelina: women—especially very young women—were not supposed to look directly at their subject, were not to attend that closely to the language and manners of life as it is actually lived.

Painting, however, and portrait painting in particular, lay very close to the center of Frances Reynolds's life. In writing of her experiences in peaceful Torrington, she confessed that "I want some grateful gale of praise to push my bark to sea, some incen-

tive to emulation to awake my slumbering powers. I thank my God who put it in my head to acquire this delightful art, and in a manner called my light out of darkness, for necessity struck the hot spark, that as the world recedes I may have something to fill up the vacancies in my heart made by ungrateful returns to the most unfeigned fraternal love and purest friendship" (Leslie and Taylor, i, 92 n.). This is the kind of passionate outburst that could be confided to a commonplace book alone, and it points to her continual difficulties as she attempted to maneuver what Germaine Greer has recently called "the obstacle race," those daunting barriers that female painters of every age have had to face.18

In Frances Reynolds's case, the obstacles to artistic independence and success were paradoxically near to hand; she practiced an art in which men were dominant and in which her brother was preeminent. It was primarily through Sir Joshua that she was allowed access to the most illustrious subjects and examples of the art of portraiture: as she was to confess to him in the letter Johnson wrote for her, "I suffer too much in the loss of your notice; but to that is added the neglect of the world which is the consequence of yours" (Letters, iii, 270). Her brother discouraged her from painting full portraits, and disparaged those few she did manage to execute; and it is certainly significant that the one enterprise in which he did encourage her—and in which she excelled—was in the painting of miniatures, a more "delicate" art in at least two senses of the word.

It is very difficult today to gauge the talent Frances Reynolds actually possessed, and we must, in any case, admit that Sir Joshua was in the best position to measure it. Perhaps the greatest significance of the 17 letters in the Princeton collection is their revelation of the importance she placed on Mrs. Montagu's patronage and on her friend's generally favorable opinion of her artistic work. Their correspondence is filled with Frances Reynolds's requests for assistance: in the publication of her Enquiry, in finding secure storage for her paintings, in obtaining a new residence, or in establishing a trust fund for an unfortunate friend. But she also looked to Johnson and Mrs. Montagu for the "esteem" and approval that her brother could only deny her. The letters therefore contain Frances Reynolds's repeated appeals for demonstrations of Mrs. Montagu's continued friendship and for assurances that she was not becoming a nuisance to her friend. As she remarked in the maxims in her commonplace book, "The first step to be despised is to be pitty'd" (Hudson, p. 147). Even with her "perplexity of mind and irresolution of conduct" she had enough sense of herself to know that she deserved much better than that.

A note on the text. The text of the following letters is for the most part an exact transcription of the Princeton manuscripts, but the careless repetition of words is not reproduced here, nor are canceled readings unless they reveal additional information or make better sense of a passage. The letters are printed in chronological order, although dating has been made rather difficult by the general lack of full dates in the texts. Frances Reynolds, however, often noted the year in which she received her letters, and other indicators occur within the texts, in the various addresses, in the consistency of handwriting, and in Mrs. Montagu's distinction in addressing "Miss" or "Mrs" Reynolds as her friend advanced in age. Two of Frances Reynolds's letters are drafts; one (no. 15) is a précis of a letter she wrote on the same day.

1. Elizabeth Montagu to Frances Reynolds. One folio sheet, folded; written on 1 side only. Address: To / Miss Reynolds. There is no date, but the direction to "Miss" Reynolds suggests that the letter was written not later than the early months of 1775 (after which Mrs. Montagu referred to her friend as "Mrs" Reynolds). Although Mrs. Montagu mentions her illness (as in the two following letters, probably dating from early 1775), she does not refer to her husband's declining health; this letter may therefore be thought to precede nos. 2 and 3.

Dr Madam

I am sure of being pleased in your Society so have no solicitude on that head. I am but very indifferent this morning, & of late I have been an Invalid for ye first hours of ye day, as soon as I find myself tolerably well I shall with great alacrity attend you & enjoy
with pride ye honour you do me, & with more tender sentiments each a proof of your partial affection for Dear Madam

Yours

EM

If S't Joshua & you are not engaged on Friday evening I wish you wd bestow yourselves here

2 Blunt (l. 106) describes Mrs. Montagu as an invalidish woman, in the habit of offering advice to others concerning their ailments.

2. Elizabeth Montagu to Frances Reynolds. One folio sheet, folded; written on 1r only. Address: To / Miss Reynolds. There is no date, but this letter was probably written between 1769 (when Reynolds published his first discourse; see n. 2) and mid-1775 (when Mrs. Montagu began to address her friend as "Mrs. Reynolds"). Mrs. Montagu's mention of her own ill health and that of her dying husband, moreover, associates this letter with the following one, which Frances Reynolds has dated "1775." It is clear that this letter precedes no. 3, however, because here Mrs. Montagu speaks of a visit with her friend that has not yet taken place; in the following letter, Mrs. Montagu assures her friend that her "long visit" was a "great favour." The similarities between these two letters (even the handwriting is quite similar) suggest that this letter was also written in early 1775, before Montagu's death in May. Since Sir Joshua published discourses in 1773, 1775, and 1777, it is almost certainly the discourse of 1775 (the sixth, published in January) to which Mrs. Montagu refers. Hilles records Reynolds's presentation copy to Mrs. Montagu in The Literary Career of Sir Joshua Reynolds (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1929), p. 284. This letter was therefore probably written early in 1775.

Dear Madam

Hillstreet Thursday morning

I have much lamented that I have not had the pleasure of seeing you since I came to Town, but Mr. Montagu's ill state of health, bad weather, & bad colds, have prevented my enjoying the conversation of my Friends at home or abroad. Mr. Montagu is a little better, & if you and S't Joshua Reynolds will do me the favour to dine with me on Sunday, you will make me very happy, & it will go some way towards making you so, that you will meet Mr. & Mrs. Garrick, & Mr. Burke; but indeed I wrong your good nature in supposing there can be any higher pleasure to you than giving pleasure, so that I will take the favour to myself. I beg many thanks to S't Joshua for his admirable discourse to ye Academy, his pencil may be jealous of his pen, & all Genius's & Artists jealous of both. My best compliments attend him

I am Dear Madam

Your most Obed. R'st Servant

Eliz. Montagu

1 The Garricks were good friends of Mrs. Montagu, and Mrs. Garrick, who outlived her husband by 43 years, remained on the fringes of the blue-stocking circle.

2 Reynolds, the first president of the Royal Academy, delivered 15 discourses to the students between 1769 and 1790, many of which, when published separately, he presented to Mrs. Montagu (see Hilles, The Literary Career of Sir Joshua Reynolds, pp. 280, 284, 285, 288, 293, 295, 296).

3. Elizabeth Montagu to Frances Reynolds. One folio, folded; written on 1r only. Address: To / Miss Reynolds. Frances wrote "1775" on 2r, which indicates a date before 20 May, when Edward Montagu died.

If my Dear Miss Reynolds ever made me a long visit she did me a great favour, but I know I never thought any visit she made me long. Mr. Montagu's illness & my own frequent indispositions have prevented me making almost any engagements since I came to London. I could laugh at your apprehensions with ye better grace as I have had a touch of the same infirmity, for to tell you ye truth, I was afraid you had withdrawn some of your partiality towards me as you had not called on me. I am happy in ye hopes of seeing you at dinner on Sunday, & wish Sir Joshua could be of ye dinner party. Pray tell him we drink tea early, let us have as much of his time as he can allow us.

I am Dear Madam

Yr most affecte R'st Serv't

Eliz. Montagu

1 Edward Montagu's final illness (and recluse-like habits) were apparently a great strain on his wife; in a letter to her sister, Sarah Scott, she wrote that "I dread the scene that is opening. With all his faults of temper he has good qualities, and the generosity he has shewn to me is very engaging, and I shall be very unhappy if he suffers much in his decline" (quoted by Blunt, l. 298).
Dear Madam

I was at dinner when your kind note arrived, & c'd not express to you (being then busy carving a bold chicken for my friends at table) the sense I have of your goodness to me in giving me a testimony under your own hand of your return towards health. I beg of you to tell St. Joshua I propose on Wensday before 12 o'clock to bring him a face which another Winter will not improve, so I will leave it with him now. 3 I propose to set out for the South of France ye end of this week. 2 I am glad I can carry with me the comfort of knowing you are getting well. I intend to return to England next summer & flatter myself I shall find you then as partial to me as you have always been. Believe me my dear Madam, your friendship is one of ye Treasures I leave behind with a solicitous hope to find it again undiminished'd unimpaired. Take care of ye health & remember that a state of convalescence requires delicate treatment & indulgence. My best respects attend St. Joshua. Miss Gregory is much yours 8

I am ever dear Madam

y' most sincerely affect[e]e

Eliz Montagu

3 Sir Joshua's portrait of Mrs. Montagu, now completed or nearing completion in Reynolds's studio (see letter no. 4, n. 1).

4. Elizabeth Montagu to Frances Reynolds. One folio, folded; written on 1st only. Address: Mrs Reynolds. Frances Reynolds wrote "74" on it, but this letter was certainly written in the autumn of 1775, shortly before Mrs. Montagu began her ill-fated journey to France (see the following letter).

5. Elizabeth Montagu to Frances Reynolds. One folio sheet, folded; written on 1st only. Address: Mrs Reynolds. No date is given, but this letter was probably written in the autumn of 1775. Mrs. Montagu, who announced her imminent departure for France in the previous letter, was struck by a severe case of influenza on her way to Dover and forced to return. She finally made her tour of France in 1776.

Dear Madam

The kind things you say on my illness & return make the illness & involuntary return less grievous. My fever has left me, but I am still weak & get very little sleep at night & till I do so my Doctor & my Friends desire my day may pass as drowsily as possible & order me perfect retirement. I believe my disorder was ye fashionable influenza, & as I have a natural antipathy to being either ye first, or in the extremes of a fashion, it has deranged my constitution. I hope ye lazy stupid life I lead will soon recruit the animal powers, much exhausted by sickness & fatigue, & as soon as I am allow'd the pleasures of conversation I shall solict you to come to my fireside, in ye mean time I envy my portrait. 2 Best comp to St. Joshua

I am Dr Madam ever yours EM

6. Elizabeth Montagu to Frances Reynolds. One quarto sheet, recto only. Address: Mrs Reynolds / Leicesterfields. Although there is no date, this letter was probably written between 1775 (when Mrs. Montagu began to address her friend as "Mrs' Reynolds") and 1779 (when Frances Reynolds left her brother's house in Leicester Fields). It should be noted that Mrs. Montagu refers to "Miss" Reynolds in the body of the letter, and this may indicate a date closer to 1775 than to 1779. The nature of Miss Reynolds's request is not known.

My Dear Madam

I ask a thousand pardons for delaying so long to answer my dear Miss Reynolds letter but I wish6 rather to do it by word of mouth. I am most truly interested in every wish of my amiable friend & sh'd be happy if it were in my power to do what she suggests but that from a particular circumstance it is not in my power I can convince her. I hope very soon to get leisure to call on you in ye mean time be assured that with ye most affectionate esteem

I am sincerely yours

EMontagu

Hillstreet sunday morn
7. Elizabeth Montagu to Frances Reynolds. One folio sheet, folded; written on 1st only. Address: To / Mrs Reynolds. There is no date, but the letter was apparently written shortly before Mrs. Montagu sat to Frances for her portrait, which Boswell reported as 6 April 1778 (Boswell's Life of Johnson, iii, 244). The portrait is reproduced by R. Huchon, Mrs Montagu 1720-1800: An Essay (London: John Murray, 1907), facing p. 210.

Dear Madam

Wensday morn

Miss Gregory informed [me] you are still enclined to make [me] once again pleased with my face. I have not liked it for these twenty or 30 years, but for the time to come may be as fond of it as in ye very meridian of female vanity, I have therefore wish'd every day to bring you my countenance to be renewed, but want of health, & want of time have prevented me, but if you & Sr Joshua w'd dine with me on Saturday, we w'd fix a day for my waiting on you for a scheme which does me so much honour. I will send to Dr Johnson to meet you. I am my Dear Madam most sincerely

yours

EM

8. Elizabeth Montagu to Frances Reynolds. One folio sheet, folded; written on 1st only. Address: Mrs Reynolds. Mrs. Montagu dates her letter "ye 19th"; Miss Reynolds added "Mrs Montagu 1770 or Dec 1781" on 2nd. Mrs. Montagu moved from Hill Street to her new house in Portman Square in December (Blunt, ii, 112); the correct date is therefore 19 December 1781.

Dear Madam

Portman Square ye 19th

I must have thought me ungrateful for the great pleasure I received from your ingenious manuscript, & very insensible to so friendly a mark of your confidence, that you have not before received my acknowledgments; but my dear Madam, as I received it only on the first morning I was an inhabitant of my new House, I was then, & have been ever since so engaged with ordering many things to be done which were deficient, others to be altered because unfit, that really it has not been possible for me to get a quarter of an hour in the morning undisturbed. I have had 3 carpenters & joiners working in my own apartment besides diverse other artificers in this state it has been, & is still, impossible for me, to give your work the close attention it appears to me most justly to merit. At night when ye busy World is at rest I shd with infinite
pleasure sit down to study it, but alas! My eyes will not enable [me] to read a manuscript by candlelight. Will you therefore my dear Madam allow me to keep this treasure 2 or 3 days longer. I will keep it as one ought to keep a treasure, in safety & surety. I shall be very happy if you can give me the pleasure of your company at dinner on sunday.

Miss Gregory desires her comp.

I am Dear Madam,

Yr most affecte & Obed

Hble Servant

EMontagu

1 Mrs. Montagu means “You.”

2 Frances Reynolds’s An Enquiry Concerning the Principles of Taste, which she showed to both Mrs. Montagu and Johnson in 1781, and which was privately printed in 1785 and 1789. Mrs. Montagu offers advice concerning this treatise in letter no. 13 (see also nos. 9, 13, 14, and 15).

3 Blunt (i, 4) records that “years of close study and endless letter-writing” seriously affected her sight.

9. Elizabeth Montagu to Frances Reynolds. One folio sheet, folded; written on 1st only. Address: Mre Reynolds / Newport Street / N° 11. Frances Reynolds supplies the date “March 82” on 2nd, which indicates that this letter represents further correspondence concerning her Enquiry (see the previous letter, written on 19 December 1781). Newport Street is west of Long Acre; Frances and her brother lived at No. 5 from 1753-1761, and it is probable that she still knew artists living there in the 1780s, one of whom may have taken her in as a lodger.

My dear Madam

I was delighted this morning when my Porter sent me yr ticket by which I find you are come to Town. I know the value of the papers you left with me too well to deliver them into any hands but your own. If I e have found any fair morning in which I had been at liberty to indulge my own wishes I had brought them to Richmond but the weather has been perverse & my engagements untoward. I hope you can dine with me on friday, & I will then deliver to you the very ingenious works in my possession if you are engaged that day let me know what morning I may wait on you with them. I am really what your virtues ought to make every one

Your admirer & sincere friend

EMontagu

1 Sir Joshua commissioned his friend Sir William Chambers to design a small villa in Richmond, which was called “Wick House,” completed in 1772.

10. Elizabeth Montagu to Frances Reynolds. One folio sheet, folded; written on 1st, 2nd. Address: Mre Reynolds N° 56 / Great Queen Street / Lincoln Inn Fields / London. Great Queen Street had been a fashionable address for painters throughout the century. The house which Frances Reynolds lodged in (with Hoole, the translator; see n. 4) had been inhabited by Sir Godfrey Kneller, Thomas Hudson, Joshua Reynolds (1740-1745), and Thomas Worlidge; it was later the address of Thomas Chippendale (Henry B. Wheatley and Peter Cunningham, London Past and Present [London, 1891], iii, 137).

Dear Madam

July 28 1788

There is not any thing that could make me proud to shew an old face to the publick but its appearing in the character of your friend. I desire Mr Townley to save 2 prints of Mr Harris, & two of your humble Servant for me. I shall not dare to exhibit them paired, for even in this representation my head is very unworthy to appear with his; for the faintest emblem of Mr Harris presents to the mind perfections to which I have not the least pretension.

I assure you I was extremly struck with the Print of Mr Hoole from its perfect resemblance to him; you have convey’d into his eye the celestial fire which glows in his translations.

I hope you have pass’d many of the hot days we have had on the Banks of the Thames at Richmond. I do not remember any Summer more favorable to rural life, & particularly to ye charms of a River, than this has been. By the direction of the late celebrated Mr Brown we are making a piece of Water at the side of a Wood, which will in time embellish the scene, & at this time w’d have refreshed the eye extremly, if the cool liquid element had flowed through it, but at present it presents only ideas of drought & labour, a large number of workmen are toiling to increase a small stream to a large body of water, the Banks to contain it require ye operations of skill & labour, & it now is an emblem of a small pittance, by industry & dexterity increasing itself till it becomes abundant. I have enjoyed a great deal of health & pleasure here this Summer, but must next week set out on my journey to Northumberland. As I have not visited my estates there, & in Yorkshire, these four years I shall find a great deal of business to [attend]. I was prevented going last year by the bad weather, for otherwise I should never let so long time pass without seeing them, as I consider all possessions bring certain duties with them, indeed I have an excellent Steward there, who in every respect does his duty, but that will not excuse me if I neglect mine.
Miss Gregory & my Nephew Montagu present their comp[rison] With very sincere esteem I am Dear Madam your most obliged & affect[ed]  

1 Frances Reynolds painted Mrs. Montagu’s portrait in 1778 (see letter no. 7).  
2 Charles Townley, the engraver, made prints of her paintings.  
3 James Harris (1709-1750), the author of Three Treatises (1744) and Hermes, or a Philosophical Inquiry Concerning Universal Grammar (1751), was a friend of Mrs. Montagu.  
4 John Hoole (1727-1809) was an auditor in the East India Company, a good friend of Johnson, and the translator of Tasso (1765) and Ariosto (1773-1778).  
5 Chambers designed Wick House so that it would afford Reynolds a particularly fine view of the Thames.  
6 Lancelot (“Capability”) Brown (1715-1783), the famous landscape gardener and architect, had died on 6 February while still supervising the improvements in the grounds at Sandalford. Mrs. Montagu’s opinion was that the gardens and woods had been transformed into “sweet pasturals and gentle elegiacs. He is an agreeable, pleasant companion as well as a great genius in his profession. I consider him as a great poet” (Blunt, ii, 129).  
7 Mrs. Montagu owned coal mines at Denton, Northumberland, and an estate in Yorkshire.  
8 Matthew Montagu (see letter no. 4, n. 3, and letter no. 13, n. 1).  

II. Frances Reynolds to Elizabeth Montagu. One folio sheet, folded; a draft of a letter, written on 1st and 2nd. No address. On 2nd Frances Reynolds noted: “my letter to Mr. Montagu on the subject of Mr. Wilks 89.” There is no other surviving evidence for dating this letter, nor for identifying Mrs. Wilks, their common friend (see n. 1).  

Dear Madam  

I am very much concern[ed] to find that the letter I took the liberty to send to you last summer at Sandalford should have produced the necessity of troubling you with another on the same subject!  

About three weeks since, Mr. Wilks came to me and said that she had heard I had written such a letter and beg[ged] I would indulge her with a sight of your answer as I had no notion that the knowl[edge] of its contents would be of any essential service to her having been informs[ed] by her, some time before that Mr. Wilks’s relations had promised to provide for them I declined shewing her the letter alleging my ignorance where I had laid it, for the there was nothing in it that I thought would not rather give her pleasure than pain imagining she no longer entertain[ed] any hopes of the appointment I writ to you about. Yet not being quite sure that you would approve of my shewing it and being unwilling to 

loose the whole treasure of the secret! I declined gratifying her curiosity imputing her desire to see it to no other motive but alas her whole hopes of future good depended upon what she might find in that letter! A few days after she sent her son to me from Richmond repeating her request of seeing it. I then sent it to her but not without expressing some apprehension of being guilty of an impropriety to permit it out of my hands tho’ to her. She is the first and only person that ever saw a single syllable you ever writ to me on any occasion whatever. You well know my Dear Madam that there are mental gratifications that lose their highest charm by communication even to the dearest Friend! such I felt the transaction to afford between you and me on the subject of M[rs] W[ill]s’s and such in some degree have I felt (as all pleasure of all communication with you seems to participate of the same principle) have I felt your favours to every occasion to afford. I heard nothing after from M[rs] Wilks till a few days since M[rs] More [came to me]. She is an intimate friend of M[rs] Wilks her visit was on purpose to inform me of the very great distress M[rs] Wilks was in that she had no hopes of existence but from the Success of the scheme which you had the goodness to suggest of an annual contribution amongst her friends. She wish[ed] not M[rs] More said to receive from any one person any sum considerable, by no means I believe above ten pounds, for she flatters herself that she has more than ten friends that will contribute and a hundred a year is the very summit of her wishes, and on this She and her Daughter are to live separated from Mr. Wilks. She requested that I would communicate this intelligence to you, probably a consciousness of having already too much trespass’d on your goodness before occasion’d her declining it indeed M[rs] More said something to that effect [and feeling myself in the same predicament] and ought not I madam from a similar motive wish to do the same? [I would have proposed to M[rs] More to wait on you but she said that she had not the honor I feel some apology seems necessary to make to you] indeed my dear Madam I feel great regret for being thus doom’d as it were to be always presented to your thoughts connected with scheme and [what I dread] perhaps with unbecoming officiousness!  

1 The only “Mrs. Wilks” to appear elsewhere in Mrs. Montagu’s correspondence is John Wilkes’s estranged wife, who died in 1784. But Wilkes’s wife had no son, and was wealthy; clearly some other woman is referred to here. Blunt (ii, 184-185) records Mrs. Montagu’s patronage of another impoverished woman—“Laetitia” Yearsley, the poetical milkwoman—in 1784 (Mrs. Montagu and Hannah More were co-trustees of trust money raised on Mrs. Yearsley’s behalf).  
2 Apparently Hannah More, a younger member of the blue-stocking circle, although Frances Reynolds curiously adds later in the letter that Mrs. More “had not the honor” to wait on Mrs. Montagu. Hannah More, however, had
known Mrs. Montagu since 1775, and was shortly to join her in another benevolent act (see n. 1).

2. Here and elsewhere in this letter deleted portions that clarify or amplify her remarks are placed in brackets.

22. Elizabeth Montagu to Frances Reynolds. One folio sheet, folded; written on 1st only. Address: Mrs Reynolds / at / Kew / Wednesday morn Dec ye 3d / 1/2 past 7 o'clock. Postmark: Hull.

In spite of the precise time and date supplied in the address, Mrs. Montagu does not specify the year in which she wrote this letter. Her acceptance of the dedication of Frances Reynolds's *Enquiry* (see n. 2) indicates that this letter precedes no. 13 (24 July 1785). A probable date is therefore either 1783, when 3 December fell on a Wednesday (Johnson's *Letters*, iii, 111), or 1784, when Mrs. Montagu is known to have extended her stay at Sandleford.

Dear Madam

At my arrival in Town yesterday my Porter delvered to me your very obliging letter; which he said, was just then brought to my Gates by the penny post. You dated it from Kew Nov 21, the post mark is Dec 3d ye 1st as I will show you when I have the pleasure of seeing you. I am greatly distress'd least you should think I received your letter according to your date, & have been so ungrateful a Brute as to have delay'd to acknowledge it till this time. The only reason I could have for declining your addressing your ingenious work to me, must be a consciousness of not deserving such an honour but if your partiality makes you think me worthy of it I cannot be so much my own enemy as to refuse it. You may depend on my keeping ye secret you desire, tho' I should have a pride in your acknowledging me as your Friend still greater than from any literary honour.

I hope that you will let me have the pleasure of seeing you whenever you come to Town, & I should be much obliged to you, if you w'd let me know that you have received this letter; for what happen'd to yours, makes me doubt of the regularity of your post, & it w'd greatly mortify & grieve me, to appear ungrateful to dear Mrs Reynolds, for whom I have a most sincere & affectionate respect.

The mildness of the weather induced me to stay much later in the Country this year than usual. If the days were not so short I would make you a morning visit, but evening now comes on so fast, there is not time to enjoy the conversation of a Friend from the dispelling of ye morning fog, to the suns setting. With great esteem

I am dear Madam

Your most obliged

& Obed: Hrs Servant

Eliz Montagu

Portman Square

Tuesday night

1. Frances Reynolds apparently lived for a time in Kew, near Richmond (her brother's friend, Sir William Chambers, laid out the gardens and built the pagoda and other ornaments there).

2. This letter indicates, somewhat surprisingly, that she decided to dedicate her *Enquiry* to Mrs. Montagu even before Johnson's death (13 December 1784).

3. Mrs. Montagu had apparently returned to London (Portman Square) from her estate in the country (Sandleford, in Berkshire). The letter, however, is postmarked “Hull.”

4. Mrs. Montagu wrote her letter Tuesday night, and then addressed it the following morning.

13. Elizabeth Montagu to Frances Reynolds. One folio sheet, folded; written on 1st, 2nd. Address: Mrs Reynolds / at M's Mayes / The Vineyard / Richmond. Postmark: 25 / IY. Frances Reynolds wrote “25 July” on 2nd, and this dating is verified by the two events mentioned in the opening paragraph of the letter.

Dear Madam

Sandleford July 24

Such a torrent of congratulatory letters poured upon me on the marriage of my Nephew, just when I received yours, that I could not then find time to enter into the subject of your letter in the manner it deserved, & as good & evil succeed each other very rapidly in human life, very soon after I had ye joy of seeing Mrs Montagu married to a most amiable young Woman, & by that means I acquired a new Friend; by the death of the Dowager Duchess of Portland I was deprived of an old Friend, & the sense of such a loss made me unable to write till ye first agitation of mind subsided.

Having for many years past left off all metaphysical studies, I am not a competent judge of any work on subjects of that nature. I was sensible there were many ingenious things in your work,
& much to be admired, but how far they might gain the applause & attention of the present set of Readers I had my doubts, for as formerly people read to help them to think, they now seek such books as ease them of ye trouble of thinking, & chase like Hamlet, to read words, words; they do not mean to investigate & study things. The Muse who speaks on ye vulgar tongue of frivolous matters, is the popular Muse. Mr. Langton is not only a Man of great learning, but of that candour & sincerity you might safely confide in his opinion. As to your Parisian friend, I have only this to say, that if your work meets the publick favour, she will let it pass as her own; if otherwise, she will declare from whom she received it, therefore it shd seem to me, of all methods of publishing it ye least likely to be advantageous to you. In this I speak merely from my general observation of the inferior tribe of french beaux esprits, for I am not personally acquainted with M. de Riverole. My heart has felt ye greatest pleasure at ye kind sentiments express’d of me in ye Dedication; ye private & silent conscientiousness of your friendship gives me far more delight than can arise from vanity were it publish’d, & therefore let not the dedication embarass you, it has done ye kindest of offices by shewing me I have ye esteem of a Person whom I highly esteem. At a time of leisure I dare say Mr. Langton would give great attention to so ingenious a Work. You might again offer it to him.

I believe the tenderness of my regard for you throws a timidity into my Counsils, & I wish you to be guided by those who have more judgment in the subject of your work, & less tenderness for the author.

I hope the good air of Richmond has been of service to your health, & that you are better than when I waited on you. With great esteem

I am Dear Madam
Your most affectionate faithfull & Oblig’d H: Serv’t
E Montagu

1 Matthew Montagu (1762-1831), later fourth Lord Rokeby, married Elizabeth Charlton on 9 July 1785 in London (she brought a fortune of nearly £50,000).
2 Lady Margaret Cavendish Harley (1715-1785), daughter of the last Earl of Oxford and wife of the second Duke of Portland, had been Mrs. Montagu’s close friend since early childhood.
3 Mrs. Montagu refers once again to Frances Reynolds’s Enquiry, which she praises without providing much helpful criticism.
4 Hamlet’s reply to Polonius when asked what he read (1.1i.149).
5 Bennet Langton (1779-1801), a close friend of Johnson and an original member of the Literary Club, was also popular with the blue-stocking circle. He succeeded Johnson as Professor of Ancient Literature at the Royal Academy (an honorary post) in 1788. Frances Reynolds had already approached Langton for advice about her unpublished Enquiry in 1780, but without much success (see Johnson’s Letters, ii. 374, and the Huntington letter mentioned below).
6 Frances Reynolds had met Louise Flint, later Madame de Reveral, during her stay in Paris in 1762 (Northcote, t. 201-202), and she saw much of her in London in 1784. A letter of 12 July 1785 from Frances Reynolds to Mrs. Montagu, now in the Huntington Library, reveals that Miss Reynolds thought she might first publish her book by having her “Parisian friend” translate it into French and have it printed in Paris, a plan that Mrs. Montagu clearly distrusts. (“Riverole” is apparently Mrs. Montagu’s version of Reveral or Reveral; in the Huntington letter Frances spells it “Riverol.”)
7 Frances Reynolds had extolled her friend as “an example of that perfection to which all my arguments tend” in the dedication of her Enquiry.
8 Her address in Richmond (“at Mr. Mayes”) indicates that she no longer had the use of her brother’s villa.

14. Frances Reynolds to Elizabeth Montagu. One folio sheet, folded; written on 1st v. only. Address: M’s Montagu / Portman Square (the address leaf and seal indicate that this is the actual letter sent to Mrs. Montagu).

April 15th 88
Adam Street Adelphi

Dear Madam

I hope you will pardon the liberty I take which is to request that you will be so good as to make an enquiry about the letter I sent to you so long ago. The only chance I have of ever seeing it again, is, that the Porter if he let your service about the time of my sending it, might inadvertently carry it away with him, and it may be still in his possession. I much wish to know where the Porter lives that I might save you the trouble of enquiry, perhaps some of your servants may be able to inform the Bearer.

It is of great importance to me the recovery of this letter particularly so as I perceive I must not presume to hope for the only patronage that could countervail the loss of Dr. Johnson’s, should I ever be induced to publish the work. I do not mean that I would publish the letter, but that the testimony it conveys of Dr. Johnson’s approbation, would be highly advantageous to me in the disposal of the copy to a Bookseller. Indeed approbation is an improper word, inadequate to the praises he bestows on the work. I durst not repeat his expressions tho I well remember them. Some friendly strictures also the letter contained, all these I remember I transcribed verbatim in a letter I sent to you in the beginning of the year 82. they begin many of your notions seem not to be very clear in your own imagination many of them &c —

202

203
I beg my Dear Madam that you will be so good as to pardon me for trespassing so much upon your time and am with the greatest Esteem.

your obliged & obedient humble Servant

Frart Reynolds.

1. The Adelphi was a complex of apartments and warehouses built by Robert James, and John Adam (hence “adelphi”) on the Thames in 1758-1772. Garrick lived in No. 5 until 1779, and his widow until 1822 (often with Hannah More). Adam Street leads from the Strand to the Adelphi and its terrace.

2. This letter (written early in 1783) has not survived.

3. Johnson, who died on 13 December 1784, had acted as Frances Reynolds’s agent in finding a publisher for her Enquiry. Following his death, Frances had the work printed but not distributed; she was currently revising the essay for another printing, and still seeking advice on how she might have it published.

4. Johnson wrote (in part): “Many of your notions seem not very clear in your own mind, many are not sufficiently developed and expanded for the common reader; the expression almost every where wants to be made clearer and smoother. You may by revisal and improvement make it a very elegant and curious work.” Johnson’s letter has survived in two versions; see his Letters, II, 433, 530-531.

5. In her letter of reply (now in the collection of Mrs. Donald F. Hyde), Mrs. Montagu stated that she could not provide “any information concerning my Porter. I do not so much as know the names of ye Persons he serves.”

5. Frances Reynolds to Elizabeth Montagu. One quarto sheet; written on both sides. Frances Reynolds noted on r. 1°: “my letter to Mrs Montagu Feb 5th 89 something like the letter sent to her then but far from its being actually so.” Either this is a very rough draft of the one sent, or a concise summary of the actual letter’s contents (see n. 1).

My Dear madam who I was writing to being just intrupted where I made a blank in my letter by a servants asking a question &c I hope my Dear Madam you continue in good health and am with the greatest

Respect

Your Oblige

& Obedient Servant

Frant Reynolds

Kew Feb 5th 89.

I forgot to say that Mr Nurse recommended Mr Northcote to a Mr Bladen in Paternoster Row for a Publisher, but I sent in the utmost haste to him to prevent his taking any step towards so disgraceful a place as I imagine that to be, so incongruous.

1. The cryptic sentences of this postscript are explained by Frances Reynolds’s full letter of 5 February to Mrs. Montagu, which was printed by Blunt (III, 289-293; he mistakenly dates it 4 February) and which is now in the Huntington Library. Several of the phrases in these two letters are similar, and it is likely that the present letter is actually a précis of the longer one. Her subject is once again her attempt to find a publisher for her Enquiry. She had already revised her work (and had it reprinted), but she still needed a friend to negotiate with a bookseller, who would advertise and sell the book. With Johnson dead, and Mrs. Montagu cool to her plans, Frances Reynolds turned to the painter James Northcote, her brother’s former pupil (and later his biographer). She had herself sent the “whole impression” to the bookseller John Nurse, but Nurse’s brother Charles (an Oxford surgeon) replied that his brother was dead and that “he did not understand anything of the matter.” He did, however, direct Northcote to another bookseller, Samuel Bladen, whose shop was located in Paternoster Row, one of the centers of publishing in London. John Nichols states that Bladen was a “man who, for his integrity and skill as an accountant, was frequently an arbitrator in complicated settlements” (Literary Anecdotes of the Eighteenth Century [London, 1812], III, 718), but Frances Reynolds apparently associated Bladen’s business premises with the more “disgraceful” aspects of current publishing, and forbade Northcote to employ him. The Enquiry was finally published sometime before July 1789 (Clifford, p. vii), even though she told Mrs. Montagu in her long letter of 5 February that she had relinquished “all thoughts of publishing it this season.”

2. The Huntington letter reveals that the “incongruity” here consists of the possible publication of a book, dedicated to Mrs. Montagu, by “a row I imagine of inferior Booksellers.” This letter also indicates that Frances Reynolds used Mrs. Montagu’s name in negotiating a financial settlement for the book: “a Mr Faulder in new Bond street is willing to dispose of them at 18° but I think it disgraceful incongruous, as I said with the honour of your name. I am determined not to sell it for less than 4/3.”

16. Frances Reynolds to Elizabeth Montagu. One folio sheet, folded; written on 1°, 2°. Apparently a draft or copy of a letter sent to Mrs. Montagu. Although Miss Reynolds dates the letter “Feb 16th 90,“ her memorandum on 2° reads “To M’S Montagu Feb 16th 91.” Her mention of Dalton (see n. 4), who died in 1791, confirms this later date.

Dear Madam

You would not feel the disgust you probably do feel on the receipt of this, if you knew how sensible I am of the impropriety of beginning again to trouble you with my grievances.

What I beg leave to communicate is, that I am obliged to quit my Apartments in which I thought myself settled for three years at least1 and I foresee with a heavy heart the difficulties and distresses my unprotected and forlorn state will again expose me to.

My luggage of pictures &c require more room than I shall easily find in any lodgings that I can afford to take. The risk of losing them as none but necessitous people let the best part of their House the being obliged to move when they move &c. &c.
all these calamitous circumstances naturally induce me to wish for some asylum for the short remnant of my Days. why I left the apparent one in the country and prefer the living in Town I will take some other opportunity to disclose but what I am going to disclose I fear will appear to you the height of absurdity. It is a supposition that Apartments in S’t Jamess Palace may not at this time be very difficult to obtain it was the death of Mr Dalton that suggested this thought. I have not the presumption to hope for those apartments be occupied, they were so handsome but should any of the Household remove into them it may cause a vacancy in some inferior ones. and would you my Dear Madam use your interest to procure me them words cannot express the blessing you would bestow nor the gratitude of her who is My Dear Madam

Your Obliged  
& obedient humble  
Servant

Fran’t. Reynolds.

1 Frances Reynolds’s lodgings were in Albemarte Street, Piccadilly; earlier she had boarded with John Hoole in Great Queen Street.
2 These are the paintings, some of them quite valuable, that Frances had purchased in Paris in 1769 (presumably she refers to some of her own work as well).
3 St. James’s Palace was the official royal residence in London from William III to George IV. A detached library was finished in 1737 (Wheatley and Cunningham, ii, 885).
4 Richard Dalton (1715-1791) was librarian to George III, and thus had accommodations in the royal palace. Dalton was an adviser on art to the king, but Walpole called him “very ill-qualified for the post of a librarian, being totally illiterate” (Horace Walpole, Correspondence, ed. W. S. Lewis [New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1966], xxii, 478). Dalton was Antiquary to the Royal Academy; Reynolds painted his portrait in 1768.

77. Elizabeth Montagu to Frances Reynolds. One folio sheet, folded; written on 1r only. Address: M’s Reynolds. This is obviously a reply to Frances Reynolds’s letter of 16 February 1791 (no. 16). Mrs. Montagu, who dated her own letter the same day (“Wednesday y’ 16”), apparently sent her immediate reply by one of her servants.

My dear Madam

Wednesday y’ 16

I never before so much regretted not having interest at Court, but tho’ I am intimately acquainted with some Persons who often see our Sovereigns, it does not enable me to make any applications, as it is a rule with those persons never to ask any favours;
The Princeton Trustees of 1807: New Men and New Directions

BY MARK A. NOLL*

Historians of Princeton have long regarded the student rebellion of 1807 as a significant occasion in the institution’s history.1 It was the kind of event—violent and disorderly, suppressed by a Draconian response from college officials who suspended over half the student body, defended by students with an overblown rhetoric inspired by the Spirit of ’76—which forcibly illustrated the uneasy course that Princeton, and other American colleges, followed in the early years of the 19th century.2 It is possible, however, that changes taking place on the college’s board of trustees during 1807 had a longer range influence on the institution than the confrontation between students and school authorities. In that year six trustees, more than one-fourth of the board, relinquished their positions, bringing about the largest turnover in the board’s entire history. By breaking ties with Princeton’s past, by altering decisively the character of relationships among trustees, and by bringing to the board new men who did not hesitate to chart a different course for the school, this reshuffling constituted an event of first importance in the life of the institution. While the story of the student rebellion is filled with dramatic events, the equally important tale of changes on the board must begin with a description of the trustees at the end of 1806.

The Board on the Eve of 1807

The board members who convened for their regular meeting on September 23, 1806, were a formidable body. Eighteen of the 23 trustees were present, representing the best attendance at any September gathering since Samuel Stanhope Smith had become president in 1795.3 The board was a mature body, distinguished in church and state. It was predominately, but not exclusively, Presbyterian and Federalist. Its members were joined by ties of blood, occupation, and geography. Perhaps most importantly, it was a board constituted by men who had made their mark in the revolutionary war and who had contributed significantly to the establishment of the new country.

Trustees September 1806

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Residence</th>
<th>Appointed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Armstrong, James F.</td>
<td>1750-1816</td>
<td>Trenton</td>
<td>1790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayard, John</td>
<td>1738-1807</td>
<td>New Brunswick</td>
<td>1778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bloomfield, Joseph</td>
<td>1753-1823</td>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>1793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boudinot, Elias</td>
<td>1740-1821</td>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>1772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boudinot, Elisha</td>
<td>1749-1819</td>
<td>Newark</td>
<td>1802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boyd, William</td>
<td>1758-1807</td>
<td>Lambert</td>
<td>1800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark, Joseph</td>
<td>1751-1813</td>
<td>New Brunswick</td>
<td>1802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condict, Ismael</td>
<td>1764-1811</td>
<td>New Brunswick</td>
<td>1804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green, Ashbel</td>
<td>1752-1848</td>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>1790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris, Robert</td>
<td>1730-1815</td>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>1761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacWhorter, Alexander</td>
<td>1734-1807</td>
<td>Newark</td>
<td>1772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ogden, Aaron</td>
<td>1750-1839</td>
<td>Elizabethtown</td>
<td>1803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodgers, John</td>
<td>1727-1811</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>1795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roe, Azel</td>
<td>1738-1815</td>
<td>Woodbridge</td>
<td>1778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutgers, Henry</td>
<td>1745-1830</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>1804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, John. Bayard</td>
<td>1742-1812</td>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>1779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, Samuel Stanhope</td>
<td>1750-1819</td>
<td>Princeton</td>
<td>1795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snowden, Isaac</td>
<td>1764-1828</td>
<td>Cranbury</td>
<td>1782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockton, Richard</td>
<td>1744-1810</td>
<td>Princeton</td>
<td>1791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennent, William M.</td>
<td>1752-1819</td>
<td>Abington, PA</td>
<td>1785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallace, Joshua M.</td>
<td>1748-1833</td>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>1798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wharton, Charles H.</td>
<td>1744-1824</td>
<td>Freehold</td>
<td>1780</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Research for this essay was undertaken while the author was a fellow of the National Endowment for the Humanities program for college teachers in residence, 1978-1979.


3 "Trustee Minutes, Princeton University," 1 (1748-1769), 11 (1797-1829). Princeton University Archives. Hereafter all references to Trustee Minutes are to the second volume.
of New York, aged 79. Richard Stockton of Princeton and the Reverend Ira Condict of New Brunswick were the youngest at 42. The average age was 58. The board members were seasoned in their oversight of the college. Robert Harris, a Philadelphia physician, had been a trustee for 46 years, and even the newest members, Henry Rutgers of New York and Condict, had been members for over two years. On the average, trustees had served for 19 years. Most of them had been colleagues of John Witherspoon (d. 1794), Princeton's most influential president before Woodrow Wilson. Twelve of the trustees were clergymen, including President Smith. The 11 laymen included the governor of New Jersey who was ex officio chairman of the board.  

The makeup of the board's clerical delegation testified both to the strong tie between the college and the Presbyterian church and to the esteem of the members themselves. Of the 10 Presbyterian ministers, three of the oldest had served as moderators of the colonial Synod of New York and Philadelphia. These three and five others had been elected to the same position in the Presbyterian General Assembly since that body's formation in 1789. One more, Ashbel Green of Philadelphia's Second Presbyterian Church, had been the assembly's stated clerk from 1790 to 1803.  

If the clerical members of the board were distinguished in the Presbyterian church, the lay trustees were distinguished in the nation. Although the Princeton board of September 1806 was not as powerful politically as when it included John Witherspoon, Supreme Court Justice William Paterson, and Pennsylvania Governor Joseph Reed, its members retained considerable influence. Governor Joseph Bloomfield, like two of the other three New Jersey governors after independence, had been serving on the college board before election as governor. In fact, all but one of the candidates who received serious consideration from the combined houses of the New Jersey legislature in its annual choice of governor from 1776 to 1813 were members of the Princeton board before they stood for office. Until 1803 the board had always had at least one of its members in the United States Congress, and the eleven lay trustees in 1806 still numbered five veterans of congressional service. The laymen had also achieved distinction in the local politics of New Jersey and Pennsylvania. Two of their most honored members, Elias Boudinot and John Bayard, illustrate the range of public offices represented on the board. Boudinot, after varied duties in the revolution, was repeatedly elected to Congress from New Jersey. In 1783 his colleagues made him president of the Confederation Congress. He had served as director of the United States Mint in Philadelphia from 1795 to 1805. Bayard also played an active role in the revolution before serving in the Pennsylvania assembly and on the state's Supreme Executive Council. Shortly after a term in the Confederation Congress, he moved to New Brunswick (1788) where he was elected mayor in 1790 and where he presided over the Somerset County Court of Common Pleas from 1797 to 1807. Bayard, like his cousin by marriage, Jonathan Bayard Smith, was a member of Philadelphia's American Philosophical Society.  

As befits a college board of trustees, the group as a whole was well-to-do. Henry Rutgers, scion of a wealthy Dutch family in New York, died a millionaire in spite of a life devoted to philanthropy. None of the others was as prosperous, but all the laymen had accumulated substantial means through inheritance, the practice of law, distributions of land during the revolution, land speculation, or business ventures. Most of the laymen and several of the ministers owned large amounts of land, both for cultivation and speculation. Only one layman, Aaron Ogden, who lost his fortune in constitutionally significant litigation with Thomas Gibbons over Ogden’s monopoly of ferry service to New York, did not have a substantial estate at death.  

It is not surprising that a college which arose out of the work of New Light revivalists in the colonial Great Awakening retained a strong Presbyterian presence on its board. It would be a mistake, however, to regard the board which met in September 1806 as...
narrowly sectarian. At least six of its 23 members did not attend Presbyterian churches. Richard Stockton, although a trustee of Princeton’s Presbyterian Church, never became a communicant member. The Reverend Rodgers enjoyed the respect and friendship of New York City’s Episcopalians who had lent New York’s Presbyterians the use of their churches during 1783-1784 while the Presbyterians restored their buildings from the damages of the war. President Smith had cooperated with Anglicans in the founding of Hampden-Sidney College in Virginia in 1775, and at Princeton had tutored Episcopalians who remained his friends as they rose to leadership in their denomination. Elias Boudinot had once even written the son of a Presbyterian minister who contemplated becoming a Roman Catholic that he had known godly Catholics and was “satisfied that the Grace of God . . . is not confined to sect or party.”

Politically, the board’s Federalism was similar to its Presbyterianism, a dominant but not unanimous position. Of the board’s ministers, only President Smith continued active in politics after the American Revolution. Several others sounded like Federalists in their sermons, and one, Alexander MacWhorter, drifted toward Jeffersonianism after the election of John Adams in 1796.

Following the example of Dr. John Rodgers, however, many of the clerical trustees of 1806 had begun to make disengagement from politics a matter of principle.

For such an elite body, the board’s lay members included a surprisingly extensive Jeffersonian component. Jonathan Bayard Smith and John Bayard had both supported the more democratic “Constitutional” party in Pennsylvania during the revolution and immediately thereafter. Smith remained a stalwart of democratic causes and helped organize the Jeffersonians in Philadelphia during the early 19th century. By contrast, Bayard, after his move to New Brunswick if not before, had cast his lot with the Federalists. The board contained two active Democratic-Republicans, Governor Bloomfield, who had been driven from Federalism by the policies of Adams and the Jay Treaty, and Henry Rutgers, who gave $28,000 to construct the first Great Wigwam of Tammany Hall in 1811. David Hackett Fischer describes three of the trustees as “Old Federalists” and two as “transitional” ones. “Old Federalists” Elias Boudinot, Elisha Boudinot, and Joshua M. Wallace were, in Elisha Boudinot’s words, “fellow travelers of the old school” who loved order and the effortless sway of deference. Richard Stockton and Aaron Ogden justly deserve Fischer’s designation as transitional figures, for they were more active in organizing resistance to Jeffersonianism in New Jersey.

Associations that cut across the lines of party politics may have eased political tension on the Princeton board of 1806. Democratic-Republican Jonathan Bayard Smith, for example, was an active member of Philadelphia’s Second Presbyterian Church whose minister, Ashbel Green, had the Federalist fear of faction. Henry Rutgers was a friend of the Reverend Rodgers who enjoyed the respect of New York’s Federalists and Jeffersonians alike. And gubernatorial rivals Bloomfield and Ogden, along with Elias Boudinot, shared a friendship with mercurial Aaron Burr.


To date I have been unable to find anything concerning the political views of trustees Robert Harris or Isaac Snowden.


Complex networks of familial, occupational, and geographical ties joined the trustees to each other. These networks are important, for the figures that stood at their center also dominated trustee activity. Two overlapping sets of connections, one lay and the other clerical, defined the makeup of the board.

A kin network embracing Stocktons, Boudinots, and Bayards was the board's center of gravity. The network's double axis was the marriages between Elias Boudinot and Hannah Stockton (1762) and between Elias's sister Annis and Hannah's brother Richard (ca. 1755). This Richard Stockton, a signer of the Declaration of Independence and a Princeton trustee for 24 years, died in February of 1781. His children (nieces and nephews of Elias Boudinot) included Richard, who became a trustee in 1791; and Mary, the wife of Andrew Hunter who had been a trustee from 1788 to 1804 and who was Professor of Mathematics and Astronomy at the college in September 1806. The interlocking character of the families' vocations further solidified the Stockton-Boudinot connection, for Elias Boudinot had learned his law from Richard the Signer and was, in turn, the teacher of the younger Richard Stockton.

The Boudinot end of the axis fanned out to two other members of the 1806 board. Elias's younger brother Elisha, of Newark, had married the daughter of a founding college trustee, William Peartree Smith (d. 1801). After her death, Elisha Boudinot married the sister of Elias's son-in-law, William Bradford, second attorney general of the United States (1794-1795). With this brother, Elias Boudinot speculated in Ohio lands, invested in domestic ventures, and organized numerous works of philanthropy. The second trustee was Joshua Maddox Wallace of Burlington who had married another sister of Bradford and who was a neighbor (after 1805), friend, and business associate of Elias Boudinot and with him an ardent promoter of Christian causes.

The Stockton connection added one more relative to the board, Ashbel Green, who in 1785 had married a second cousin of the younger Richard Stockton.

The link between the Stockton-Boudinot clan and the Bayards was Samuel Bayard, who became a trustee of the college in 1807 upon the death of his father John. Samuel Bayard in 1790 married Martha Pintard, a niece of Richard the Signer and Elias Boudinot, as well as first cousin to the younger Richard Stockton. Samuel Bayard was a friend and protégé of Elias Boudinot, and he studied law with William Bradford, Boudinot's son-in-law. Bayard's move to Princeton in 1806 merely brought him physically into an orbit of influence that he had already known from afar. Through Samuel Bayard the Boudinot-Stockton-Bayard network reached out to John Bayard, whom Elias Boudinot had known during his years in Philadelphia. The connection also netted Jonathan Bayard Smith, a first cousin by marriage of John Bayard, who had taken the name Bayard as an adult to fulfill the conditions of his father-in-law's will.

The ties joining the laymen on the board extended well beyond family. Besides land investment and legal training, they had established working relationships in at least two other areas. The first was Alexander Hamilton's Society for Useful Manufactures, incorporated in New Jersey in 1791 as one of the United States' first speculative business ventures. Among the early shareholders or promoters of this company were five members of the Boudinot-Stockton-Bayard connection as well as board chairman Joseph Bloomfield. The second was the board of trustees of the Presbyterian General Assembly, incorporated in Pennsylvania in 1799 to serve as legal representative for the Presbyterian church. On this board served Elias Boudinot, Jonathan Bayard Smith, and Andrew Bayard, another son of John Bayard, who became a trustee of the college in 1808.

The associations of Elias Boudinot conveniently summarize this lay network. Boudinot was closely related to two of the other lay trustees (brother Elisha, nephew and apprentice Richard Stockton), tangentially related to three more (J. M. Wallace, John Bayard, and J. B. Smith), a business associate with at least five (J. Bayard, Stockton, Wallace, Elisha Boudinot, and Bloomfield), and an associate of at least one more in his work for the Presbyterians (J. B. Smith). It is also likely that he was well acquainted with Aaron Ogden, for Boudinot had lived in Elizabeth town while Ogden was a young man, and was a member with Ogden of the New Jersey Society of the Cincinnati.

The Boudinot-Stockton-Bayard network was crucial for the Princeton board inasmuch as those trustees who stood outside this connection were least important in the direction of the college.

---

Robert Harris, Isaac Snowden, and Henry Rutgers, for whom no close ties seem to have existed with the Boudinot-Bayard-Stockton connection, were never factors in the important decisions of the board.

The network connecting the clerical members of the board was not as involved as the one drawing lay members together, but it too was extensive. At least four of the ministers were related through marriage. William Mackay Tennent was married to the daughter of John Rodgers. Tennent’s cousin, a stepdaughter of his revivalist uncle Gilbert, married John Woodhull, who in turn named two of his sons Gilbert and William in honor of the revivalists. And Alexander MacWhorter married an in-law of the Tennents. The ties among these four elder statesmen on the board went beyond kinship. John Rodgers catechized MacWhorter in Delaware, served with him on the committees that led to the establishment of the Presbyterian General Assembly, and enjoyed ministerial fellowship when he was settled in New York and MacWhorter in neighboring Newark. MacWhorter had studied for the ministry with W. M. Tennent’s uncle, William Tennent II. And it had been John Woodhull who succeeded this same William Tennent II at the latter’s death in the Freehold Presbyterian Church.

Although the kin connections among the clerical trustees were not as elaborate as among the lay, the ministers enjoyed in the judicatures of the Presbyterian Church a ready-made device for association. Rodgers and MacWhorter met frequently in the meetings of the New York presbytery, as did Joseph Clark, James Armstrong, Samuel Stanhope Smith, and John Woodhull in the presbytery of New Brunswick, and Asbhel Green and W. M. Tennent in the presbytery of Philadelphia. Asbhel Green’s many activities on behalf of the General Assembly, combined with his residence in Philadelphia where the General Assembly always met, placed him in a strategic position. The meetings of the General Assembly itself provided a forum for college trustees to solidify personal bonds. Every clerical member of the 1806 board except the Episcopalian Charles Henry Wharton had attended at least two of the 18 meetings of the General Assembly.21 One final forum of association for the clergymen, as it had been for the laymen, was the board of the General Assembly which included no less than six of the clerical trustees of 1806: Rodgers, MacWhorter, Smith, Green, Tennent, and Clark.

Although no one figure stands out as the hub of the clerical network as Elias Boudinot among the laymen, it is clear that the ministers linked by marriage to the Tennents, along with Asbhel Green, were the most important individuals in the clerical network. Once again, those board members who were not close to the center of the clerical network outside the board tended to be least influential within.

Finally, the clerical and lay networks on the board overlapped substantially. For one thing, many of the lay trustees were, or had been, members of churches pastored by other trustees: Snowden and Jonathan Bayard Smith in Asbhel Green’s Second Church in Philadelphia; John Bayard in Joseph Clark’s church in New Brunswick; Henry Rutgers in John Rodgers’s United Presbyterian Church of New York; Elisha Boudinot in Alexander MacWhorter’s Newark church; and J. M. Wallace, Elias Boudinot, and Joseph Bloomfield in St. Mary’s Episcopal Church of Burlington where C. H. Wharton was the rector. We have already noted that Asbhel Green was a collateral relation of the Stocktons and Boudinots. John Rodgers enjoyed an even closer relationship with the Bayards. He was engaged briefly to John Bayard’s sister who died before the marriage could occur. He then married a first cousin of John Bayard, becoming in the process a brother-in-law of Jonathan Bayard Smith. When Rodgers’s first wife died, he married an elderly widow whose own widowed daughter would eventually wed widower John Bayard.

Elias Boudinot’s circle of friends and associates encompassed several of the board’s ministers. On more than one occasion he provided a refuge for Asbhel Green’s family during Philadelphia’s epidemics of yellow fever, and in the early years of the 19th century he cooperated with Green in the founding of a missionary magazine for the Presbyterians. Elias and his brother Elisha were correspondents with John Rodgers on a wide variety of subjects. And Elias shared with Alexander MacWhorter a concern for bringing up the orphaned children of James and Hannah Caldwell, who lost their lives during the revolution. More mundane ties linked the Reverend J. F. Armstrong to laymen on the board. He had invested in four shares in the Society for Useful Manufactures, and he had borrowed money from William Bradford,

21 Even Condict, who had ministered in a Presbyterian church before accepting the Reformed Dutch pulpit in New Brunswick, had been a delegate. John Rodgers had been at the most meetings—10.
Elias Boudinot's son-in-law, before settling into his church in Trenton.

The agencies of the Presbyterian Church provided an additional forum for laymen to mix with ministers. Nine of the trustees of 1806 had served on the General Assembly's board of trust (six ministers, three laymen). And at least three of the laymen served as commissioners to the General Assembly in the period 1789 to 1807. The nature of a trustee's connections with other board members outside Princeton was directly related to his influence at the college. While it is difficult to weigh precisely the relative influence of board members through the bland record of trustee minutes, it is possible to obtain a general sense of their relative importance by noting attendance as well as services performed for the board or at the board's request. By these means, it is clear that those members who stood at the intersection of lay and clerical connections outside the board were its most important members in exercising oversight of the college. For the period beginning with the burning of Nassau Hall in 1802 through the September 1806 meeting, the most active lay members were Richard Stockton, John Bayard, Elias Boudinot, and Eliza Boudinot. For the clergymen, most active were Ashbel Green, Alexander MacWhorter, Andrew Hunter (who resigned in 1804 to join the faculty), Joseph Clark, W. M. Tennent, and John Woodhull. Of the 10 most important trustees during the period from 1802 to 1806, therefore, only one (Clark) was not related to the Boudinot-Bayard-Stockton or Tennent connections (which themselves were joined in the person of John Rodgers).

Princeton's central location between New York and Philadelphia defined the geography of trustee representation. Influential trustees, with few exceptions, lived in New York, Philadelphia, or along the major arteries linking the two. Physical residence in Princeton imparted special privileges and responsibilities on trustee Richard Stockton, and eventually on Samuel Bayard. But the roads and ferries northward to New Brunswick, Elizabethtown, Newark, and New York, and southward to Trenton, Burlington, and Philadelphia were reliable much of the year, so that the trustees who lived in these cities had ready access to the college. Trustees who lived any distance from the well-traveled paths beyond New York and Philadelphia, such as William Boyd in Lamington, generally had limited influence on the board.

As much as family connections, business and vocational associations, the Presbyterian church, and the roads traversing New Jersey linked trustees, an even stronger, if more nebulous bond joined most of them together. This tie was the common effort they had shared in forming the American nation. At least 18 of the 25 board members had taken an active part in the events of the American Revolution. At least 10 of the 1806 board members had been on active duty during the war, and many of these had faced enemy fire. Joseph Bloomfield accompanied Benedict Arnold to Quebec in 1775 and later fought at Monmouth and Brandywine, where he was wounded. John Bayard was also at Brandywine as well as at Germantown and Princeton. The service of Aaron Ogden, who was bayoneted in action, was even more extensive. Ashbel Green, "a flaming Whig" when but "a boy entering my teens," as he described himself, was called out with the Morris County militia to guard the Passaic River. Elias Boudinot was Washington's personal choice to act as commissary of prisoners with responsibility for negotiating exchanges and providing for American prisoners in British hands.

The clergymen were as active as the laymen. Green, Joseph Clark, and J. F. Armstrong actually fought. Armstrong, John Rodgers, MacWhorter, Woodhull, and Tennent served as chaplains, and Azel Roe was put in prison for his Whig views. Even those who had not mustered for active duty often did their part. Samuel Stanhope Smith, president of the recently founded Hampden Sydney College, helped organize the local committee of correspondence and sent many of his students into the Virginia militia. Richard Stockton, then only 12 years old, remained behind late in 1776 to "protect" his family estate in Princeton when the British occupied the village. Even Charles Henry Wharton, who served most of the war years as a Roman Catholic priest in Worseter, England, was active in the cause. To raise money for the relief of Americans sequestered in England he published a laudatory sketch of General Washington in 1779. The only trustees who were definitely not active as patriots in the war were Ira Condict, born in 1764, and Robert Harris, who fell afoot of the Condick, born in 1764, and Robert Harris, who fell afoot of the war Pennsylvania provincial legislature in the early days of the war

---

22 John Bayard attended 12 of the 18 General Assemblies from 1789 to 1806, Isaac Snowden 10, Henry Rutgers three.

for misdirecting gunpowder and salt and who spent much of the war on his family estates in Cape May, New Jersey.\textsuperscript{21}

The personal relationship which at least eight of the trustees enjoyed with George Washington underscored the intimate connection between the board and the founding of the country. Strikingly enough, the inner circle of the trustee board in 1805 corresponded roughly with those who had known Washington face to face. John Bayard was among a body of soldiers which Washington personally led into the battle of Princeton in January 1777. Once Bayard moved to New Brunswick, he entertained Washington in his home, and Washington returned the favor after becoming president. Alexander MacWhorter met Washington on the latter's journey to Boston in June of 1775, preached a moving sermon to the general's troops in early December 1776 as the Continental Army retreated across New Jersey, and apparently had something to do with planning the battle of Trenton later that same month. John Rodgers met Washington during April 1776 in New York City and thereafter supplied the general with military intelligence which Rodgers's biographers at least have deemed vital to America's fate in the war. Aaron Ogden rose to a position of eminence with the New Jersey Continental forces and helped Washington plan an attack on Staten Island in November 1780. Richard Stockton's mother, Hannah Boudinot Stockton, idolized the country's Father and sent him a series of panegyric odes which eventually weared even that great rock of imperturbability.\textsuperscript{25} In spite of that literary imposition, Washington was often a guest at the Stockton's estate, Morven, in Princeton. When Washington passed through the village in 1790, he asked to dine with Richard Stockton, John Witherspoon, and Samuel Stanhope Smith. The latter subsequently received unsolicited commendation from the general as an excellent instructor of youth.\textsuperscript{26}

Washington's associations were particularly numerous with Elias Boudinot and Ashbel Green. In July 1775 Boudinot had been the first colonial official to respond to Washington's plea from Boston for powder. He had accepted the post of commissary of prisoners only after Washington's personal intercession, and he later received assurances from the general that he would make good to Boudinot any unreimbursed expenses that he incurred in providing for imprisoned continental. Boudinot had the dubious honor of forwarding his sister's poems to Washington, and the more agreeable honor of formally thanking the general on behalf of the Confederation Congress in 1783 for Washington's contribution toward winning the war. He made up a committee with Henry Knox and Alexander Hamilton to inform Washington of his reelection as president-general of the Society of Cincinnati in 1787, and two years later chaired the congressional committee that staged Washington's festive reception in New York as president-elect. When the seat of government moved to Philadelphia, Washington even bought his cider from Boudinot, whose apple trees had achieved wide renown.

Ashbel Green was valedictorian at Princeton's 1783 commencement when Congress and Washington attended the exercises. He embarrassed the general on that occasion by his fulsome praise, but later received Washington's personal thanks in a private conversation in Nassau Hall. After Green became a chaplain of Congress in 1792, he dined in company with Washington once a month while Congress was in session, and he also served as spokesman for Philadelphia's ministers in their annual message to the president. While Washington was for Boudinot an honored friend and colleague, he was an object of veneration for Green. The highest compliment that Green could pay to the personality of his mentor, John Witherspoon, was to write, "he had more of the quality called presence—a quality powerfully felt, but not to be described —than any other individual with whom the writer has ever had intercourse, Washington alone excepted."\textsuperscript{27}

Participation in the American Revolution amounted to much more than a casual series of incidents to be endured and quickly forgotten. Trustees joined a number of the new institutions, and participated joyfully in the celebrations, which kept revolutionary patriotism alive. Several of the veteran officers belonged to the Society of Cincinnati, and several joined Washington benevolent societies when these arose in the early 19th century. Laymen like Boudinot as well as ministers like Rodgers, Green, and Armstrong...
preached patriotic homilies on the Fourth of July.28 Published sermons testify to the fact that many of the ministers exploited special fast days to rekindle the patriotic spirit.29 A biographer of John Woodhull, who had been a chaplain at the battles of Long Island and Monmouth and who lived much of his long life in a house on the site of the latter battle, reported talking to the elderly minister in the winter of 1818-1819: “His reminiscences of the olden times, and especially of the events of the Revolution, seemed inexhaustible; and what rendered them the more interesting was, that he scarcely spoke of anything of which he was not himself a sharer or a witness.”30 The biographer of James Armstrong, volunteer private in the New Jersey militia before becoming a chaplain, told a similar tale: “It was interesting to observe how the celebrations of the Cincinnati and other kindred societies,—while they furnished an opportunity of reviving his old associations, and renewing his intercourse with many of his old friends, served also to quicken his patriotic zeal, and work up his spirit to the tone of other days. When, by reason of his infirmity, he was not able to sustain himself in a long march through the streets, I have given him my arm to prevent his falling by the way.”31

The sentiments that trustees shared with other Americans in commemorating the death of Washington suggest that he served as a symbol for deeply held values of great emotional significance. The eloquent, but reserved Samuel Stanhope Smith began his oration in the New Jersey state house with this invocation: “Great God! we adore thy Sovereign Providence, which hath smitten the father of his country, and left a nation in tears.” Soon, it was the world that Smith called to mourn: “Friends of humanity and of liberty throughout the world! It is for you to weep!”32 Eighteen days earlier Alexander MacWhorter had ventiled a more elemental grief: “Washington the great!—Washington the admired! 

29 Sermons on special fast or thanksgiving days were published by Green (1798). Miller (1798), Woodhull (1790), Clark (1812), and Bayard (1813).
31 Ibid., p. 305.

—Washington the beloved! is no more. . . . How extensive the stroke! How deep the wound!”33

When the board of trustees gathered at Princeton in September 1806, it did so as a tightly knit body. Its members enjoyed respected positions in society, they partook of a predilection for Presbyterianism and Federalism, and they shared a great number of connections beyond their common concern for the College of New Jersey. But what they shared most of all were memories of the times that tried men’s souls and the aspirations for the nation which had been born in the revolutionary period.34

The Trustees After 1807

When the Princeton board met on April 6, 1808 for its first meeting of that year, its ranks included six new men. Three of the old trustees had died during the previous year: John Bayard (January 7), the Reverend William Boyd (May 17), and the Reverend Alexander MacWhorter (July 20). Three others, bowing to the infirmities of old age, had resigned: the Reverend John Rodgers (age 80), the Reverend Azel Roe (69), and Jonathan Bayard Smith (65). Far more than a mere shuffling of interchangeable parts occurred when replacements for these men took their seats on the board. The new trustees of 1807, and the four others who joined them in the next three years, rapidly took the lead in directing the school. The turnover of trustees, combined with the great activity of the new board members, meant that virtually new leadership guided Princeton into the second decade of the 19th century.

New Trustees 1807

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Residence</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bayard, Samuel</td>
<td>Princeton</td>
<td>1767-1840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finley, Robert</td>
<td>Baskingridge</td>
<td>1772-1817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkpatrick, Andrew</td>
<td>New Brunswick</td>
<td>1756-1831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller, Samuel</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>1769-1850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richards, James</td>
<td>Morristown</td>
<td>1767-1843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodhull, George S.</td>
<td>Cranbury</td>
<td>1775-1834</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The retiring members took with them much more than just

their abundance of years. The two laymen with ministers Rodgers, Roe, and MacWhorter had been links to a rapidly vanishing world. These five were veterans of the Revolution, contemporaries and friends of George Washington and John Witherspoon, and were among the few who knew firsthand the exalted visions of the American Revolution. Aspirations for a “Christian Sparta” or “a Republic of Christian Virtue” did not entirely disappear with the passing of the revolutionary generation, but the ways in which educational leaders perceived godliness and freedom, morality and the safety of the republic, certainly were changing as the United States moved into its third decade.

To be sure, the new trustees came from the same circles that had produced the old. Samuel Bayard and Andrew Kirkpatrick were related to the Stocktons and Boudinots by business and personal associations as well as by kinship ties. Three of the four new ministers were related to the incumbent clergymen. George Spafford Woodhull was the son of a current trustee. Robert Finley married Esther Caldwell, daughter of a former trustee and ward of Elias Boudinot, and he had studied at different times with Ashbel Green and Joseph Clark. Samuel Miller had been a colleague of John Rodgers in New York’s United Presbyterian Church since 1793. Yet these trustees constituted a new breed. They were young, and none had served in the revolution.

As a group the new trustees lacked the comprehensive vision which the contemporaries of Witherspoon displayed. They were, rather, particularists, expert in forming voluntary societies, eager to press the claims of Presbyterianism, and anxious to professionalize the ministerial calling. In the face of these interests the comprehensive purposes of Witherspoon and Samuel Stanhope Smith received secondary consideration.

The founding of the Presbyterian theological seminary at Princeton illustrates the concerns of the new trustees.26 Ashbel Green as early as 1805 had begged the General Assembly to encourage the training of ministers.27 After an appeal by Archibald Alexander at the General Assembly of 1807 to the same end,28 trustees Green and Samuel Miller spearheaded the effort to found a seminary. They even seemed to have used gatherings of the college trustees to plan ways of establishing a theological school free from the influence of the college. In May 1808, after a board meeting, Miller wrote Green that, with respect to theological education, “Nothing can be done at Princeton at present, and perhaps not for ten years. I doubt whether a divinity-school there, with ever so able and eminent a professor at its head, could be made, in the present state of the college, to command the confidence and patronage of the Presbyterian Church.” Miller went on to express doubts that the college board could handle “a large and important divinity school,” and that all its members could “subscribe [to our] Confession of Faith.” A year later Miller commended Lyman Atwater to Green as someone who agreed with them that “the importance of Colleges” is measured “by the degree which they subserve the interests of the Church.”29 In short, the vision which Witherspoon promoted and Smith had nurtured of making the college a comprehensive training ground for church and state was giving way to a more sectarian conception of education.30

Although Miller led in this new direction, other trustees followed. Probably the single most important reason why the college did not recover from the riot of 1807 as it had from the fire of 1802 was that its trustees and chief supporters were redirecting their efforts toward founding a competing institution for the training of ministers. The college board proposed on June 6, 1810 to raise money for a new vice-president and professor of theology, but the effort fell flat. Many of those who had labored so profitably in the past to raise money for the college had turned their energies toward funding the new theological seminary.31 When the seminary finally came into existence in 1812, its board had a more than casual resemblance to that of the college. Of the seminary’s 30 original board members, 10 were college trustees.32 And of those

36 For a general overview of that development, see Mark A. Noll, “The Founding of Princeton Theological Seminary,” Westminster Theological Journal, 42 (Fall 1979), pp. 72-110.
37 Minutes of the General Assembly, pp. 341-343.
38 Quoted by John A. Mackey, “Archibald Alexander (1772-1851): Founding
seven were college trustees who had taken their place on that board after 1806. From another point of view, seven of the 10 trustees named to the college board from 1807 through 1811 became founding members of the seminary board.

The new college trustees departed in other ways from the more cosmopolitan disposition of their predecessors. Earlier trustees had been active in the Presbyterians church, but the new trustees of 1807 and after were not only active in the denomination but champions of its distinctives. Samuel Miller, after the broad catholicity of his Brief Retrospect of the Eighteenth Century (1809), became increasingly a champion of Presbyterian causes. In 1807 and 1808, for example, he published lengthy defenses of Presbyterian ordination against New York's Episcopalians, including John Henry Hobart, the student and lifelong friend of President Smith. In those same years Robert Finley showed a similar concern for denominational distinctions by publishing two defenses of Presbyterian baptism. Finley and George Spafford Woodhull also poured their energies into writing a series of catechetical aids for the General Assembly. In addition, many of the new trustees were active promoters of revival. Where earlier ministers had combined a concern for revival with broad interests in the general life of society, in the beginning of the 19th century the concern for revival became a more exclusive preoccupation. Under the influence of these trustees, the catholic atmosphere of Princeton began to dissipate. The school was on the way to becoming, as Wertenbaker put it, "a step-child of the church."

It augured ill for the fate of the college that the new trustees were leaders in the formation of voluntary societies. As Protestants committed themselves more and more to denominations in the early 19th century, they also turned increasingly to voluntary agencies to accomplish in society as a whole what the individual groups could not do by themselves. The effect on the College of New Jersey was to make it just one of the many "causes" which its board members supported. This contrasted with the attitude of earlier trustees who regarded the college as an institution to train students generally, and by so doing to fit them for leadership in all areas of church and state. In this shift toward a particularist conception of doing good in society, the new trustees were joined by some of the old. For reasons that are not clear—whether disillusionment with the earlier comprehensive goals of the college, a desire to move with the times, or a shift in the perception of society's needs—older trustees like Elias Boudinot also lent their energies to the creation of voluntary societies. The New Jersey Bible Society, founded in 1809, provides an example of this new concern. Six of its founding members were college trustees, four who had been on the board before 1807 (Elias Boudinot, Clark Wallace, John Woodhull), two who joined that year (Samuel Bayard, Kirkpatrick). In general, however, the newer and younger trustees were more active in the voluntary societies. Samuel Miller, for example, helped establish the New York Bible Society and the New York Historical Society, and Robert Finley's concern for the slaves eventually led to the establishment of the American Colonization Society (1816).

In sum, the trustees who came on to the board in 1807 were in the vanguard of those searching for new solutions to American problems. While none repudiated the revolutionary ideals which had held sway at Princeton since the 1770s, all were willing to adapt the mission of the college to the particularist, denominational, and voluntarist currents rapidly gaining ascendency among the country's educated and religious elite.

One of the reasons for the new character of the Princeton board was that ties between its ministers and laymen had been weakened by the passing of the old trustees. In particular, ministers John Rodgers and Alexander MacWhorter had been crucial mediators between lay and clerical interests. The removal of these two stal-
warts from the board, in conjunction with the death in 1807 of Ashbel Green’s wife (née Stockton), also in 1807, meant that the Stockton-Boudinot-Bayard lay axis had no remaining bonds of blood to the influential kin-network of ministers. The removal of laymen John Bayard and Jonathan Bayard Smith also left unfilled gaps in the boundary area between laymen and ministers. Jonathan Bayard Smith, for example, had worked with ministers Clark, Green, MacWhorter, Rodgers, and Tennent on the board of the Presbyterian General Assembly; he was a member of Ashbel Green’s Presbyterian church; and he was the Reverend Rodgers’s brother-in-law. This range of contacts with the clergy on the board simply did not exist for the new lay trustees.

It is probably not a coincidence that the disjunction of clerical and lay interests on the board, witnessed in planning for the theological seminary, became increasingly evident after 1807, for MacWhorter, Rodgers, John Bayard, and Jonathan Bayard Smith particularly had served in their persons to draw lay and clerical interests on the board together. An offhand remark by Elias Boudinot in 1809 suggests some of the tensions that had emerged between the two groups. It is even possible that this statement had specific reference to the efforts of college trustees to found a Presbyterian seminary, for it was contained in a letter to the Reverend Edward Griffin on theological education: “I have wished, among other improvements in Theological Studies, a Professorship of Common Sense & Prudence was established in our Seminaries. I really have known so many ruinous Errors in practice, among our pious & zealous Ministers, for want of this celestial quality, that I am sure it is of more importance than is generally believed.”

Boudinot’s general comment was hardly a sign of absolute rupture between the laymen and the ministers on the Princeton board. It did, however, coincide with a rapidly growing domination of board activity by ministers. And it is one further bit of evidence to suggest that the trustee changeover in 1807 struck a telling blow against the unity of lay and clerical purpose at Princeton.

The board reflected the special interests of the new members at once, for they involved themselves immediately in the affairs of the college. From 1807 through 1812, the year President Smith resigned, all six of these new members were among the 14 most active trustees (out of 26 total). New trustee Samuel Bayard, who left the board in 1810 to become treasurer of the college, was from 1807 to 1810 the most active board member during the entire tenure of President Smith.

Just as noticeable as the rapid participation of new trustees is the increasing influence of ministers on the board. Under Witherspoon and during Smith’s early years, laymen—the Bayards, Boudinots, and Stocktons—were clearly the most active and influential board members. After the great fire of 1802, clerical involvement increased rapidly until clergymen dominated the board’s decisions in President Smith’s last years. While many ingredients undoubtedly contributed to this new state of affairs, one important factor was the passing from the board of two influential laymen, John Bayard and Jonathan Bayard Smith. Perhaps even more importantly, clerical trustees had lost the vital link to the laymen supplied by John Rodgers and Alexander MacWhorter, and evidenced diminished confidence in the Boudinot-Stockton-Bayard connection.

Historians of Princeton have treated the student rebellion of 1807 as a crucial stimulus for trustees to increase their stifling oversight of the institution. Board members did indeed tighten their control as a result of the disturbance. It was at the same time, however, a substantially new trustee board which did the tightening. It was, ironically, a board in which clergymen took a larger share of the leadership at the same time that they directed their major interests toward the founding of a seminary. After 1807, fewer of the board’s ministers had intimate ties of kinship or shared interest with its laymen. The older lay trustees were either reducing their involvement in college affairs or turning their attention in other directions. The board’s newer laymen had neither the vision for the school nor the single-minded commitment to it which the preceding generation had displayed.

Under the influence of the new trustees who joined the board in 1807, the college began to move away from the ideals that had dominated Princeton since the revolution. Ties to the past had been broken, as had ties between the board’s lay and clerical interests. While the new members were no less concerned to save the nation and strengthen the church, they looked for new means to accomplish those goals. Now it would be through voluntary.

50 Hoyt, Elias Boudinot, p. 250.
agencies, revival, and ministerial education, instead of through revolutionary idealism and an organic union of political and religious aspirations. The trustees were still concerned about the flourishing of the college, but they had other vineyards to tend and could accept a certain languishing at Nassau Hall.

Music in a Nineteenth-Century Parlor

By CAROLINE MOSELEY

It is my purpose in this article to introduce Chronicle readers to the little known collection of early 19th-century sheet music in the Princeton University Library, and, in doing so, to describe the typical musical fare of America in this period. I am a singer with a special interest in antebellum vocal music. One day last spring I was speaking with Marti Black, library assistant in the Music Collection. She was shelving books inside “the cage,” a locked area which houses the older and rarer material in the collection. Through the wire mesh, I happened to notice a volume labelled “19th Century Sheet Music,” and I asked if I might look at it. This, I discovered, was one of 69 bound volumes of sheet music (largely vocal, some instrumental) that comprise the Princeton collection.*

The collection is made up of over 3,000 pieces† dating from the 1820s through the Civil War period. Sheet music published in the 1840s through the 1860s, however, forms the bulk of the collection. Though not, of course, the largest representation of 19th-century sheet music, Princeton’s holdings in this area are significant and comprehensive enough to enable certain general conclusions to be drawn about the musical tastes of the time.

The music was donated at various times by many different donors; 22 of the volumes contain some indication of donor, but, for the rest, there is no record of acquisition. They seem all to be personal collections, belonging to private individuals. The volume bindings are similar. It was common practice in the 19th century to have sheet music bound by a local bookseller, and perhaps stamped with the owner’s name or initials. The covers were often embossed with stringed instruments, cherubic musicians, or a floral motif. The music itself was certainly valuable enough to preserve in binding, as it cost the equivalent of three to five dollars per selection. A favorite piece might be received as a gift, and valued

* I gratefully acknowledge the assistance of Alexander Wainwright and his staff of Marti Black; and especially, of Paula Morgan.
as such; many are inscribed, for example, “Maggie MacLaren from Uncle Morris.” If torn, the precious music was painstakingly sewn together by hand.

The name, if any, on the cover is almost invariably a woman’s name. “Maggie MacLaren” owned several of these volumes; “Hattie P. Dixon,” “Lizzie S. Paul,” “Augusta Smith,” and “Nettie” owned others. When only initials appear, a female name is often written on the music; “A.M.S.” is revealed to be “Anna Margaretta Stockton,” “S.E. Parish” is “Sarah E. Parish.” Most of the music in these volumes was probably played and sung by young women before a family audience. Music in the 19th-century home was, if not exclusively, preeminently the province of young women.

A gentleman, describing the ideal wife, said: “She must love and cherish music above all other arts and sciences . . . and when she sings her music must be such as will excite joy and grief, give pleasure and pain, and compose my disturbed thoughts, after being out all night.” Lowell Mason, the father of music education in this country, invoked the shade of Benjamin Rush to convince Americans that “vocal music should never be neglected in the education of a young lady; . . . besides its salutary operation in soothing the cares of domestic life, it has a still more direct and important effect . . . that is, the exercise of the organs of the breast by singing, contributes very much to defend them from those diseases, to which the climate and other causes expose them.”

Musical competence was encouraged, although excellence was discouraged: “It is never attained but at the expense of the domestic virtues.” Contemporary aesthetic did not, however, demand proficiency, as “Music’s highest and best influence is its moral influence.” Music was felt to be the “handmaid of virtue and piety. . . . It should be cultivated and taught, not as a mere sensual gratification, but as a sure means of improving the affections, and of ennobling, purifying and elevating the whole man.” This beneficent influence was best effected by refined lyrics: “Music alone soars on angel wings,” said Lydia Maria Child, “for she cannot express anything gross or wicked, unless united to unworthy words.”

So long as the young lady enunciated carefully, and sang with expression, technique was expendable, for, as Mason declared, “Goodness is more to be desired than greatness.” The presence of such elevating music in the home tended to promote “social order and happiness in a family,” to “smooth the brow of care,” and to create “a paradise of bliss.” A typical, or at least ideal, scene adorns the cover of the “Happy Family Polka.”

Browsing through the volumes in the Princeton collection, one can see a few familiar names and titles: Stephen Foster, for example, or “Home! Sweet Home!” Certainly the classical composers whose works entered the parlor (often via an arranger)—Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven, Chopin, Strauss, Bellini, Donizetti—would be easily recognized. Most composers and titles, however, are unknown today.

There are many titles which divert. For instance, anyone interested in American political history would linger over the “Harrison Anthem,” “The Battle of Buena Vista,” or “Clay’s Quick Step” (on which the partisan owner has written “Prince Hal”). Cultural historians might examine “The Burial of Allston” or “Jenny Lind’s Greeting to America”; social historians, the “Song of the Tee-Totaller” or “The Bloomer’s Complaint.” Princeton alumni might be interested in “Ode Sung at the Second Centennial Celebration of Harvard University, Cambridge” (“Fair Harvard! Thy sons to thy Jubilee throng . . .”) or “Les Charmes de New Haven.”

It is very tempting to browse. We should resist, however, the temptation to regard this music as a collection of charming and nostalgic, but essentially inconsequential, period pieces. The music in these volumes, although what we today might call popular rather than cultivated music, is the only music most Americans heard at the time. This is American music at mid-century, America was, after all, in her cultural infancy. Emerson’s clarion call to native American artists, the “American Scholar” address of 1837, was answered by writers, it was answered to some extent by

---

8 Mason, Normal Singer, p. iii.
9 Mason, Manual, p. 22.
11 Rather than burden the text with notes on each of the many songs mentioned, I refer the reader to the excellent index in the Music Collection. I refer only to pieces which are in the collection.
painters, but it was not answered by musicians. As for European music, Boston had its Handel and Haydn Society; opera and oratorio could be heard, but only in major cities. America in general was musically unsophisticated, if not illiterate. Thomas Bangs Thorpe writes of a backwoods character who doesn’t know the difference between those two Yankee marvels, a piano and a washing machine; and even in Philadelphia, William Tappan Thompson’s “Major Jones” reports, “I like the opery well enuff, all but the singin.”  

We can only be amazed at how limited were the musical resources of our ancestors, and how much they made of the resources which were available to them.

The sentimental ballad is the genre most representative of the collection, and most representative of contemporary musical taste. Foreign influence here is overwhelming. It was the era of American Romanticism, with an abiding attraction for foreign names and places. In addition, there was no copyright protection for songs which had been first printed abroad. The primary reason, however, that foreign music and musicians were in vogue was that Europe was still the arbiter of, in Washington Irving’s words, “the masterpieces of art, the refinements of highly cultivated society.” “The commonplace realities of the present,” represented by American music, could not yet hold their own against “the shadowy grandeur of the past,” represented by foreign musical influence. Thus, noted Emerson, “We preach America but practise Europe.”

Swiss and pseudo-Swiss songs abound; for example, the songs of the Rainer Family, such as “The Alpine Horn” and “The Mountain Maid’s Invitation.” The Rainers were a travelling musical troupe that toured America in the 1840s. The *Dial* testified, somewhat reluctantly, to their popularity: “It is very evident, that, at the present time, the simplest music is that which is the most kindly listened to; and for this reason, as well as their freedom from pretension, the Rainers have become favorites with the public.”

There are hundreds of Scottish and pseudo-Scottish songs, such as “Auld Robin Gray,” “Scots, Wha Hae Wi Wallace Bled,” and


Oh, when I'm dead and gone to rest,
Lay de ole banjo by my side
Let de possum an de coon to de funeral go,
For dey was my only pride.

Only a small number of minstrel songs were genteel enough, or "comic" enough, for the parlor trade. Stephen Foster's "Nelly Was a Lady" was widely popular:

Nelly was a lady—
Last night she died,
Toll de bell for lubly Nell—
My dark Virginny Bride.17

"Comic" songs such as "Jim Crow," sung "alla nigro," apparently amused all and offended none. "Jim Crow" is probably one of the few titles in the collection which is, for better or worse, as familiar to us as it was to its singers:

Weel about and turn about and do jis so,
Eb'ry time I weel about I jump Jim Crow.

Den go ahed wite fokes
Dont be slow,
Hop ober dubble trubble
Jump Jim Crow.

European classical music entered the parlor, but in considerably modified form. Classical music in general was watered down for American audiences. The "Swedish Nightingale," Jenny Lind, was an operatic and concert soprano, whose tour of the United States in 1850 was called by Dwight "this great ideal episode in our young national existence."18 A number of songs associated with

17 At least one contemporary musician found even Nelly too "dark" for comfort, and created words which he considered "more generally acceptable":

Jessie was a fair one,
Last May she died;
 Shed a tear for Jessie dear,
My bright, my gentle bride.

Jenny Lind are in the collection. Her programs would strike us as something akin to a “pops” concert. She sang selected arias of Bellini and Donizetti heroines; but hearing “Casta Diva” is in no way comparable to hearing Norma. Operatic and Handelian arias would share the bill with Swedish folksongs, “Auld Lang Syne,” and “Old Folks at Home.” What seemed high art, even to John Sullivan Dwight, is not what we today would consider as such. That the Princeton volumes contain some compositions by classical composers does not mean that the parlor musicians knew, or cared, very much about classical music.

Many arias were sold as sheet music, usually arranged, simplified, and translated; for example: “It’s Better to Laugh Than Be Sighing” or “Make Me No Gaudy Chaplet,” from Donizetti’s Lucrezia Borgia. Sometimes the melodies were adapted, with new words. Bellini is credited as the composer of “Katy Darling” (“They tell me thou art dead, Katy darling . . .”). “Come Brave with Me the Sea, Love” employs the melody of a duet in I Puritani, although the text bears no relation to the original.

The instrumental pieces in the collection are striking in their similarity. Some few are by classical composers, most are not. There are many military and heroic pieces: “Lafayette’s Grand March,” “Kosuth’s Welcome Polka,” and those composed to honor now forgotten regiments and commanders: “Fredonia March,” “Col. Brimmer’s Quick Step,” “Colonel Ellsworth’s Funeral March.”

There are hundreds of currently fashionable dance pieces—schottisches, polkas, quadrilles, redows, waltzes. Many are inscribed with suggested fingering, presumably for the benefit of the struggling parlor pianist. Young Maggie’s and Hattie’s strove to master such evanescent dainties as the “Just the Thing” schottische, the “Sunshine of Love Polka,” “Fanny’s Favourite Waltz,” and “The Sociable.” Although the girls did not often promenade abroad, the latest in contemporary culture came to them via the “Electro Galvanic Galop,” “The Ocean Telegraph March,” and the “Minnehaha” polka.

The most astonishing inventiveness is displayed in the creation of elaborate variations and fantasies on well-known themes. Almost any fashionable song exists in forms other than the original. “Home! Sweet Home!” is arranged with variations, by several composers. We have the “Oh! Susanna Quick Step,” “Listen to the Mocking Bird” is rendered as schottische, cotillion, and quick step. Even the most pedestrian piece might be translated into some higher artistic sphere: “‘Grande Fantasie de Concert’ sur la Ballade Americaine: ‘Ben Bolt.’” The few operas known to the public were arranged, rearranged, and arranged again. Besides the many “Gems from the Opera . . .” and “ Beauties of the Celebrated Operas . . .” we find such unlikely products as the “Norma Quadrilles,” and, from La Sonnambula, the “Elvino Quick Step” and the “La Sonnambula Galop.”

These musical efforts represent a striving for a cultural ideal which was not yet realizable, something akin to “the desire of the moth for the star.” Perhaps the same impulse moved young Lizzie Hayes (vol. 25) to write on her music, “Mlle. Hayes, Drury Lane Opera.” Contemporary critic J. F. Tuckerman wrote: “We must hear much music, and weigh not only its momentary impressions, but its after influences . . . A cultivated taste is the fruit of time, experience, and thought.”

One’s impression of the collection is, inevitably, of quantity rather than quality. In the young democracy, music was to be the province, not of a European few, but of an American many. We must remember also that the value of music was felt to be moral as much as aesthetic, so that “quality,” however one might define it, was not a primary concern. George F. Root, a successful songwriter of the period, said, “It is an axiom that emotional or aesthetic benefit by music can come to a person only through music that he likes.”

The more music conformed to the popular taste, and the more of that music there was, the better. These sentimental ballads enlarged the sensibilities of an otherwise utilitarian people; the snippets of opera evoked a patriotic pride that America was not a cultural wasteland; “On the Blue Danube” and “The Swiss Boy” gave a sense of enlarged horizons, however spurious.

Henry David Thoreau tells us in Walden that, although he did not have a wide experience of the world, “I have travelled a good deal in Concord.” Perhaps to the people who owned our vol-deal in Concord. 

---

10 Tuckerman, Dial 1, 4 (April 1841), 539.
20 The Story of a Musical Life (Cincinnati: Church, 1891), pp. 19–20. Root composed such well-known songs as “Just Before the Battle, Mother,” “There’s Music in the Air,” and “The Vacant Chair.”
umes—especially to the young women—parlor music provided a way of "travelling" in Bayonne, New Jersey, Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania, and Watertown, New York. We now "travel" further, but probably with no greater pleasure, than the original owners of Princeton's collection of early 19th-century sheet music.

Library Notes

NOTES FROM THE EXHIBITION GALLERY

If the current exhibition, "Let Joy Be Unconfined: Three Centuries of Ballet," in the Gallery of Firestone Library from February 9th until May 4th, seems to concentrate especially on ballet in the 19th century it is not entirely accidental. The idea for the show was conceived about twelve years ago, with the hope of borrowing some of the collection of ballet prints owned by Allison Delarue. Mr. Delarue, a member of the Princeton Class of 1928, has been especially interested in the Romantic Ballet, and indeed has written many articles and at least two books dealing with the subject. He has lent generously from his well-known collection of 19th-century prints, porcelains, and books, and we are most indebted to him for offering what has become the nucleus of this exhibition. Other individuals who have been willing to lend from their collections, and to whom we are equally grateful, include Mrs. Alan S. Downer and Mr. William H. Scheide.

Because dance in general, and ballet in particular, have become immensely popular in this country in the last few years, this seemed a timely exhibition with which to usher in a new decade and an Olympian year. Therefore about two years ago we began to plan for the show. But it was also decided to attempt to lead up to the Romantic period of ballet in an historical way, and lead away from it to a point in the history more familiar to most of our gallery's visitors. Thus the exhibit begins with an etching by Jacques Callot depicting an Italian court ballet in 1617, and for all practical purposes ends with the Diaghilev Ballets Russes tour of America in 1916-1917. In this way a framework is set for the 19th century and the remarkable changes that took place in ballet during that time. At least in part because of some of these changes, ballet became a theatrical art no longer based in Paris, nor in Russia, but firmly ensconced in the United States, as it now is.

Historically, it is said to have been brought to France from Italy in 1581 by Catherine de Medici. It became a court spectacle, as it was to remain for two centuries, and the performers included
kings as well as the members of their courts. Professional danseurs performed with the courtiers, but women did not dance professionally until Le Triomphe de l'Amour in the late 17th century. The livret for this production, dated 1687, is included in the exhibition.

Paris continued to be the seat of ballet in the 18th century, and French was established as its official language. Through costume designs, prints, and a terra-cotta mould for a Sévres figure of a danseur français of the period, we are shown the elegance and grace—in imitation of the king—of the tradition. This courtly attitude also persists to this day, perhaps most obvious now when we watch dancers onstage move into position for performance. We see also changes in costume for both male and female dancers, to give more freedom of movement and to allow audiences a better view of the performers' skills. Choreographers are becoming important at this time, and the best of them are being trained in Paris.

But ballet is not yet airborne; dancers leap, but they do not yet lift one another into the air. And male dancers are still most important. This changed after about 1820, when ballerinas began to dance on pointe. From then on until the 20th century, women dominated the art of dance. Granted that they used partners to assist them in certain positions and lifts, and there continued to be some important male dancers, but it was the ballerina who drew audiences. This is obvious as one views the colorful lithographs of the Romantic Ballet in the 1830s and 1840s.

Two cases in the gallery are devoted to Fanny Elssler, the Austrian ballerina who brought the Romantic Ballet to the United States in 1840. Americans had seen dancers before, but never anything like Elssler's performances. A contemporary caricature by F.O.C. Darley, the gift of Sinclair Hamilton, depicts Elssler dancing across America with its inhabitants at her feet. Alas, "Modesty" is shown weeping in the lower corner!

European dancers continued to tour America for the next several decades, but ballet was declining as an art form. To be sure, it was no less theatrical than earlier, but it had begun to dissipate itself.

On September 12, 1866 a musical called The Black Crook opened at Niblo's Garden, a theatre in New York City. Although it is frequently referred to as "the first American musical," this is not in fact so. It was, however, the first musical to employ a
ballet chorus—imported from Europe—and this did change the American musical theatre permanently. We were fortunate to be able to borrow the original promptbook, in manuscript form, for this production, from the Players Club in New York City. Also exhibited, from Princeton’s Theatre Collection, is one of the earliest playbills for *The Black Crook*, dated September 22, 1866.

By the end of the 19th century many dancers were touring in productions which attempted to emulate the successful *Black Crook* in many ways, as several playbills in the exhibition reveal. Other dancers were finding employment only in the music halls. And Paris was no longer the seat of classical ballet as it once existed.

St. Petersburg, with its Imperial Ballet School, began to rise in importance after the middle of the century. Indeed, many dancers and choreographers had visited Russia, bringing of course the influence of Parisian ballet traditions. In 1869 Marius Petipa became ballet master at the Maryinsky—now the Kirov—Theatre and continued to preside there for more than three decades. His association with Tchaikovsky further influenced the history of ballet. Especially in Russia, composers became increasingly interested in creating music specifically for this dance form. The exhibition notes the reappearance of the solo male dancer, with photographs of Massine, Mordkin, Fokine, Nijinsky, and Adolph Bolm. And the rise of Diaghilev is presented.

The Otto Kahn Papers, housed in the Theatre Collection, have proved to be a rich source of material pertaining to Diaghilev and his Ballets Russes tour of the United States in 1916-1917. Partly for want of space in the gallery, partly because it might have proved difficult to surpass the wealth of this material, but mainly because three centuries of ballet—from ballet de cour to Diaghilev’s Ballets Russes, from Jacques Callot to Leon Bakst—are neatly rounded off in 1917, the exhibition ends at this point in its history. But it does not end without the reminder that in 1917 such a figure as George Balanchine was a student at the Imperial Ballet School, training to continue that history.

—MARY ANN JENSEN, Curator of the Theatre Collection
Recent Acquisitions—Manuscripts

The Records of Gabriel de Iturbe e Iraeta

The Manuscripts Division has recently acquired the records of a Mexican colonial merchant, Gabriel de Iturbe e Iraeta, and his family, mainly from the 1770s to the 1840s. Gabriel de Iturbe e Iraeta was an important member of the Consulado or Merchant Guild of Mexico, and a factor in the Royal Philippine Company. His uncle, Francisco Ignacio de Iraeta y Azcarate, called him from his native Anzuola in Guipuzcoa to become his partner in 1784, a partnership which lasted until his uncle’s death in 1797; Iturbe then settled the estate among his uncle’s Creole heirs, of whom Iturbe’s own wife was one. Iturbe continued the business until his son, Gabriel Manuel de Iturbe e Iraeta, took it over around 1810, in partnership with Leonardo Alvarez.

The collection has more than 2,000 pieces, and contains four letterbooks of Iturbe and family’s outgoing correspondence (1795-1834) and six volumes of incoming correspondence to Iturbe and his family (1770-1845), commercial and hacienda accounts, sermons, and miscellaneous family documents. Among the accounts, the earliest is the ledger book of Iturbe’s uncle, Francisco Ignacio de Iraeta, for 1780; he was associated with Juan José Gana in the Guatemalan cochineal trade, and married his daughter. The last ledger book, of the 1830s, chronicles payments, workdays, debts, and deaths of workers on the family sugar plantation near Izucar. A few manuscripts have become separated from the collection and are held by the New York Public Library; particularly relevant is the estate settlement of Francisco Ignacio de Iraeta, Iturbe’s uncle and partner.

These newly acquired records provide detailed information on the commercial relations, family connections, political involvement, social outlook, and activities of an important Mexican merchant of the day. Iturbe’s own letters, 1795-1801, give an extraordinarily detailed picture of his affairs during an important decade of New Spain’s economic and political history. His outgoing letters for 1808 and early 1809 are particularly valuable for they provide a view of the critical economic situation and the political events preceding the Mexican independence movement, initiated in 1810. There is material for research on topics of social history, family history, political and military history, as well as colonial trade and agriculture in such widespread areas as New Spain, the Caribbean, Philippines, Spain itself, and in non-Spanish trading areas. The manuscripts are easier to use because the Library has such a good collection of printed material on Spanish colonial trade and on Mexican history, and has excellent biographical and genealogical resources.

This account is based on a memorandum prepared by Professor Stanley J. Stein and Barbara Hadley Stein, formerly the Library’s Latin American bibliographer. We are very grateful to both of them.

—Jean F. Preston, Curator of Manuscripts

Recent Acquisitions—Coins and Medals

In 1979 the Numismatic Collection received gifts of considerable historic and artistic interest. Mrs. Henry L. Savage and her sister, Mrs. Joseph B. Townsend, presented their family’s collection of more than 150 medals, mainly struck to commemorate events of the First World War. They include work by some of the finest medallists of the day, Oscar Roty and his followers among them, and by three artists of wider reputation, Daniel Chester French, Paul Manship, and René Lalique. This gift complements the group of more than 80 medals of the same era given by H. Kenaston Twitchell in 1978 (Princeton University Library Chronicle, XL, No. 1, 180). For example, the Twitchell collection contained a single German war medal, Karl Goetz’s satirical comment on the Lusitanian’s last voyage ("Geschäft über Alles"); the Savage-Townsend gift adds one of the notorious English imitations in which the date of the event is given as May 5, anticipating the sinking by two days. The imitations were issued in far greater numbers than the original and did much to arouse Allied indignation against the Germans. With their absorbing subject matter and consummate technique, these two collections make a notable addition to the Library’s holdings of medals.

Equally fine but with a very different emphasis are a pair of commemorative pieces presented by Mr. and Mrs. Harold D. V. Shaw ’14: the beautiful gold dollar and quarter-eagle struck for
the Panama-Pacific International Exposition held in San Francisco in 1915. The design of the dollar, with its “idealized head of Labor” signifying progress through industry and commerce, makes an especially poignant contrast to the contemporary medals of the European war.

Dr. Pierre Bastien and Professor J.V.A. Fine donated a number of useful sales and museum catalogues to our numismatic reference collection.

—BROOKS LEVY, Curator of Coins

RECENT ACQUISITIONS—BOOKS

Cahn Gift

Certainly the 1920s were among the golden years of American book collecting. Capped by the highest prices paid to date for English literature in the Jerome Kern sale of 1929, the decade had seen several outstanding auctions of Americana, English literature, and illustrated books. During these years, and afterwards, a New Yorker who began a career in banking while in his teens, De Witt Millhauser (1884-1946), was putting together a fine collection of English books and Americana.

Recently, Mr. and Mrs. William M. Cahn, Jr. '33, son-in-law and daughter of Mr. Millhauser, have given to the Library in his memory a portion of his collection. The gift collection of 180 volumes is marked by choice copies of outstanding books in American literature and history, English literature, and English illustration. There are press books as well. Among the books in the recent gift are a Cato Major printed by Franklin in 1744 and a presentation copy of the 1769 edition of Franklin’s Experiments and Observations on Electricity. It is inscribed “To Lord Le Despencer,” who was Francis Dashwood, Baron Le Despencer, a friend of Americans in England and a supporter of their grievances against the ministry. (In his early years Dashwood was known as a rake, but in later life he turned his attentions to government, the Anglican Church, and the post office.)

There are nearly a score of American revolutionary tracts printed in London, Philadelphia, New York, and Boston between 1765 and 1783, as well as works by General Clinton and Lord Cornwallis. Laid in a copy of the proceedings against Major André are copies of letters in the hand of John Hanson, president of Congress, about André’s collaborator, Benedict Arnold. One is

a letter from Washington to Hanson announcing Arnold’s treachery, September 26, 1780, and another is Arnold’s letter to Washington, September 25, 1780. Caesar Rodney’s copy of the Proceedings of the first Congress, a first edition (New York, 1788) of The Federalist [Papers], John Hancock’s copy of The Constitutions of the Several Independent States of America (Philadelphia, 1781) with his bold signature on the title page, as well as many other books round out the American history section of the gift.

Turning to English and American literature one finds letters of Charles Dickens, R. W. Emerson, Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, Alfred Lord Tennyson, and one to Nathaniel Hawthorne. There are choice clusters of novels by W. M. Thackeray, H. B. Stowe, and George Eliot; the sporting novels of R. S. Surtees; poetry and prose fiction by R. L. Stevenson; a presentation copy of Whitman’s Democratic Vistas (Washington, 1871). Books both written and illustrated by George Cruikshank were also given as well as an 1853 letter of George Cruikshank to J. B. Gough, a fellow temperance advocate. Perhaps most striking is a copy of John Howard Payne’s Clari; or, The Maid of Milan (London, 1829), famous for the nostalgic song “Home, Sweet Home.” Payne wrote it to music by Sir Henry Rowley Bishop based on a Sicilian air.

Of the press books, perhaps the choicest group comprises seven books printed at Strawberry Hill, home of Horace Walpole.

A Rare Incunable

Mr. Arthur W. Machen, Jr. ’42 has given the Library a rare Italian legal incunable, of which only one other copy is recorded, that in the Vatican Library. Bound in contemporary half pigskin over oak boards, and bearing an inscription that it was once in the College of St. Peter at Strasbourg, the book is the Consilia et allegationes of Paulus de Castro, professor of law at Avignon, Siena, Padua, and Florence between 1394 and 1441. Paulus de Castro ranked with his teacher, Petrus Baldus de Ubaldis, and the earlier Bartolus (1314-1357) as among the leading jurists of the time, especially for his work on the Justinian Code. His Consilia went through five editions from the first in 1473 to that of 1580.

Mr. Machen’s gift is the first edition printed in Rome by Windelinus de Wila; it is, as well, the first book printed at Rome by Windelinus, whose career there lasted until late 1475. In total,
Windelinus's short-lived press issued eight titles, all of which are of considerable rarity since printing had only begun at Rome in 1465.

_Muggletonians_

In 1659, the religious options open to an Englishman were many. One could become a Biddellian, a Tryonist, a Salmonist, a Dipper, a Behmenist, a Cappinist, a Traskite, a Philadelphia, or even a Baptist, Presbyterian, or Quaker. On the other hand, if these groups did not suit, another might; or one could suddenly become the first member of a new sect.

To a London tailor, Lodowick Muggleton, and his cousin, John Reeve, inspiration came one day in 1659 when they both declared themselves the chosen ones of the Lord as, they said, was prophesied in Revelation 6:3. Their first inspired act was the discrediting of two rival prophets, John Tawny and John Robins. With Tawny and Robins out of the way, success was certain. Although Reeve died a few months later, Muggleton carried on their work. Preaching and pamphleteering, he gathered around him a small band of followers who continued to expound his doctrines after his death in 1697. The small sect survived many years and was active until its meetinghouse was destroyed by the Nazi blitz of London. It is said that the last member died only in recent years.

The Muggletonians believed that their founders had received "The Third and Last Testament of Our Lord Jesus Christ" and, indeed, until the day of judgment, this book was the last communication of God with man. These teachings, including the one that Heaven is just beyond the stars and six miles above the earth, were not subject to question.

Recently, the Library acquired more than 30 separately published Muggletonian tracts. Fifteen are pamphlets by Muggleton and are reprints by 1795 and 1856 by his followers of tracts first published during Muggleton's lifetime. One tract attacks a formidable rival, William Penn; there is also _A Divine Looking Glass_ and _A Looking-Glass for George Fox the Quaker_, and _other Quakers: Wherein they may see themselves to be Right Devils_. The remaining tracts are by other Muggletonian authors and were printed during the same period as these 15.

There are some unusual books, bibliographically speaking, among the Muggletonian tracts. One is titled _A Stream from the Tree of Life or, the Third Record Vindicated_. Even at first glance,
one is struck by the dissimilarity of the typefaces used for the title page and the text. Closer examination reveals the text to be the remaindered sheets of the 1758 edition of the book while the title page was certainly printed in the 19th century, perhaps when Joseph and Isaac Frost issued the supplements to the *Stream* in 1831.

Another book, Isaac Frost's *Two Systems of Astronomy*, juxtaposes the Newtonian system alongside the Muggletonian universe. Newton is proven unscriptural in the process. To demonstrate the point, the work is stunningly illustrated with 11 large oil color prints done by George Baxter, using his remarkable process soberly described by Professor Morris Martin in the Winter 1979 issue of the *Chronicle*.

**Two Poetry Collections**

Two collections of poet's works—one American, one English—have been recently given to the Library. From Edward Naumburg, Jr. '24 has come a collection of 22 books of poetry, plays, and translations by Robert Lowell and 18 books and periodicals about him. Outstanding in the Naumburg gift is a mint copy in original dust wrapper of Lowell's first book of poems, *Land of Unlikeness*, issued by the Cummington Press in 1944. It is copy 17 of 26 printed on Dacus paper and signed by the author.

From the late Hamilton Cottier '22 has come a comprehensive Walter de la Mare collection of more than 190 volumes. Covering not only de la Mare's poems, fiction, and criticism, the collection also includes a selection of books and articles about him. Several of the books are signed copies of limited editions. Hamilton Cottier's own annotated copy of the Walter de la Mare checklist, prepared in 1956 for the exhibition of his books and manuscripts at the National Book League in London, serves as a guide to the contents of the collection.

**The Valley of the Mississippi**

The revolutions of 1848 caused an upheaval in Europe which resulted not only in changes in government and social philosophy but also eventually led to a large emigration to America during the 1850s. From Germany, emigrés went to the Middle West, particularly Missouri, Illinois, and Wisconsin. One need only think of Chicago's John Peter Altgeld in order to realize the impact of these people on America.
It may well be that many Germans were inspired to go to the Middle West as a result of the artistic work of the English-German painter, Henry Lewis. Travelling up and down the Mississippi River during 1846-1848, Lewis sketched and wrote about the Indians, steamboats, plantations, and frontier towns of the valley. As a result of his trip, he painted a vast panorama 1325 yards long and 12 feet high. Mounted on rollers, it was designed to move through a large viewing frame before a standing audience, and in effect was a prototype of the modern motion picture. By 1851, Lewis had resettled in Germany and in Düsseldorf he prepared and published a 20-part book depicting the Mississippi Valley in 79 lithograph plates with text. His book *Das illustrierte Mississippial* is today "one of the finest published pictorial portrayals of the mid-[19th] century Mississippi Valley," according to one bibliographer. Princeton recently acquired a copy of the first edition (Düsseldorf: Ariz and Company, 1854-1858) from a Philadelphia bookseller for its collections of Western Americana, begun by Philip Ashton Rollins. This splendid and colorful copy joins a 1923 reprint kept in the rare book collections since its publication, in some ways as a "decoy" for the first edition.

—STEVEN FERGUSON, Curator of Rare Books

THE HAMILTON COTTIER COLLECTION OF ILLUSTRATED CHILDREN'S BOOKS

Children’s books make up a special class of printing far more revealing of historical, social, and cultural attitudes than is usually realized. A recent gift to the Graphic Arts Collection by Janet Cottier of her husband Hamilton Cottier’s library of illustrated children’s books presents an excellent survey of modern book illustration for children and makes a dramatic bibliographic contrast to the many historic children’s books already in the Library’s Graphic Arts Collection. The Sinclair Hamilton Collection of American Illustrated Books has a particularly rich showing of the extremely rare children’s books printed in America in the period between 1670 and 1870. The earliest American editions of such children’s classics as Mother Goose, Little Goody Two Shoes, Tom Thumb, and many others are found here. Despite the charm of the titles and woodcuts, these little duodecimos are often full of melancholy messages and the direst warnings of death and damnation for all little readers who do not maintain decorum and good behavior. The 20th-century child has come a long way in his reading since those stern, black-and-white outlooks.

The Cottier collection of children’s books is full of color, cheerful fantasy, and even mild naughtiness sanctioned in a way unthinkable in most early American children’s books. The collection contains over 500 volumes and includes an excellent reference collection and the nearly complete works of several of the best contemporary children’s book illustrators. These include Marie Angel, Edward Ardizzone, Nancy Burkert, Edward Gorey, Roger Duvoisin, Milton Glaser, Leo Leonni, William Pène du Bois, Maurice Sendak, Peter Spier, Brian Wildsmith, and many other notable artists. Also represented in the Cottier collection are several favorite children’s book illustrators of an earlier generation, including Randolph Caldecott, Richard Doyle, Kate Greenaway, and Beatrix Potter. Professor Cottier’s collection brings up to date an already interesting representation of children’s book illustration included in the earlier Princeton graphic arts collection of Elmer Adler and Frank Jewitt Mather. One of the most important discoveries of juvenilia is in the Graphic Arts collection of original prints formed by Elmer Adler. This is a broadsheet entitled *Tabulae Abcdaeae Pueriles*, printed in Leipzig by Valentin Bapst circa 1544. It represents one of the earliest and rarest of printed abecedariums to teach children their ABCs, and is described in the Pierpont Morgan Library exhibition catalogue of "Early Children’s Books and Their Illustration."

—DALE ROYLANCE, Curator of Graphic Arts
Princeton University Library Publications

CERTAIN SMALL WORKS
Robert H. Taylor
Of Collectors and Collecting; The Writer’s Craft; Anthony Trollope
164 pp. 9 illus. 1980. $10.00

F. SCOTT FITZGERALD’S ST. PAUL PLAYS, 1911-1914
Four plays written for the Elizabethan Club of St. Paul, Minnesota
Edited with an introduction by Alan Margolies
166 pp. 8 plates. 1978. $12.00

FINE BINDINGS: GOTHIC TO MODERN
Jamie Kleinberg Shalleck
European Handbound Books in the Princeton University Library
32 pp. 8 plates. 1976. $2.00

HARPSICHORD MUSIC OF HANDEL
Opera Overtures: Amadigi, Scipione, and Admeto
Oratorio Overtures: Samson and Athalia
Two Fugues: G minor and A minor
Performed by Edward Parmentier
Explanatory notes by J. Merrill Knapp
Stereo LP 1976. $7.50

SMYTH REPORT ON THE ATOMIC BOMB
Offprint of three Chronicle articles about the publishing history and bibliography of the official report on the first atomic bomb
(Printing and the Mind of Man, 422)
45 pp. 13 illus. 1976. $2.00

Princeton University Library Publications

FATHER BOMBO’S PILGRIMAGE TO MECCA
ed. Michael Davitt Bell
The first American novel, written in Nassau Hall in 1770 by Philip Freneau ‘71 and Hugh Henry Brackenridge ‘71
130 pp. 4 plates. 1975. $10.00

THOMAS MANN, 1875-1955
Stanley Corngold, Victor Lange, and Theodore Ziolkowski
62 pp. 9 plates. 1975. $3.00

DR. PANOFSKY & MR. TARKINGTON: AN EXCHANGE OF LETTERS, 1938-1946
ed. Richard M. Ludwig
151 pp. 8 plates. 1974. $10.00

GEORGE CRUIKSHANK: A REVALUATION
ed. Robert L. Patten
258 pp. 44 plates. 1974. $10.00

ESSAYS ON THE ROSSETTIS
ed. Robert S. Fraser
117 pp. 11 illus. 1972. $10.00

ROBERT LOUIS STEVENSON: A CATALOGUE OF COLLECTIONS IN THE DEPARTMENT OF RARE BOOKS
Alexander D. Wainwright
142 pp. 8 plates. 1971. $12.50
Princeton University Library Publications

WILLIAM BLAKE, ENGRAVER
Charles Ryskamp
intro. Geoffrey Keynes
A Descriptive Catalogue of an Exhibition
61 pp. 12 plates. 1969. $3.50

AN OTOMI CATECHISM AT PRINCETON
intro. Gillett G. Griffin
76 pp. 1968. $3.00

SELECTED MANUSCRIPTS
FROM THE CHESTER BEATTY LIBRARY
62 pp. 8 illus. 1967. $1.25

WILDE AND THE NINETIES
ed. Charles Ryskamp
75 pp. 12 illus. 1966. $3.50

THE PORTRAIT OF JOHN MILTON AT PRINCETON
John R. Martin
42 pp. 24 illus. 1961. $7.50

ON PLAYS, PLAYWRIGHTS, AND PLAYGOERS:
SELECTIONS FROM THE LETTERS OF
BOOTH TARKINGTON
ed. Alan S. Downer
110 pp. 12 plates. 1959. $3.00

Princeton University Library Publications

A LETTER FROM BENJAMIN FRANKLIN TO
BENJAMIN VAUGHAN CONTAINING SOME
OBSERVATIONS ON THE PRODIGAL
PRACTICES OF PUBLISHERS
intro. Carl Van Doren
14 pp. facsimile. 1949. $4.00

PAUL ELMER MORE
A Bibliography
Malcolm Young
40 pp. 1941. $2.00

Also Available, Published in Germany:

THE NEW WORLD IN THE TREASURES
OF AN OLD EUROPEAN LIBRARY
Catalogue of an Exhibition
on loan from the Herzog August
Bibliothek, Wolfenbüttel, held
in Princeton University Library
September 24-October 17, 1978
164 pp. 86 illus. 1976. $5.00
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