



The Women's Print History Project

Bluestockings in Print (feat. Betty Schellenberg), *The WPHP Monthly Mercury*

Produced by Kate Moffatt and Kandice Sharren

Mixed and mastered by Alexander Kennard

Transcribed by Hanieh Ghaderi and Sara Penn

Music by Ignatius Sancho, "Sweetest Bard," *A Collection of New Songs* (1769), played by Kandice Sharren

Project Director: Michelle Levy (Simon Fraser University)

Moffatt, Kate, and Kandice Sharren, hosts. "Bluestockings in Print (feat. Betty Schellenberg)." *The WPHP Monthly Mercury*, Season 1, Episode 9, 17 February 2021, <https://womensprinthistoryproject.com/blog/post/62>.

PDF Edited: 22 April 2024

This podcast draws on research supported by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada and the Digital Humanities Innovation Lab at Simon Fraser University.



Social Sciences and Humanities
Research Council of Canada

Conseil de recherches en
sciences humaines du Canada

Canada



Bluestockings in Print (feat. Betty Schellenberg)

Kate Moffatt and Kandice Sharren



In the ninth episode of *The WPHP Monthly Mercury*, “Bluestockings in Print,” hosts Kate Moffatt and Kandice Sharren sit down with Bluestocking expert Betty Schellenberg to talk about this famous group of eighteenth-century men and women and their relationship to print—which is, as it turns out, as complex as the group itself.

Informal in both dress and attendance, the Bluestockings were an intellectual group of men and women whose famous gatherings focused on conversation and wit. Admittance was more likely due to the subjects you studied or the wit you boasted than your social status, although the three famous hostesses of these gatherings—Elizabeth Montagu, Frances Boscawen, and Elizabeth Vesey—all held significant social positions. With members across England and Ireland, the Bluestockings met to discuss many of the important intellectual conversations of the day; published in a range of genres, including classical translations, fiction, and educational letters; and sent and received more than 8000 letters, some of which were collected and published posthumously.

“Bluestockings in Print” examines the relationship between these ladies of wit and learning and publication. Betty Schellenberg illuminates the many overlapping stories that impacted their presence in print, whether it be as authors or in dedications and subscriber’s lists (and explains the significance of “blue stockings!”).

Guest

A big thank you to **Dr. Betty A. Schellenberg** for joining us for this episode of *The WPHP Monthly Mercury*! Betty Schellenberg is a Professor of English at Simon Fraser University. Her interests in authorship, the Bluestocking movement, and interfaces between the print trade and scribal networks inform her publications, which include *Literary*

Coteries and the Making of Modern Print Culture (2016), *The Professionalization of Women Writers in Eighteenth-Century Britain* (2005), and *Reconsidering the Bluestockings*, co-edited with Nicole Pohl (2003). She is currently researching the eighteenth-century manuscript poetry miscellany and editing Elizabeth Montagu's correspondence with the Duchess of Portland for the *Elizabeth Montague Correspondence Online* digital project. And, like Elizabeth Carter, she loves long-distance walking, although Samuel Johnson would not have complimented her on her talents at sewing shirts and making puddings.

WPHP Records Referenced

Carter, Elizabeth (person, author)

Talbot, Catherine (person, author)

A Series of Letters between Mrs. Elizabeth Carter and Miss Catherine Talbot, from the year 1741 to 1770. (title)

Montagu, Elizabeth (person, author)

Austen, Jane (person, author)

Chawton House Library (source)

Garrick, David (person, author)

More, Hannah (person, author)

Letters on the Improvement of the Mind (title)

Chapone, Hester Mulso (person, author)

A description of Millenium Hall, and the country adjacent (title)

Scott, Sarah (person, author)

Burney, Frances (person, author)

Lennox, Charlotte (person, author)

Fielding, Sarah (person, author)

Fielding, Henry (person, author)

Richardson, Samuel (person, author)

Evelina, or, a young lady's entrance into the world (title)

Camilla: or, a picture of youth (title)

Northanger Abbey (title)

The History of George Ellison (title)

Pennington, Montagu (person, editor)

Montagu, Matthew (person, editor)

Montagu, Barbara (person, author)

Blue-Stocking Hall (title, author)

Florio: a tale, for fine gentlemen and fine ladies: and, The Bas Bleu; or, conversation: two poems (title)

Wollstonecraft, Mary (person, author)

All the works of Epictetus (title)

Yearsley, Ann (person, author)

Wheatley, Phillis (person, author)

Sensibility: a poetical epistle to the Hon. Mrs. Boscawen. By Miss H. More (title)

Mary the Osier-Peeler (title)

Morgan, Mary (person, author)

A Tour to Milford Haven in the year 1791 (title)

Works Cited

Eger, Elizabeth. *Bluestockings: Women of Reason from Enlightenment to Romanticism*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.

Ezell, Margaret J. M. *Writing Women's Literary History*. John Hopkins UP, 1996.

Schellenberg, Betty A. *Literary Coteries and the Making of Modern Print Culture*. Cambridge UP, 2016.

Schellenberg, Betty A. *The Professionalization of Women Writers in Eighteenth-Century Britain*. Cambridge UP, 2009.

Schellenberg, Betty A., and Nicole Pohl. *Reconsidering the Bluestockings*. Huntington Library, 2003.

Spunaugle, Emily D. "A Travel Writer Reconsidered: Recovering Mary Morgan's Mary, the Osier-Peeler," *ABO: Interactive Journal for Women in the Arts, 1640-1830*, vol. 10, no. 2, 2020.

Further Reading



Guest, Harriet. "Bluestocking Feminism." *The Huntington Library Quarterly*, vol. 65, no. 1/2, January 2002, p. 59–80

Haslett, Moyra. "Becoming Bluestockings: Contextualising Hannah More's 'The Bas Bleu.'" *Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies*, vol. 33, no. 1, March 2010, pp. 89–114.


Hurley, Alison E. "A Conversation of Their Own: Watering-Place Correspondence Among the Bluestockings." *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, vol. 40, no. 1, 2006, pp. 1–21.

Schmid, S. *British Literary Salons of the Late Eighteenth and Early Nineteenth Centuries*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2013.

00:00:00		[music playing]
00:00:08	Kate Moffatt (co-host)	“I am really very ill qualified, my dear friend, to give you any exact account of a scheme which I always drive as fast as possible out of my head, because I never think of it without a very painful degree of confusion; however I will answer your questions as well as I am able. First in regard to the size of the volume: I apprehend it may make a pamphlet of—what value the readers may guess, but about the price of one shilling, or eighteen-pence at farthest. Next as to additions to the manuscripts you have seen, there will be absolutely none. I never I believe writ anything but what you have seen; and I am very incapable of writing any thing now.
00:00:42	Kate Moffatt (co-host)	Indeed if I was not, I have no idea of sitting down and writing verses merely by way of putting them into a book. Indeed I am neither so stupid nor so ingrateful as to be insensible to the honor which is done me on this occasion: but I find all the encouragement that has been given me too weak to overcome my own diffidence and reluctance.
00:01:00	Kate Moffatt (co-host)	However I have promised Mrs. Montagu that if this scheme is not disapproved of either by my father or my friends at Lambeth, that I will give up my own scruples. If after you have been so good as to mention it to his Grace, no objection come from you, I will write to Mr. Rivington that he may speak to Mrs. Richardson about printing them directly.”
00:01:18	Kandice Sharren (co-host)	In this 1761 letter from Elizabeth Carter to Catherine Talbot, Carter discusses arranging the publication of her 1762 poetry collection, <i>Poems on Several Occasions</i> , an octavo volume of 104 pages dedicated to the Earl of Bath. Both Carter and Talbot were associated with a group known to posterity as the Bluestockings, who, beginning in the 1750s, hosted informal gatherings devoted to intellectual conversation. These gatherings played a vital role in encouraging women’s intellectual lives, and in later decades, prominent writers including Frances Burney and Hannah More also had strong connections to this group.
00:01:59	Kandice Sharren (co-host)	Despite the prominence of the Bluestockings, they did not necessarily or frequently publish their writing. As Carter’s letter indicates, she only published her poems at the urging of friends, and expresses a reluctance to discuss the prospect. Her addressee, Catherine Talbot, would remain largely unpublished until after her death, despite being widely respected as a lady of wit.

00:02:21	Kandice Sharren (co-host)	Instead, much of their writing was circulated in manuscript, often in the form of letters. However, the early Bluestockings did not eschew publication entirely and much can be gleaned about their intellectual commitments, relationships, and manuscript practices from their strategic uses of print.
00:02:40		[music playing]
00:02:48	Kate Moffatt (co-host)	Hello and welcome to <i>The WPHP Monthly Mercury</i> , the podcast for <i>The Women's Print History Project</i> . The WPHP is a bibliographic database that collects information about women and book production during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. My name is Kate Moffatt—
00:03:03	Kandice Sharren (co-host)	and I'm Kandice Sharren—
00:03:04	Kate Moffatt (co-host)	and we are long-time editors of the WPHP, and the hosts of this podcast. On the third Wednesday of every month, we'll introduce you to anecdotes, puzzles, and problems related to recovering evidence of women's involvement in print.
00:03:17		[music playing]
00:03:24	Kate Moffatt (co-host)	We are, here at the WPHP, occasionally haunted by the fact that our database only accounts for women's writing that appeared in print, not manuscript. But print and manuscript are not mutually exclusive, as the Bluestockings demonstrate: friendships formed at informal gatherings and through letters are reflected in print publications, through dedications and subscriber's lists. The WPHP's bibliographic data can provide evidence of or point us towards what exists beyond the bounds of print, or how the printed works included in the WPHP can help inform what we see existing in manuscript.
00:03:56	Kandice Sharren (co-host)	To help us sort through our questions and analyze some of our findings, we're joined for this episode by Dr. Betty Schellenberg. Betty Schellenberg is a Professor of English at Simon Fraser University. Her interests in authorship, the Bluestocking movement, and interfaces between the print trade and scribal networks inform her publications, which include <i>Literary Coteries and the Making of Modern Print Culture</i> in 2016, <i>The Professionalization of Women Writers in Eighteenth-Century Britain</i> in 2005, and <i>Reconsidering the Bluestockings</i> , co-edited with Nicole Pohl in 2003.
00:04:30	Kandice Sharren (co-host)	She is currently researching the eighteenth-century manuscript poetry miscellany and editing Elizabeth Montagu's correspondence with the Duchess of Portland for the

Elizabeth Montagu Correspondence Online digital project. And like Elizabeth Carter, she loves long-distance walking, although Samuel Johnson would not have complimented her on her talents at sewing shirts and making puddings.

00:04:53 

[music playing]

00:04:50 Kandice Sharren (co-host) So first off, thank you so much for joining us on this episode, Betty. We're very excited to talk about the Bluestockings with you and hear some more of your expertise on this subject.

00:05:16 Betty Schellenberg (guest) Thank you so much for inviting me. I'm always thrilled to talk Bluestockings. And I think I discover more about them in a way every time I try to articulate this odd sort of phenomenon [Kandice laughs]. So it's a great opportunity. Thank you.

00:05:32 Kandice Sharren (co-host) To warm us up, we just want to start by chatting a little bit about how the Bluestockings weren't a particularly formal society, which raises a lot of questions about how we establish who was and who wasn't a Bluestocking, and how someone might join the Bluestockings or come to be affiliated with them. How do you navigate that kind of tension between them being a recognized phenomenon, as you said, and an informal group that shifted and changed over time?

00:06:07 Betty Schellenberg (guest) Yes. It's really important to remember and know that the Bluestockings weren't a club where people were voted into membership, and so on. They were kind of like the *salons* in France, if people are familiar with that at all, but a loose social network of overlapping circles. And that only accidentally came to be called Bluestockings when they started making jokes about having a blue evening or the Bas Bleu getting together, or we were very blue last night [Kate laughs]—

00:06:46 Betty Schellenberg (guest) and what they meant—okay, this is a story that's often told, but just in case listeners haven't heard it—it seems to have originated with Benjamin Stillingfleet, a not very well-off philosopher and mathematician who was either known for showing up at social gatherings in his sort of coarse, blue wool stockings, rather than his finely knitted silk stockings.

00:07:15 Betty Schellenberg (guest) And so the expression started to be, well, “just come in your blue stockings, don't worry about dressing up.” So that actually tells us something important, I guess, about the group, which was that there was an element of informality to it, nothing like what we in our time would consider informality where you say “hey” and walk in the door

with a pizza [Kate and Kandice laugh] it was—everything was much more formal, but you didn't have to necessarily have a letter of introduction.

- 00:07:45 Betty Schellenberg (guest) You didn't have to be of a certain social class. So there was a kind of a radical informality to it, and a chance to cross social lines that tended to be very strict at the time. So you could be relatively poor. You could be somebody who was interesting simply because of what you had studied and read and your intelligence or your artistic accomplishments. You didn't have to be a member of the social levée.
- 00:08:17 Betty Schellenberg (guest) So, I think I've gotten quite a far away from the original question, but it was, how do you know who's a Bluestocking? Well, you don't really [Kandice laughs], except that they hung out with other people who were called Bluestockings, and there were kind of three basic nodes in the first generation. I guess we're probably going to talk about generations yet, but there were three main female hostesses: Elizabeth Montagu, Francis Boscawen (the wife of an Admiral), and Elizabeth Vesey, who was the wife of an Irish MP, so she spent her time between Ireland and England. And they were sort of the famous hostesses who had these gatherings that came to be associated with the Blues.
- 00:09:02 Kate Moffatt (co-host) We know that you've recently discovered a new collection of manuscript poems by a woman named Sarah Wilmot who was associated with the Bluestockings. And we wanted to hear a little bit more about how you identified the author and the fact that she was affiliated with the Bluestockings, which as you say was—it's something you kind of have to puzzle through, right? There's no roster that you can just go through.
- 00:09:21 Betty Schellenberg (guest) Right. And even Bluestocking scholars hadn't really paid any attention to her name. Sarah Wilmot was the wife of a barrister who lived in Southern England, in Farnborough in Hampshire. And when I had the opportunity to hold a fellowship at the Chawton House library, which is a library dedicated to eighteenth- and nineteenth-century women's writing, it's located in the home of Jane Austen's brother, Chawton House in Hampshire and in the village of Chawton where Jane Austen's house is as well.
- 00:10:03 Betty Schellenberg (guest) So I had the opportunity to have a fellowship in that library. And I was given a folder, uh, containing three, small soft cover notebooks full of poetry, supposedly by Sarah Wilmot. And nobody knew anything about this Sarah Wilmot, but just as I started to read the poems, I started coming across names like Montagu and Carter and Pitt. And I thought, "Whoa, wait a minute. I know those people! [all laugh] I hang out with them all the time intellectually."

- 00:10:35 Betty Schellenberg (guest) So I had to kind of try to piece together what this connection might be. So it actually came through the poetry. So there were a number of poems that were referencing these key Bluestocking figures or addressed to them. And there was one that sort of went through this whole list of learned and famous women and ended up at Monague as the pinnacle of Parnassus, the mountain of the poets.
- 00:11:03 Betty Schellenberg (guest) So I thought, okay, she obviously wrote that poem to send to Montagu—they had to have been friends or acquaintances. There was a poem talking about a chess match between some of them, like Monague and Carter and Pitt and this other woman. Yeah. So, there's an example of somebody who you wouldn't find on a roster, but who was in some way, obviously part of this network, but even had escaped the eye, I guess, of historians of Bluestockings who have been quite active in the last three decades or so, trying to put together this phenomenon and figure out what these social networks were about.
- 00:11:42 Betty Schellenberg (guest) But then when I went back and consulted with other colleagues who have examined the Bluestocking letters, we *did* find references to Mrs. Wilmont borrowing books from Elizabeth and her sister, or stopping by for dinner when taking her son to Eaton after a holiday, and things like that. So, and she's much tighter in the circles of David Garrick, the famous theatre manager and actor who is also often considered a Bluestocking. So it's all overlapping circles. Everyone knows everybody else. Sometimes they write letters, they have dinner, they borrow books, but you have to piece together that social network, which is a fascinating kind of research to do.
- 00:12:31 Kandice Sharren (co-host) So out of curiosity, are there any surviving letters, either from Sarah Wilmont or to Sarah Wilmont, to any of these other sort of key figures that you've identified or that you're aware of?
- 00:12:43 Betty Schellenberg (guest) I am trying to pursue that, which is a difficult thing to do in the time of COVID-19 especially [all laugh] but there are parish church records for the Farmborough church, and some amateur historian of the community, I guess, has put together a kind of a fact sheet about the eighteenth century in that church and Henry Wilmot was kind of the chief small land loaner in that area. So he was kind of the chief patron, if you will, of that little parish church. And so there are family monuments there, which helps with all the dates—somebody's put those online—but there are also, there's a reference to a poem that David Garrick wrote about the Wilmot's cat.
- 00:13:32 Kandice Sharren (co-host) Interesting! [laughs]

- 00:13:32 Betty Schellenberg (guest) Yeah! And it says, also, that there's a letter from Hannah Moore to David Garrick—they were very close friends—written when she was staying at the Wilmont's, written to Garrick. So I'd love to be able to track those documents down [Kandice laughs]. But in that poetry notebook, that started the whole thing, there is actually a poem that Mrs. Wilmont has written to David Garrick, thanking him for an invitation to come celebrate their wedding anniversary at a party.
- 00:14:07 Betty Schellenberg (guest) So there's a poem to Garrick and there's a poem from Garrick as well. Again, it's more—not direct correspondence between—at this point, Mrs. Wilmont and the Bluestockings, but quite a lot of circumstantial evidence.
- 00:14:24 Kandice Sharren (co-host) Oh, wow. I love it [laughs]. So Sarah Wilmont's poetry exists in manuscript, but our database the WPHP has a focus on print. So we want to talk a little bit about that relationship between a printed record and a manuscript record. You opened *Literary Coteries and the Making of Modern Print Culture* with a reflection on how your interest in the way professional authors networked led you to look more closely at the manuscript cultures embedded in the coteries they operated within.
- 00:14:54 Kandice Sharren (co-host) So we were wondering if you could talk a little bit more about some of the ways that we can find evidence of the relationships embedded in coteries, such as the Bluestockings and the manuscript culture that they created in print and printed documents.
- 00:15:14 Betty Schellenberg (guest) If it's okay, I think I'm actually going to back up just a bit from that question and say that, I think one of the hardest, or the most challenging issues of perspective when you're studying Bluestocking culture is to realize how print was not everything for them. Because like you said, so this fabulous women's print history database is turning up all this interesting material about women and their connections.
- 00:15:44 Betty Schellenberg (guest) But from the other perspective, from the perspective of being a Bluestocking, it was all about sociability. It was all about conversation and letters, really, and so when they did move into print, that was kind of an exceptional thing. And I would say it was always a project that had a kind of purpose, like here, I'm going to write I've written *Letters on the Improvement of the Mind* and this is something that would be great for girls education—
- 00:16:16 Kate Moffatt (co-host) Right.

- 00:16:17 Betty Schellenberg (guest) Or, I've written this essay on the genius of Shakespeare, and I'm going to defend Shakespeare against Voltaire.
- 00:16:24 Betty Schellenberg (guest) So there's always a moral or social purpose or something to going big. But most of the time the Bluestockings felt they were doing their social work through conversation and letter writing. And they achieved a lot of fame through those two things—you could, in those days, be a brilliant conversationalist or a great letter writer and people would copy your letters and circulate them. So you didn't necessarily feel there was any point to printing.
- 00:16:54 Betty Schellenberg (guest) So that is my little preamble to actually answering your good question about what do you see in print? I have tended to find the evidence of Bluestocking collaboration and networking in the paratext of printed works. So in the prefaces and the dedications, and so on. So *Letters on the Improvement of the Mind*, which I just mentioned, it's published, I think in 1772, by Hester Chapone, a very well educated, intelligent woman who had very limited means; she wasn't absolutely poor, but struggling to hold onto the middle class basically by her fingernails. And so she was proud.
- 00:17:45 Betty Schellenberg (guest) But Elizabeth Montagu was really good at forming friendships with women who were much poorer than her, but who had intellectual gifts and education. So she would set up this kind of dynamic. You can see her doing it in the letters where she's saying, "you have so much to offer me." She really builds them up and makes them feel like there's an exchange here.
- 00:18:10 Betty Schellenberg (guest) So even if you're staying in my house or travelling with me on my credit card, I'm the gainer from this. And I think she was sincere in a lot of ways. That's how she kind of got her education. So, she really encouraged Hester Chapone to publish this book. So when you read the preface of the book, you see Hester mentioning that it's dedicated to Montagu and saying that Montagu really encouraged her to publish this. Montagu edited it, gave her advice.
- 00:18:43 Betty Schellenberg (guest) I'm trying to remember, sorry, if this one is published by subscription or not, but often Monague would really push subscriptions with her friends. So you look at the lists of people at the beginning of the work. So we tend to read dedications and practices as though they're *pro forma*. And of course you compliment the person because you're dedicating to them. And there's something in it for you. And of course that's to a degree true.

- 00:19:11 Betty Schellenberg (guest) But I think those phrases, when Chapone says, "You helped me edit this. You encouraged it." Then you can go to Montagu's letters and you can see her sending letters to people saying, "Make sure you buy this book. It's going to be good. Make sure you support Mrs. Chapon, she's very deserving." So you see in the correspondence, the background work that went on behind those hints in print.
- 00:19:37 Kandice Sharren (co-host) It's interesting that you note print as secondary to the Bluestockings and kind of their literary project, because I think now the way we tend to encounter them is through the works that they printed. So my first encounter with the Bluestockings was reading *Millennium Hall* by Sarah Scott, which is a novel. But as you note, [laugh] that's not the norm for them, publication. Because *Millennium Hall* is a novel that first introduced me to the Bluestockings it has a special place in my heart, so we were doing a little bit of digging around *Millennium Hall* and perhaps other printed texts of the Bluestockings in the WPHP.
- 00:20:24 Kandice Sharren (co-host) And we noticed that in the sort of first generation (loosely defined) Bluestockings, there was not a great deal of fiction published, whereas sort of later people who came to be affiliated with the Bluestockings, like Frances Burney and Clara Reeve really made their reputations as novelists. And in the case of Frances Burney, kind of came to join the Bluestockings through her published work. So we were wondering if you could explain to us why this shift happened, why weren't more early Bluestockings novel writers and what changed?
- 00:21:05 Betty Schellenberg (guest) Oh, that's a really good question. I think it's about what happened around them to a large degree in terms of the status of the novel. So when mid-century women, when the Bluestocking women read novels, there's this interesting sort of double thing. They treat novels as though they're mindless, not quite trash, but it's just, it's fluffy entertainment—it's the kind of thing you look for when you'd sit down, we would sit down and watch a few episodes of a comedy on Netflix [Kandice laughs]. Something we all need to relax ourselves to relieve stress and things.
- 00:21:48 Betty Schellenberg (guest) So they will talk about reading novels. They'll read them, they'll read novels by Charlotte Lennox or Sarah Fielding while their hair is being dressed or woman will read it to her mother as they're walking in the garden, or when they're doing these long coach journeys that take forever and must have been excruciatingly bumpy and boring [Kate and Kandice laugh].

- 00:22:10 Betty Schellenberg (guest) And they read to each other, right? So novels often take that kind of place and they will say they have enjoyed them, but it's a silly thing and something that will occupy for a few hours. So the Bluestockings, I think, tended to see themselves as about something more serious; they had bigger fish to fry, so to speak [Kate and Kandice laugh], and they also tended to see novels as being published to make money. So if you didn't have to make money, then you wouldn't do that.
- 00:22:45 Betty Schellenberg (guest) And so Sarah Scott, who is Elizabeth's sister, does publish quite a few novels, some of them in translation from French, but that's because she does need money. So they didn't look down on her for it, they tried to help her find publishers and so on, but there's a little bit of sympathy or pity for somebody who has to do that.
- 00:23:04 Betty Schellenberg (guest) And then when you get to Frances Burney, and Jane Austen beyond that—Burney aligns herself with Fielding and Richardson who have done a lot to elevate the novel. And almost, I think, deliberately avoids mention of any female novelists before her.
- 00:23:27 Kate Moffatt (co-host) Interesting.
- 00:23:27 Betty Schellenberg (guest) She is really on the make—her family and her, they have to place themselves very carefully culturally to maintain and gain cultural prestige—and the approval of the Bluestockings party! [laughs] Right? So she works really hard to present her novels as elevated works.
- 00:23:51 Betty Schellenberg (guest) And she doesn't really, except for *Evelina*, she doesn't really use the term "novel." She talks about *Camilla* as a series of moral reflections or something, I'm, the phrase escapes me right now. But she really tries to place it in a category that's something *more* than merely a novel. Jane Austen can go on that little rant [Kate and Kandice laugh] in *Northanger Abbey* about—these are serious works! These are—they show the best and worst of human nature and teach so many lessons and she specifically refers to Burney novels.
- 00:34:36 Betty Schellenberg (guest) So there's definitely a sense by the time you get to the end of the century, that the novel can be a very serious form, that it has a literary tradition by now and the best of the novel is a really admirable thing. So, Burney can position herself in relation to that, I would say, whereas it wasn't really there so much in the middle of the century, even though we did have Richardson and Fielding starting to create that kind of respectability, I guess, might be the term for the novel.

00:25:10 Kate Moffatt (co-host) That's so interesting. Another thing that we found while we were digging through all of our WPHP data, we were finding all these things we didn't know about Bluestockings in print [Kandice laughs]. And something that we noticed in particular were these inconsistencies around lifetime publications, so stuff printed while the author was alive, versus posthumous publications in the WPHP title data in what we have.

00:25:35 Kate Moffatt (co-host) So, for example, all of the 35 titles we have by Catherine Talbot in the WPHP were published posthumously, while only one of Sarah Scott's titles, a 1797 edition of *The History of George Ellison*, appeared posthumously. Could you speak to the role of posthumous publication in relation to the Bluestockings and their cultural prominence?

00:25:55 Betty Schellenberg (guest) I think you're actually telling several stories there, Kate.

00:26:02 Kate Moffatt (co-host) Am I? [Laughs]

00:26:02 Betty Schellenberg (guest) No, I mean not confusing, but there's just a few really sort of important phenomena there. I mean, one of them is what I've already mentioned is publishing to make money. Probably a lot of what Sarah Scott published, she wasn't necessarily thinking of as a legacy work or a long-term thing. Her *History of George Ellison* is a story of a slave owner in the Caribbean—

00:26:32 Kate Moffatt (co-host) Right.

00:26:33 Betty Schellenberg (guest) Who makes his fortune there and then comes back. He's the gentleman of *Millennium Hall* who discovers Millennium Hall, but this is the sequel to *Millennium Hall*, which is a utopia female community. And so he tries to establish that perfect estate and way of life from what he's learned from the women of *Millennium Hall*.

00:26:55 Betty Schellenberg (guest) So *George Ellison* is more of a crossover work, I guess you could say. I mean, it's written to appeal to a male and female audience. It addresses issues of slavery and how to treat slaves well. It's one of those ameliorist works. It's not an anti-slavery work, which is not so out of the ordinary for the middle of the century. So it maintains kind of, I guess, a cultural relevance that many of Sarah Scott's works, however entertaining and well written they might be, did not.

- 00:27:28 Betty Schellenberg (guest) So, in contrast to that, the other story that I see with Catherine Talbot is she was just very reluctant to publish and she had that kind of reputation for conversation and manuscript based wit in her time. A lot of her work circulated and people would gawk at her and she just hated it [Kate and Kandice laugh]. When she'd meet strangers, and they would just be waiting for the learned lady to say something witty [laughs].
- 00:27:58 Betty Schellenberg (guest) She was quite a retiring and very self deprecating person, very hard on herself. And so she just would not publish. And her fellow Bluestockings wanted her to publish, so it's not that they were anti—they felt that the writing she did, she wrote something called *Reflections on the Seven Days of the Week*. That's probably one of the main and then *Moral Essays* or something, which was just a gathering of various of her writings.
- 00:28:26 Betty Schellenberg (guest) So, after her rather untimely death, she died, I think she was about 49 or so of cancer, her good friend Elizabeth Carter, who's one of the central Bluestockings—urged on by Elizabeth Montagu again—wanted, I think, to create a kind of legacy for her and a recognition of her, what they felt was her wisdom and her good sense in how to conduct a good life.
- 00:28:55 Betty Schellenberg (guest) And so they published this. And that kind of conduct writing, how to conduct yourself, especially for women was a very popular genre at the time. So it did extremely well and it might have done equally well if published during her lifetime. But there's a third story in there. This is a rather sad or distressing one that you may see as a pattern in the WPHP in general. And that is the frequently very short lifespan of women's reputations.
- 00:29:32 Betty Schellenberg (guest) So a woman may write a book and have it be widely praised. Sarah Fielding was a colleague of Sarah Scott and patronized by the Bluestockings and Henry Fielding's sister, and her novels were widely respected in her time, but just disappeared. Women for some reason, their reputations have not stuck. Their cycle of recognition is just much shorter than men's tends to be, and that's a very complicated phenomenon [Kandice laughs] that we could spend the rest of this podcast talking about.
- 00:30:18 Kate Moffatt (co-host) I was going to say, because it almost sounds like the posthumous publication is, in the case of Catherine Talbot for example, who didn't want to publish, but her friends were like, "Your stuff is so good. We want to publish it." So the publication after her death is almost like this sign of a life well and intellectually lived, if you know what I mean?

- 00:30:35 Kate Moffatt (co-host) She was so brilliant during her lifetime that of course her stuff was published posthumously. There's this really interesting cause and effect thing going on there that I think feels very almost Bluestocking-specific because publication during your lifetime was kind of such a tenuous complicated sort of thing. But now I find that fascinating.
- 00:30:56 Betty Schellenberg (guest) The critic Margaret Ezell, who has done a lot of important work on women and manuscript culture in this period, has written about the sort of posthumous collection of a woman's works. And, it's actually a fairly common phenomenon and possibly a way of doing rendering homage in a way to that person, but also perhaps a way of getting around the fact that it might be looked at as self-promoting to publish during your lifetime. It's hard to say, but it was not unheard of. It did occur. Yeah. Yeah.
- 00:31:42 Kandice Sharren (co-host) A lot of the posthumous publications that we did find in the WPHP as well are letters or correspondence. So we wanted to just chat about those a little bit too. So you've already mentioned that Bluestocking letters would probably be circulated beyond the people they were addressed to. They'd be copied, they'd be shared. So they're obviously not necessarily all written in a kind of private sense to begin with, but thinking about the idea of legacies and the way these letters were collected, we noticed that a lot of these letter collections were edited by family members.
- 00:32:25 Kandice Sharren (co-host) So for example, Elizabeth Carter's nephew Montagu Pennington edited her correspondence with Katherine Talbot as well as one side of her correspondence with Elizabeth Montagu. We don't have Montagu's letters included there. And Elizabeth Montagu's nephew, Matthew Monague [laughs] collected and edited—a lot of Montagu's [laughs]—
- 00:32:48 Betty Schellenberg (guest) Yeah—
- 00:32:49 Kandice Sharren (co-host) collected and edited her letters after her death. So what was the role of sort of family dynamics and family legacy in the printed forms that these correspondences took and how does that inflect the legacy of women's writing as we understand it from this group of writers?
- 00:33:08 Betty Schellenberg (guest) Another excellent double or triple barreled question!

00:33:15 Kandice Sharren (co-host) [laughs] Lots of stories? [laughs]

00:33:20 Betty Schellenberg (guest) Family definitely had a strong influence and influence that has, I think been cursed by many a subsequent scholar or editor because they were concerned—and I feel that we should be a little bit more charitable about this because I think we can understand how, if a person important to us dies and requests of us that we do certain things with their possessions or their online profile or whatever it is, we want to respect those wishes.

00:33:57 Betty Schellenberg (guest) And there also was an element of family pride, I guess, or family ambition involved. Elizabeth Montagu had risen socially quite a bit through her marriage had become very, very wealthy and very prominent through her lifetime. So her nephew was concerned not to publish anything that he would've considered a smear on her reputation. And so he wasn't concerned about her relationship with her husband or any of those kinds of things that we might consider to be the more dirty laundry that you might hide [Kate laughs].

00:34:34 Betty Schellenberg (guest) Although she had a fairly amicable relationship with her husband, he was more concerned about status. So when Montagu was a young woman before her marriage, when she was Elizabeth Robinson, she was more or less the companion to the much wealthier and more socially elevated Duchess of Portland who was only about seven years older than her, but much, much more wealthy.

00:35:03 Betty Schellenberg (guest) So she was essentially a semi-permanent house guest and companion, which meant that if the Duchess wanted to write letters, she could write letters but if the Dutchess wanted to talk, she had to talk, she couldn't write letters. Or if the Duchess' husband was suffering from gout, she might have to talk to him and entertain him or read to him.

00:35:26 Betty Schellenberg (guest) So Matthew Montagu actually suppressed a lot of that material, or he made it sound more like an egalitarian friendship than a companionship, which had certain associations with social inferiority and obligation. He also raised the elegance of her language. So where she used—

00:35:53 Kandice Sharren (co-host) Interesting—

00:35:54 Betty Schellenberg (guest) slang, really, it's sometimes kind of a little bit crude he cleaned that up—

00:35:59	Kate Moffatt (co-host)	Oh!—
00:36:00	Betty Schellenberg (guest)	or eliminated it. And then he did things like put two letters together and present them as one, but that everyone in the eighteenth century did that [all laugh]. So, they are important in that they have preserved letters for us that we might not have otherwise. But their choices are not necessarily our choices. So we do bump heads with them a little bit.
00:36:27	Kate Moffatt (co-host)	Yeah. I think that's really interesting, too, that he was so concerned with the status of it versus the dirty laundry of it. I find that so fascinating because it almost speaks to this whole, we've come up in the world, why remind people that we moved like that in the first place. That's really interesting.
00:36:45	Betty Schellenberg (guest)	I mean, there is a dirty laundry aspect to the Sarah Scott Montagu correspondence because Sarah married quite unhappily George Lewis Scott, who was the Prince of Wales, one of his preceptors or tutors. And it's a murky story that we don't really have sorted out totally. It might have been associated with Scott seeming to be a secret Jacobite, and this is the time of leading up to and including and shortly after, the rebellion of 1745.
00:27:24	Betty Schellenberg (guest)	So that was politically very tricky and very much the opposite to the position Montagu was in politically. There were possible suggestions of sexual incompatibility or impropriety and rumour—and Sarah Scott ended up spending the rest of her or some years after that with her close companion Lady Barbara Montagu. And it was, I think, a life partnership.
00:37:56	Betty Schellenberg (guest)	But nothing that was openly scandalous at the time, but there just seemed to have been a bit of rumour. So what happened was, if for some reason, Sarah Scott's health was really suffering and the family was really unhappy with this marriage or for whatever reason, Elizabeth Montagu really disliked it. And at some point her brothers and father went and forcibly seized Sarah out of that marriage.
00:38:27	Kandice Sharren (co-host)	Oh, wow!
00:38:27	Betty Schellenberg (guest)	And then Sarah became very, very ill. It was a terrible time. But those letters have just disappeared.

00:38:36	Kate Moffatt (co-host)	Oh. Disappeared! [laughs]
00:38:40	Betty Schellenberg (guest)	Yeah. They didn't accidentally disappear. So definitely Montagu, she wasn't going to leave that up to her nephew or anyone else. I mean, she was going to make sure that certain things just did not survive in the family record.
00:38:53	Kate Moffatt (co-host)	Right. Wow. So there's been so much, over the course of this interview, we've talked about how the Bluestockings were obviously not this official club or anything, but obviously very well known. And there was lots of people would refer to them and the term Bluestockings was well used.
00:39:12	Kate Moffatt (co-host)	And we noticed while we were doing all of our data digging in the WPHP, that while we have a number of titles by writers affiliated with the Bluestockings, we only have one title that actually references the group directly using the term Bluestockings. And it's this 1827 novel called <i>Bluestocking Hall</i> popularly thought to be by a man, and that authorship is now being contested, and it said that it was by a woman instead.
00:39:33	Kate Moffatt (co-host)	But we were wondering if you've encountered any other titles from the period that referenced the group explicitly. Because we thought it was fascinating that there was only one in the WPHP. And if not, do you think there's a particular reason for the absence?
00:39:47	Betty Schellenberg (guest)	I mean, one might be partly that initially anyway the term was fairly informal, as I said. It would be exchanged in letters, but it wasn't necessarily common usage for what we often call the first generation of the Bluestockings, which is kind of the late, very late 50s into the 70s.
00:49:08	Betty Schellenberg (guest)	And then we have the second generation where we've got people like Frances Burney and Hannah Moore and so on, and where the whole phenomenon is much more public and talked about. So you do have quite a lot of poetry and caricature, even, in contemporary newspapers and magazines, some of it will be praising Montagu. Others will be making fun of Montagu, satirizing her and her relationships. But they don't necessarily use the term Bluestocking. They will talk about Mrs. Montagu particularly, or talk about these assemblies in <i>Hill Street</i> or <i>Portman Square</i> .

- 00:40:52 Betty Schellenberg (guest) But there is one poem written by Hannah Moore, so second generation basically. Her name's come up a few times in 1786 called *The Bas Bleus; or, Conversation*, in which she really tries to capture what it is that is the essence, I think, of the social, cultural contribution, political contribution of the Bluestockings—
- 00:41:18 Kate Moffatt (co-host) Oh, interesting—
- 00:41:18 Betty Schellenberg (guest) she identifies it as conversation. So, talks about how it has elevated the moral tone. A big thing was that the Bluestocking assemblies—we always talk about them not playing cards. They set up this kind of dichotomy where cards represent, I mean things like gambling and excessive luxury and so on, but also just time wasting and empty pass time.
- 00:41:45 Betty Schellenberg (guest) And conversation on the other hand is potentially improving, right? And we learn things and especially women learn things through conversation because they didn't have formal educations. And the big thing about the Bluestocking assemblies or groups or networks was they were *mixed gender*. So women could learn from this conversation with men. And they were seen as contributing and as helping men get along, even if they were from different political parties and things.
- 00:42:18 Betty Schellenberg (guest) So Hannah Moore tries to capture that in the poem. It's a very positive poem. It's about 450 lines long and it was published, so there is material out there. But using the term “Bluestocking” became pejorative in around that time as well, not a hundred percent, but could be used pejoratively. And one theory about that is initially these assemblies were understood to be mixed gender.
- 00:42:56 Betty Schellenberg (guest) So we haven't talked about them, but they were men like David Garrick mentioned, but also George Lord Lytteltn, a politician baronet, William Poltney, Lord Bath, men that were very central to the group at various points. And so it was genuinely not seen as such a feminized phenomenon, but as it became more entrenched, I guess, and more publicized it was more associated with women. And—
- 00:43:22 Kate Moffatt (co-host) Interesting—
- 00:43:22 Betty Schellenberg (guest) so then a Bluestocking became a woman and you didn't really use the term for men. And then you get the 1790s, you get all the issues associated with intellectual women, like Mary Wollstoncraft, Mary Hayes, and the French revolution and the reactionary kind of social movements that came out of that. As a result, I would say the term really

soured, which is a kind of a disheartening thing similar to the problem of why do women's reputations disappear? If you are a scholar, a literary historian with feminist interests, you just have to deal with this over and over to constantly find it.

- 00:44:06 Kate Moffatt (co-host) Yeah. Constantly digging. And, sorry, this is mildly unrelated, but I now see in people's Twitter bios, or on the internet, they'll talk about themselves as Bluestockings. And it's this thing they're excited about. They're like, "I'm a Bluestocking. I am Bluestocking-esque." And I love that! That's almost this reclamation of being an intellectual woman, right? Which is a fun pushback.
- 00:44:27 Betty Schellenberg (guest) Right. Because it does definitely through the nineteenth century become associated with—I mean, it's not that there's no reason for critique [Kandice laughs] of aspects of Bluestocking culture. Yes, it's easier in retrospect than it was to poke at the efforts of these women. Elizabeth Montagu herself can be quite, don't quote me [Kate laughs] to all my various Bluestocking colleagues. She was an amazing woman in what she accomplished, but she could be really full of herself and pompous.
- 00:45:10 Betty Schellenberg (guest) And, that element of wanting to maintain her position in society led her to treat others sometimes in ways that were imperious and very interfering with their life choices. So that's not really admirable. And she was visible. She was so visible. She had this huge, fabulous new house with these massive assemblies. She might have 200 people there.
- 00:45:39 Kate Moffatt (co-host) Wow.
- 00:45:40 Betty Schellenberg (guest) And so if you're going to be the rich and famous, you become a target for criticism. And that tended to overlook what was really innovative and important about how they brought women into the public sphere and into sort of significant exchanges with power.
- 00:46:10 Kandice Sharren, interview (co-host) So, for our final question, you've just acknowledged that it can be very easy to critique people from 200, 250 years distance [laughs] but also that there can be strong resonances that you feel with these historical figures that we study. So we just want to close the interview by asking who your favourite Bluestocking is and why?



- 00:46:34 Betty Schellenberg (guest) Well, I probably tipped my hand already a little bit about it not being Elizabeth [Kate and Kandice laugh]. I admire her and she enabled a lot of what other more socially modest and less well- off women were able to achieve. So I'm not wanting to discount that at all, but I do think I started with the Bluestockings by reading her sister Sarah's correspondence with her.
- 00:47:05 Betty Schellenberg (guest) And Sarah is just so sharp tongued [Kandice laughs], she can be really quite snarky [Kate and Kandice laugh] about people they know in her letters to Elizabeth, probably she wouldn't have been maybe in another context. So right from the start, I kind of liked Sarah's edginess a little bit more than Elizabeth's concern about propriety and being the *noblesse* that has to oblige everybody [Kate and Kandice laugh].
- 00:47:21 Betty Schellenberg (guest) But, my real favourite is Elizabeth Carter, I think. And maybe it's just to end up with kind of personal affinities to people. And I would like to be more like her, but she was just this really down home, down to earth woman who lived in this tiny muddy village on the sea coast. And she really liked that!
- 00:47:47 Betty Schellenberg (guest) She didn't want to spend all her time in London or with the glittering society. She wanted to be in the country to be with her family. She never married. Her father totally supported her in that, he taught her Latin and Greek and he said, "it's fine if you just want to live a life of independence," but travelling home from London, she'd jump out of the coach at Canterbury and walk the remaining 16 miles home and—
- 00:48:30 Kate Moffatt (co-host) Incredible—
- 00:48:31 Betty Schellenberg (guest) everybody's like, "[Gasp] Is that safe?! You might faint by the roadside or something" [Kate and Kandice laugh] and she just, whatever, she just did it. I like her, the fact that even though she moved in very privileged society based on her accomplishments, she translated the stoic philosopher Epictetus from the Greek for the first time into English. And that was a real kind of blockbuster publication for her and really made an amazing reputation that lasted the rest of her life.
- 00:49:06 Betty Schellenberg (guest) She was perfectly willing to hang out with long time, female friends in Deal, in Canterbury, and just talk about silly things. And maybe I'll take the chance to just mention this famous quote by Samuel Johnson, who was a good friend of hers, who said something about Elizabeth Carter can make a pudding as well as she can translate Greek. [laughs]

- 00:49:39 Betty Schellenberg (guest) And that's really kind of irritated a lot [all laugh] for understandable reasons, right? Because it seems to be placing her into this domestic framework, even though she's such an accomplished intellectual. But I think you could look at it more charitably because they were good friends who respected each other. And I think maybe what he's saying, is what I'm trying to say too, that she was grounded. She was just kind of a real person and seems to have actually deliberately sought out having a kind of balanced life. So just not sitting at her desk all the time—
- 00:50:21 Kandice Sharren (co-host) Oh! What is that like? [laughs]
- 00:50:22 Betty Schellenberg (guest) but she did suffer. Yeah [all laugh]. We don't know anything about that, right? So I think that's a good example of a model that actually in some ways still kind of speaks to us. The need to be about other things. She did suffer badly from migraines and I don't envy her that, but otherwise I like her. Yeah.
- 00:50:48 Kate Moffatt (co-host) So good, so good. We love Elizabeth Carter. Was there anything else that you'd like to chat about Betty, that we didn't get to touch on during our questions at all?
- 00:50:56 Betty Schellenberg (guest) Oh, they've been great questions. It's been wonderful to talk about this. Maybe one thing that I haven't really thought about in preparation, but I feel like maybe I haven't done justice to, I alluded to it just in sort of two answers back, but what the actual influence of the Bluestockings might have been, since some of this, conversation is ephemeral, even letter writing. We have more than 8,000 letters between Elizabeth Montagu and her correspondents.
- 00:51:37 Betty Schellenberg (guest) So there's a tremendous legacy there in terms of insight into eighteenth-century culture and Bluestocking thinking and so on. But they were important in their time. They did really push forward a kind of egalitarian social framework, which, to be fair, it did not include the poor, the labouring poor. They were quite concerned that if Elizabeth Montagu patronized a shoemaker poet, she would be quite concerned that he didn't become "too proud." And "too ambitious."
- 00:52:17 Betty Schellenberg (guest) Hannah Moore had an episode like that with Ann Yearsley as well, which became quite notoriously public. But that aside, they did create these, for their time, quite egalitarian, social interactions, social spaces, I guess, would be a good term to use. And they advocated for women's education—and they proved, they showed, demonstrated women's capacity—in a way that really, I think, benefited a later generation of women like Mary Wollstonecraft, even though she had lots of quarrels with them.

00:52:59	Betty Schellenberg (guest)	So not literal quarrels, but bones to pick with them. So they were significant in their time. And I think they did things that were radical. My colleague, Elizabeth Eger, talks about how Elizabeth Montagu had this famous feather room where she collected, from all kinds of female friends, all these feathers, and made these huge wall hangings and things.
00:53:33	Kate Moffatt (co-host)	Wow.
00:53:34	Betty Schellenberg (guest)	Yeah, but she took something that women did do these little feather screens for fireplaces and sort of decorative arts, but she did everything in a huge, a big scale [all laugh]. So she took these very feminized and domesticated arts and turned them into sort of public phenomena, things that people wanted to come and see, and spaces in which literally opposition politicians could meet, and Persians, and probably Phillis Wheatley at some point, and people from all different walks of life were able to find an open door there. So I think it's a significant contribution—
00:54:32	Kate Moffatt (co-host)	Oh yeah—
00:54:32	Betty Schellenberg (guest)	even though there are aspects of it that might sometimes make us feel uncomfortable, that we might criticize.
00:54:41	Kate Moffatt (co-host)	Oh, marvellous. Thank you so much for joining us today, Betty. It has been an absolutely wonderful time being able to sit and chat with you about this.
00:54:50	Betty Schellenberg (guest)	Well, it's been my pleasure. I just love to talk Bluestockings and thank you for giving me the opportunity.
00:54:57	🎵	[music playing]
00:55:05	Kandice Sharren (co-host)	As our conversation with Betty indicated, there were more avenues than just print for intellectual women, like those involved with the Bluestocking circle, to circulate and engage with ideas—and print wasn't necessarily the most important of them. However, print can be an important metric for understanding the impact of women's writing and the relationships that shaped it to subsequent readers.

00:55:27	Kate Moffatt (co-host)	As Betty noted, paratexts, especially dedications and subscription lists, are helpful for discovering connections between individuals, particularly those of informal groups like the Bluestockings where no roster or official list of members exists. Paratexts can provide us with evidence of specific kinds of relationships, too— relationships of patronage, for example, can be found in introductions or dedications.
00:55:49	Kate Moffatt (co-host)	As Betty mentioned, Hester Chapone’s dedication to Elizabeth Montagu is a result of Montagu’s patronage and encouragement of Chapone’s writing. They can also indicate contact between particular people: Elizabeth Carter’s <i>Poems</i> was dedicated to the Earl of Bath, who she knew personally. We don’t have fields for these kinds of metadata in the WPHP, but when dedications appear in titles, those do get captured and are thus searchable.
00:56:12	Kate Moffatt (co-host)	When you search for “dedicated” in the title field, 201 results come up. Searching for names in the title field can also yield results: Frances Boscawen, who didn’t publish anything, appears in the WPHP title search because she had a poem dedicated to her by Hannah More: <i>Sensibility: a poetical epistle to the Hon. Mrs. Boscawen. By Miss H. More</i> , published in 1785. Print, here, despite Boscawen’s lack of publication, makes searchable the connection between the two Bluestocking women.
00:56:40	Kandice Sharren (co-host)	But, as our discussion of Betty’s discovery of Sarah Wilmot’s poetry shows, being an active member of a coterie was no guarantee of being remembered. Unlike Boscawen, Wilmot was not at the heart of a coterie network, even though she was integrated into it, and her poetry remained in manuscript, unknown until very recently.
00:57:03	Kandice Sharren (co-host)	However, even if Wilmot’s poetry had appeared in print, there was no guarantee that it would have been widely read or remembered—the issue of women’s comparatively brief shelf-lives ran through our conversation, exemplified by Queen of the Blues Elizabeth Montagu’s sister, Sarah Scott, whose novels, other than the consistently topical <i>Sir George Ellison</i> , ceased to be reprinted at all after the 1770s. Despite Scott’s very close relationship to one of the core Bluestockings, her reputation was not necessarily long-lived either.
00:57:36	Kandice Sharren (co-host)	And while we were completing this episode, another example of how even a combination of publication and savvy networking doesn’t guarantee longevity actually arose, when a comment left on the WPHP by Emily Spunaugle directed us to her recent research on the attribution of a pamphlet of poetry from 1798 titled “Mary the Osier-Peeler.”

00:57:59	Kandice Sharren (co-host)	Spunaugle was able to attribute this work to Mary Morgan, a writer best known for her successful 1795 travel memoir <i>A Tour to Milford Haven in the year 1791</i> . As Spunaugle points out, by not including her name on the title page of “Mary the Osier-Peeler,” Morgan “intentionally chooses not to advance authorship or even leverage this relative success of her previously published book as imprimatur for the osier poem.”
00:58:26	Kandice Sharren (co-host)	While Morgan’s embeddedness in Bluestocking networks likely did play a role in allowing Spunaugle to identify her as the author of this pamphlet, for over 200 years after its publication, it remained unidentified. Even within a single author’s <i>oeuvre</i> , both longevity and recovery can be uneven, determined by paratextual information as much as archival records and personal correspondence and connections.
00:58:54	Kate Moffatt (co-host)	As a project, the WPHP relies heavily on the work of other scholars to establish authorship—the intensive work of author attribution is something that our team just doesn’t have the time or resources for. If we pursued every rabbit hole that opened up before us we’d never get anywhere.
00:59:09	Kate Moffatt (co-host)	In the letter that we opened this episode with, from Elizabeth Carter to Catherine Talbot, she mentions a Mrs. Richardson in connection to the printing of a work. We did, of course, with our WPHP hats on, want to know more, but our initial searches in the WPHP, and sources like the <i>British Book Trade Index</i> , brought up dozens of Mrs. Richardsons involved in the London book trades. So which Mrs. Richardson was this? Did she ultimately print Carter’s poems?
00:59:33	Kate Moffatt (co-host)	The sources we usually rely on didn’t provide an immediate answer, in part because the digitized versions of Carter’s poems we have access to don’t include a colophon. More detailed research into Carter’s publishing networks could yield results, but that’s a level of research that we typically don’t have time to undertake.
00:59:50	Kandice Sharren (co-host)	As with many of the questions we asked Betty today, there is not one simple answer, but, rather, multiple overlapping stories that interact with larger historical forces. These determine which historical figures we can easily find out more about, as well as who we even find out about in the first place. While print publication increases the odds of a text’s survival, and therefore makes the people who produced it more likely to be identified, it is no guarantee of longevity.
01:00:20	Kandice Sharren (co-host)	However, the networked nature of print, much like the networked nature of the Bluestockings, provides pathways for us to identify new nodes—whether books, authors, printers, publishers, patrons, or protégés.

01:00:36		[music playing]
01:00:47	Kandice Sharren (co-host)	This has been the ninth episode of <i>The WPHP Monthly Mercury</i> , and the penultimate episode of Season 1. We will be returning on March 17th to finish the season with a celebration of Women's History Month. If you're interested in learning more about what we discussed today, we've compiled a list of suggestions for further reading and links to some relevant entries in the WPHP in a blog post that you can find at womensprinthistoryproject.com .
01:01:14		[music playing]
01:01:23	Kate Moffatt (co-host)	[outtakes] Hello!
01:01:28	Kandice Sharren (co-host)	Hello! [laughs]
01:01:28	Kate Moffatt (co-host)	I'm trying to be a lady of wit. Okay? [laughs]
01:01:32	Kandice Sharren (co-host)	Penultimate.
01:01:33	Kate Moffatt (co-host)	Penultimate [both laugh].