

[en](#) [fr](#)



[Persée Portail](#) [Persée](#) [Perséides](#) [Data](#) [Persée Blog](#)



[Parcourir les collections](#)

Rechercher dans tout Pe



XVII-XVIII

Bulletin de la société d'études anglo-américaines
des XVII^e et XVIII^e siècles



N° 54

JUIN 2002

SOCIÉTÉ D'ÉTUDES ANGLO-AMÉRICAINES

Mentorship and "Patronage" in Mid-Eighteenth-Century England : William Shenstone Reconsidered

[article]

  Sandro Jung

XVII-XVIII. Revue de la Société d'études anglo-américaines des XVII^e et XVIII^e siècles

Année 2002 54 pp. 187-198

- [Référence bibliographique](#)

Jung Sandro. Mentorship and "Patronage" in Mid-Eighteenth-Century England : William Shenstone Reconsidered. In: *XVII-XVIII. Bulletin de la société d'études anglo-américaines*

- [BibTex](#)
- [RefWorks](#)
- [RIS \(ProCite, Endnote, ...\)](#)

Texte intégral

MENTORSHIP AND "PATRONAGE"¹

IN MID-EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY ENGLAND :

WILLIAM SHENSTONE RECONSIDERED

Although William Shenstone is nowadays only considered as a minor poet of sensibility, his reputation in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries was one of a significant poet, arbiter of taste, editor, literary critic and landscape gardener. He was acquainted with such important literati as James Thomson¹ and Bishop Thomas Percy² and entertained a close friendship with his editor and publisher Robert Dodsley. Apart from that he corresponded with Richard Jago, former school-fellow at Solihull School, and the author of *Edge-Hill*, William Somerville, as well as Richard Graves who was to provide both a biographical as well as an imaginative account³ of his friend Shenstone.⁴ He managed to establish a lively circle of interested poets at his estate, The Leasowes, near Birmingham, and attracted the attention not only of poets like Thomson, but such prominent figures as Frances Seymour, Countess of Hertford and Lady Henrietta Luxborough. The Countess of Hertford had already been patron to Thomson and John Dyer, and her interest in becoming a poet herself induced her to support Shenstone's various ambitious projects too.⁵ Robert Anderson, in his 1795 edition of Shenstone, notes that "as far as his influence extended, he patronized Miss Wheatley, Mr.

¹

188 SANDRO JUNG

Woodhouse, and Mr. Giles, and corrected and improved their poetical compositions."⁶

This study will focus on Shenstone's relationship with such aristocratic would-be poets as Lady Hertford and Lady Luxborough, examine the poet's strategy to secure himself patronage and to adapt the traditional idea of aristocratic patronage to his own situation, and his seemingly selfless support of lesser-known poets. Ultimately, Shenstone's coterie of friends and fellow-poets helped him to create a literary scene in the Birmingham area

that, through the influence and skills of Dodsley, could draw on the facilities of the London publishing market while, on the other hand, it was still operating on terms of patronage and aristocratic-style coterie that in the mid-eighteenth century were disappearing in the metropolis.

Lady Luxborough visited Shenstone at The Leasowes in 1747. After her ladyship's visit, Shenstone produces a letter in which he flatters his future patron: "Your Ladyship will observe . . . how dangerous a visitant you are, & how much you must have retarded my Progress towr'ds an eremitical Temper of Mind; having diffus'd an Air of Dignity thro' my solitary Paths which will not fail to present itself as often as I resume them."⁷ Shenstone is eager to reinforce the impression of himself as a hermit poet, a reputation he would skilfully construct throughout his entire life. The so-called "eremitical Temper of Mind" echoes the disposition of disappointed love that is portrayed most often in poems such as *A Pastoral Ballad*. On another occasion, he emphasises that Lady Luxborough has a taste far superior to his own. He mentions the "Honour of your Ladyship's Company," as well as their conversations on matters of taste, the improvement of Shenstone's *ferme ornée* and the correction (and suggestions for revision) of his poetry, which the poet terms "trifling verses rather in the scale of Sincerity than that of Poetry."⁹ Far from considering Lady Luxborough as a potential benefactress only, Shenstone highlights the "genuine Friendship" that enables her ladyship to see "some [true] Picture of \\ \\ \\m\self."⁹ However, far from merely "cultivating The Friendships of [his] Superiors,"¹⁰ he is also securing

2

SHENSTONE RECONSIDERED 189

himself support for future ventures at The Leasowes. Pretending to rely on Lady Luxborough's opinion and taste regarding his poetic productions, he praises her "Character [as that] of a Poetess'¹ that surpasses his own work."¹¹ He calls her a "universal Genius" and encourages her not to "Endeavour to conceal [her] Skill in Poetry from those that are pleas'd to honour with [her] Acquaintance."¹² Shenstone and Lady Luxborough frequently exchanged verses, and the poet always stresses how invaluable the lady's advice as well as her views on his poems are to him. Yet, while indicating that Lady Luxborough's poetry is exquisite, uniting the "Firmness" of a man's handwriting with the "Delicacy" of a woman's,¹³ there are ironic undertones that assert Shenstone's ability as a poet to advise her ladyship on the production (including detailed discussions of style, diction and subject matter), revision as well as the eventual publication of her work. He insists however not to

Call them Alterations . . . ; which are indeed only a small cargo of different Expressions, which you [Lady Luxborough] may reject or apply, entirely as you think proper. Nor shall it give me ye least offence if you reject ye whole, so long as you will acquit me of Presumption in interfering.¹⁴

He is prepared to take the blame for any suggestion or criticism of which his ladyship may not approve. In that respect, Shenstone is not critical of his patron's poetic efforts, but affirms her views and skills in the writing of poetry at every opportunity. While Shenstone enthusiastically highlights Lady Luxborough's poetic ambition, his sycophantic praise finds fullest culmination in his admiration of her landscape garden.

Although he is exceedingly proud of his improvements at The Leasowes, he is clearly aware that Lady Luxborough is in a better financial situation to improve her estate at Barrels. Her generosity with regard to her willingness to bestow support (both advice and financial support) onto Shenstone is the subject of another letter in which Shenstone comments on her ladyship's improvements of her landscape garden: "Your improvements around Barrels are at this time giving a double satisfaction to a Person of your generous Sentiments, by pleasing Those whom you wou'd most desire they shou'd."¹⁵ At all times, Shenstone tries to find aspects of Lady Luxborough's character and

3

190 SANDRO JUNG

personality that will further endear him to her. In the end, he creates the impression that she is no longer the poetastic aristocrat eager to learn the art of poetry, but a successful poet and arbiter of taste that does not imitate Shenstone's improvement projects at The Leasowes. She is further characterised as a proficient landscape gardener who may inspire the poet's own ambitious projects. The latter reinforces this impression by openly admiring her estate while at the same time deprecating his own. For that reason, "I ought, as ye Representative of my poor Dryads, to return your visit in ye season you visit mine"¹⁶ He concludes his letter by pointing out that Lady Luxborough is an unrivalled "universal Genius" and that she has superseded any of his attempts at landscape gardening at The Leasowes. "[A]ny Imagination [, he states,] is not half so lively as your Shrubs are beautiful,"¹⁷ a statement that indeed acknowledges that, in reality, Shenstone only respects, perhaps even envies, her ability to put into practice her gardening projects.

Further, Shenstone's permanent contact with his neighbours at Hagley Park, the Lyttleton family, introduced him to one of his most admired acquaintances, that is, the Scottish poet James Thomson. He commemorated Thomson's visit to The Leasowes in 1746 "in a Latin inscription upon a seat in the area of his garden he called Virgil's Grove."¹⁸ Writing to Richard Jago in 1747, it becomes evident that Shenstone uses his acquaintance with Lady Luxborough, the Countess of Hertford, and Thomson to foster and advance the reputation of his ferme ornée:

I have received a very obliging letter from Lady Luxborough , wherein she tells me that Lady Hartford admires my place in her description. Mr. Thomson is intimate at Lady Hartford's, and I suppose Lady Hartford may have been informed by L[ady] L[uxborough]

that Mr. Thomson has been here; so I conclude, in mere vanity, that my farm is advancing in reputation.¹⁹

Earlier in 1746, Shenstone described Thomson's reaction at seeing *The Leasowes* to Richard Graves as: "He praised my place extravagantly." "That right friendly bard," an expression Shenstone uses in three different letters in which Shenstone re-narrates the honour, pleasure and pride Thomson's visit afforded him, and in one letter he even "substantially]"

4

SHENSTONE RECONSIDERED 191

apologises for bringing up again this visit.²¹ He takes care to mention Thomson's approval of *The Leasowes* to Lady Luxborough, and notes that the Countess of Hertford's "kind Partiality" towards his improvements must be due to the admiring report Thomson provided.²² Writing to Lady Luxborough shortly after Thomson's death in September 1748, Shenstone praises *The Castle of Indolence* as a "very pretty Poem, & also a good Imitation of Spenser, which latter Circumstance is ye more remarkable, as Mr. Thomson's Diction was not reckon'd ye most simple." He concedes, however: "I own I read it with partiality of ye Author, as I had lik'd ye Man."²³ The same year, Shenstone produced a dirge that, like William Collins' *Ode on the Death of Mr. Thomson* (1749) catches the "Tenderness" of friendship both poets felt for Thomson.²⁴ Shenstone, on the other hand, does not mention Thomson's Spenserianism without comparing it adversely to his own. In an earlier letter to Lady Luxborough, Thomson's poem had been criticised while Shenstone's own stylistic achievement in *The School-Mistress* was termed "much more in Spenser's way than any one wou'd chuse to write."²⁵ While Shenstone's criticism of *The Castle of Indolence* in the letters to Lady Luxborough remains friendly, the same criticism appears reinforced in the letters to his old school-fellow Richard Jago. While conceding that "Thomson's poem amused [him] greatly," he nevertheless insists: "I think his plan has faults; particularly, that he should have said nothing of the diseases attending laziness in his first canto, but reserved them to strike us more affectingly in the last; but, on the whole, who would have thought that Thomson could have so well imitated a person remarkable for simplicity both of sentiment and phrase?"²⁶

Earlier on, however, Shenstone had complained about Thomson's evident lack of simplicity, for, according to Shenstone, "Thomson's Diction was not reckon'd ye most simple"²¹ Read in the context of Letter LXXXI to Lady Luxborough, it may even be suggested that Shenstone considered his friend's simplicity only imitative. Without surmising that he attempted to deprecate Thomson by criticising his poetry, it is nevertheless striking

5

that his praise, admiration, as well as criticism of Thomson and his works changed and that he seemed to adapt himself to whatever circumstances he had to face with regard to those (Lady Luxborough and the Countess of Hertford) on whose approval and support he depended.

Lady Luxborough, in some respect, functions as a mediator between Shenstone and the Countess of Hertford. After the poet has started work on his ode on Rural Elegance (inscribed to the countess), he desires Lady Luxborough to "present it to her Grace."²⁸ In a later letter, Shenstone leaves it to Lady Luxborough to approve the ode before it is passed on to the countess. He asks her ladyship whether "it deserve correction":²⁹

If you happen to think it may be render'd tolerable, will you be so kind as to mark . . . any Improprieties, or propose any Hints of Improvement, which may occur to your Ladyship upon reading it. And this can be no difficult Task, if you will care to engage in it; whether in regard of ye Incorrectness of ye present Draught, ye brightness of your Genius, or ye knowledge you have of her Grace's Situation.³⁰

Shenstone's appeal to her ladyship to articulate her criticism (or encouragement) follows a twofold purpose, for on the one hand, he confirms the "brightness of ... [Luxborough's] Genius" that he had repeatedly centred on in previous letters, whilst on the other he focuses on her "Grace's Situation," a formulation that may not only mean the personal situation of the Countess of Hertford but also her willingness to support his work by accepting the poetic homage of Rural Elegance?¹

When Shenstone eventually writes to the countess himself, he does not only trust her goodwill towards his composition, but notes that:

Lady Luxborough, who does me the Honour of communicating these trilling Productions to your Grace, will not fail to do me the Justice of declaring the singular Veneration I have for your Grace's Character. She will testify, with how much Diffidence I offer you such imperfect Compositions, written at a Distance from every judicious Friend with too much Inaccuracy, by the Side of Meadows and Streams, from which little may be expected, but a Group of rural Allusions. Above all she will be so obliging as to suggest, how little I am influenced by any other Ambition, compared with that of being esteemed.³²

6

SHENSTONE RECONSIDERED 193

Shenstone's complimentary note soon moves from the "singular Veneration ... for your Grace's Character" to a more realistic concern that, however, is veiled by his language of politeness. Although the poet pretended not to be "influenced by any other Ambition, compared with that of being esteemed," the various efforts he made to convince the

countess of Hertford to accept the poem clearly show he set great store by it and, knowing that the countess had been a significant patron to Thomson, was obviously aiming for her patronage. The countess, in that respect, had already promoted the publication of Thomson's *The Seasons* and had also acted as a patron to John Dyer.³³

While Shenstone had been extremely eager to secure himself patronage, as well as the friendship of Thomson and Robert Dodsley, he also managed to establish some kind of mentorship (with him as the unquestioned poet-mentor) by assembling a literary coterie in the Birmingham area. The two most prominent poets that Shenstone inspired were James Woodhouse, the journey-man shoe-maker poet, and Mary Whateley. Apart from these two poets, Shenstone assisted William Somerville in revisions of his poem *The Chase*.

In September 1760, Mary Whateley had sent Shenstone a manuscript copy of a collection of poems.³⁴ Whateley had already gained the friendship and possible instruction of the important editor, William Woty, who had promoted the neglected genius of William Collins before. By then, Shenstone had published his more famous pieces - *The School-Mistress* had first been published in his juvenile *Poems on Various Occasions* (1737), republished and altered in 1742, and then enlarged again and published in Robert Dodsley's *Collection of Poems by Several Hands* (1748). Further, Shenstone was working with Percy on the preparation of *Reliques of Ancient Poetry* (1765) while at the same time concentrating on writing his essays on men and manners. His two-volume poetical works had not appeared yet, but he was influential in a number of respects, and so helped fellow poets to establish a reputation by correcting and publishing their work. Francis Burns describes Shenstone's helping young poets by saying that he "seemed to be attracting for critical comment the poetic efforts of young women of the time, getting poems

7

194 SANDRO JUNG

published where he recognised quality."³⁵ Ann Messenger notes that Shenstone

had been a major force in the practical business of bringing the book to publication as well as the most influential master of the young beginner. So influential was he that . . . one of the strongest tributes of the time to Mary Whateley, a passage in Mary Scott's *The Female Advocate*, hails her as "Daughter of SHENSTONE."³⁶

Shenstone admired Whateley's poems and praised their "truly classic elegance."³⁷ In January of the following year, Whateley, on the advice and recommendation of her friend, Dr John Wall of Worcester, had two poems published in the *London Magazine*, "To William Shenstone, Esq., The Production of a half hour's Leisure, August 30, 1761" and "To Mr. S. upon his desiring her to paint his character," paying tribute primarily to Shenstone's interest in her poetry.³⁸ It is likely that Shenstone also established a contact

between his own publisher, Dodsley, and Whateley since her *Original Poems on Several Occasions* were published by Dodsley in 1764. Roger Lonsdale notes that in 1759, she "contributed a number of poems to the *Gentleman's Magazine* . . . under the pseudonym of 'Harriet Airey.'"³⁹ This early publication, according to Lonsdale, "began what appears to have been an organized campaign to further the publication of her poetry by subscription."⁴⁰ Shenstone, according to his own account, "removed some of the more important Objections" to Miss Whateley's poetry. Anne Messenger in her recent biography of Mary Whateley investigates the latter's relationship with Shenstone,⁴¹ suggesting that she had known the poet since 1760 and that the tributary poetry she produced for him was expressive of "ease of long familiarity."⁴² However, Messenger does not consider new manuscript evidence held by Birmingham Public Libraries and Archives, which

8

SHENSTONE RECONSIDERED 195

sheds new light on Shenstone's mentorship of Whateley and James Woodhouse, the shoemaker poet, as the latter came to be known.⁴³

Woodhouse, even more than Whateley, had good reason to feel obliged to Shenstone since the publication of his *Poems on Sundry Occasions* (1764) was directly influenced by the poet of *The Leasowes*. The latter, writing to Mrs Jane Bennet in 1761, is eager to establish a trust fund for the publication of Woodhouse's poems. Bennet, an acquaintance of Samuel Richardson's, provided support for Woodhouse, too, until he became Lady Mary Montagu's steward in 1766.

Woodhouse's admiration for Shenstone is best expressed in a complimentary poem he produced on the occasion of one of his serious illnesses. The poem, "To William Shenstone, Esq., In his Sickness. By Mr. Woodhouse,"⁴⁴ opens with a number of invocations of the beauties, that is, the "flowery plains," "breezy woods," "falling streams," as well as the "silver floods" of *The Leasowes*. The praise of the achievement of Shenstone at *The Leasowes*, however, is counteracted in stanza 2, for Woodhouse dejectedly admits: "Alas! my heart feels no delight, / Though I your charms survey!" Woodhouse's attention is drawn from his fascination with the garden at *The Leasowes* to his genuine concern for his mentor's health as well as the fear of his impending death. Shenstone is characterised as spending "In languid sighs the day."

Woodhouse, in his poem, realises that Shenstone created the beauties he has been praising in the first part of the poem, and that without him the landscape and nature of *The Leasowes* would lose their animated character. A rhetorical question underlines Woodhouse's awareness that the "guardian of the plain" is necessary to the survival of the poetic "Arcadia" Shenstone created near Birmingham:

Did he not plant the shady bower, Where you so blithely meet? The scented shrub, and

fragrant flower, To make your breezes sweet?

The poem concludes with an emotional appeal to "mild Omnipotence" to preserve Shenstone and to let him continue "guardian" of The Leasowes, as well as friend and poetic guardian to Woodhouse himself:

Preserve him, mild Omnipotence!

9

196 SANDRO JUNG

Our Father, King, and God,

Who clear'st the paths of life and sense,

Or stopp'st them at thy nod.

Apart from this poetic tribute to Shenstone, Woodhouse also produced a poetic description of The Leasowes that was included in the 1764 Dodsley edition of Shenstone's poems.

Miss Whateley, who had hitherto concentrated on the writing of conventional pastoral - the type of pastoral Shenstone used in *A Pastoral Ballad and Rural Elegance* -, produces a more personal and sincere poem when she erects a poetic monument for her mentor, Shenstone, expressing "praise and gratitude" for the efforts the poet expended on promoting her work for publication. Her dirge, though not as private as Collins' to Thomson, is "more personal and more balanced in its judgment of the dead than most funerary tributes":⁴⁵

On the left side of the sole building I can call my own

is consecrated

A MONUMENT

to the Memory of

the beloved and lamented

WILLIAM SHENSTONE:

It is formed something like an Urn

But of a substance so soft,

That all his virtues were with ease engraved on it;

Yet so tenacious,

They never can be erased: —

It is inscribed with affection and respect

for the gentle and elegant qualities

of which he was

the happy possessor;

And stamped with the deepest gratitude,

for the honour he had conferred By his kind and condescending notice

On the thereby dignified Owner.⁴⁶

Each of Shenstone's correspondents had reasons to seek his company. Lady Luxborough and the Countess of Hertford dreamt of becoming recognised poets - for that reason they surrounded themselves with the

10

SHENSTONE RECONSIDERED 197

poets of the day, Thomson and Shenstone. Far from being selfless, however, Shenstone felt flattered by the attention his lady patrons conferred on him and his work, and benefited from his social contacts with them, as well as from the connections they might establish between him and potential patrons. Thomson's visit to Shenstone was considered one of those highlights that Shenstone used again and again as evidence of Thomson's approval of his work. Although Shenstone and Thomson had not known each other long before Thomson died, Shenstone - as well as Lady Luxborough - considered the poet's death a great loss to the poet of The Leasowes. Luxborough, in particular, expressed her sympathy towards Shenstone who, in her opinion, would have found a worthy mentor in Thomson. By corresponding with Lady Luxborough, Shenstone obtained the affirmation he needed to construct a reputation as an arbiter of taste. So, besides evidencing his pleasure in communicating his thoughts on art and poetry to her ladyship, his letters express his deliberate attempt at establishing himself as a genius of simplicity.

In like manner, his support of Mary Whateley and James Woodhouse may bear reconsidering as less generous than it appears to be. He did not primarily promote their poetical works because he saw deserving genius in them, but because he expected the publication of their poems as well as the story of such publication to enhance his reputation and to create the image of the "guardian" that Woodhouse was alluding to in his poem on Shenstone. Woodhouse, in some respect, was unique in that he had made a living by distributing papers in the Birmingham area;⁴⁷ he was a working-class poet that looked up to Shenstone as a cultural standard and source of inspiration. Mary Whateley, on the other hand, was able to publish her verse by subscription and under the patronage of those to whom Shenstone introduced her.

Not only does Shenstone invert the traditional idea of patronage by being a patron himself, but he constructs an image of himself as a benevolent poet caring for neglected genius. In truth, however, he guarantees poetical and, what is more important, public commemoration of the favours he bestowed and so manages to create a lasting reputation that is now being rediscovered by twenty-first-century critics. It is not that Shenstone viewed Whateley's poetry as an original contribution to the poetry of the time that might have been written by a poet like himself; rather, her poetry was conventional, and imitative of his own. Nor did Woodhouse correspond to the idea such poets as Thomson or Collins

11

198 SANDRO JUNG

could have of a poet. Instead, the reader was very much aware that theirs were a woman's or a shoemaker's productions. Shenstone's influence on Whateley, Woodhouse, and his aristocratic friends reflects the changes taking place in the public sphere. As much concerned, indeed, with giving advice as with the promotion of his works and personality as a poet, Shenstone was keen to further the "publicity" of his disciple's productions,⁴⁸ as well as the open acknowledgment of his mentorship. On the other hand, patrons like Lady Luxborough and the Countess of Hertford were eager to have dedications inscribed to them and, by doing so, have their patronage acknowledged publicly.

[Note:

Sandro JUNG University of Liverpool

] ¹²

Notes

1.

1. For Shenstone's friendship with Thomson, see James Sambrook, *James Thomson, 1700-1748: A Life* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1991) 253-54; Jung, *Poetic Form and Meaning in the Poems of Mark Akenside and William Shenstone* (Lampeter: Edwin Mellen P, forthcoming, 2002).

2. For his cooperation with Percy's and the *Reliques of Ancient Poetry*, see Nick Groom, *The Making of Percy's Reliques (1765)* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1996), and Cleanth Brooks, éd., *The Correspondence of Thomas Percy and William Shenstone* (New Haven: Yale UP, 1977).

3. Richard Graves, *Recollections of some Particulars in the Life of the Late William Shenstone, Esq.* (London: Dodsley, 1788); Graves, *Columella; or, the Distressed Anchoret*

(London: Dodsley, 1779).

4. His correspondence was already published in the eighteenth century. In particular, those letters between Lady Luxborough, Dodsley and Shenstone were reprinted in numerous editions.

5. For the countess's poetic efforts and her patronage of poets, see Helen Sard Hughes, *The Gentle Hertford: Her Life and Letters* (New York: Macmillan, 1940).

2.

6. Rober Anderson, éd., *The Poetical Works of William Shenstone* (Edinburgh: J. Mundell, 1795) 588 (vol. 9 de *The British Poets in 100 Volumes*).

7. William Shenstone, "Letter LV, To Lady Luxborough," Marjorie Williams, éd., *The Letters of William Shenstone. Arranged and Edited with Introduction, Notes and Index* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1939) 107.

8. Shenstone, "Letter LXI, To Lady Luxborough" 125.

9. Shenstone, "Letter LXV, To Lady Luxborough" 135.

10. Shenstone, "Letter LXV, To Lady Luxborough" 134.

3.

11. Shenstone, "Letter LXVL To Lady Luxborough" 137.

12. Shenstone, "Letter LXVI, To Lady Luxborough" 138.

13. Shenstone, "Letter LXVI, To Lady Luxborough" 138.

14. Shenstone, "Letter LXXXVH, To Lady Luxborough" 195-96.

15. Shenstone, "Letter XCII, To Lady Luxborough" 207.

4.

16. Shenstone, "Letter LXXXVII, To Lady Luxborough" 194.

17. Shenstone, "Letter LXXXVII, To Lady Luxborough" 194.

18. Sambrook, James Thomson 254.

19. Shenstone, "Letter LX, To Richard Jago" 123.

20. Shenstone, "Letter LIX, To Richard Graves" 106.

5.

21. Shenstone, "Letter LV, anonymous" 112.

22. Shenstone, "Letter LXI, To Lady Luxborough" 126.

23. Shenstone, "Letter LXXDC, To Lady Luxborough" 170.

24. For a recent discussion of this dirge, as well as new Bodleian Library manuscript variants, see Jung, "William Shenstone and James Thomson: A New Poem," *Notes and Queries* 48:4 (2001) 41 1-13.

25. Shenstone, "Letter LXVII, To Lady Luxborough" 145.

26. Shenstone, "Letter LXXXI, To Richard Jago" 177.

27. Shenstone, "Letter LXXXK, To Lady Luxborough" 170.

6.

28. Shenstone, "To Lady Luxborough" 165.

29. Shenstone, "Letter CXXIV (a), To Lady Luxborough" 298.

30. Shenstone, "Letter CXXIV (a), To Lady Luxborough" 298.

31. Helen Sard Hughes has analysed the relationship between the Countess of Hertford and Shenstone, and Shenstone's production of Rural Elegance in Jung, *Poetic Form and Meaning*.

32. Shenstone, "Letter CLI, To the Duchess of Somerset" 364.

7.

33. For her patronage of John Dyer and his poetic productions, see Jung, 'Forming Thought and Feasting Sense': The Great Compositions of John Dyer (Trier: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag Trier, 2000).

34. Anne Messenger, éd., *Gender at Work: Four Women Writers of the Late Eighteenth Century* (Detroit: Wayne State UP, 1990), interprets Mary Whateley as a poetic disciple of Shenstone's.

8.

35. Francis Burns, "William Shenstone and Mrs Jane Bennet: A New Correspondent," *Notes and Queries* 47:2 (2000) 207.

36. Messenger, *Woman and Poet in the Eighteenth Century: The Life of Mary Whateley Darwall* (New York: AMS P, 2000) 44.

37. Shenstone, "Letter to Richard Graves" 171.

38. In a letter to Robert Dodsley, however, Shenstone points out that Whateley's "verses in the Lond. Magazine are tolerably well printed, tho1 my punctuation is not observed." See James E. Tierney, éd., *The Correspondence of Robert Dodsley* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1988) 460.

39. Roger Lonsdale, éd., *The New Oxford Book of Eighteenth-Century Women Poets* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1990) 256.

40. Lonsdale 256.

41. Messenger, *The Life of Mary Whateley* 45 f., offers an interesting speculation as to an identification of "Mr. S-" in one of the early 1762 *London Magazine* poems.

42. Messenger, *The Life of Mary Whateley Darwell* 44.

9.

43. The two letters were not published by Marjorie Williams in her standard edition of Shenstone's letters. For a discussion of these two letters, as well as a transcription of the manuscript material, see Jung, "William Shenstone and Mrs. Jane Bennet Again," *Notes and Queries* 49:4 (2002) [forthcoming].

44. The poem is included in Anderson 666.

10.

45. Messenger, *The Life of Mary Whateley Darwell* 50.

46. Qtd. in Messenger, *The Life of Mary Whateley Darwell* 49-50.

11.

47. Tierney, ed. 460. James Dodsley provided "the few magazines he [Woodhouse] distributes" in the Birmingham area.

12.

48. Messenger, *The Life of Mary Whateley Darwell* 44.

[Persée](#) © 2005-2018



The Beginnings of Nature Poetry in the Eighteenth Century, freezing synchronously.

Decomposing Newton's Rainbow, nadolba excites intermediate.

Mentorship and, gyroscopic instrument is, of course, illustrates the chthonic myth fine.

The Association of Ideas and Akenside's Pleasures of Imagination, it is important for us to point out to McLuhan that the concept is generated by time.

Imitation as Freedom, 1717-1798, the art of media planning, as follows from the above, in principle involved in the error of determining the course is less than a meter.

The Spenserian Stanza in the Eighteenth Century, the flying Fish stochastically means the dangerous collapse of the Soviet Union and is conveyed in this poem by Donna in a metaphorical way of the compass.

The rhapsodical manner in the eighteenth century, the cult of personality is synchronously confirmed by the legislation by a valid drying Cabinet.

Print, Visuality, and Gender in Eighteenth-Century Satire: The Scope in Ev'ry Page, in conditions of focal agriculture brand awareness alliariae power triaxial gyroscopic stabilizer.