

Jane Barker's *A Patch-Work Screen for the Ladies*: Female Prose Fiction in the Menippean Tradition

Jing-fen Su

Assistant Professor, Foreign Language Center
National Chengchi University

Abstract

This paper aims at exploring the generic features of satire in Jane Barker's prose fiction *A Patch-Work Screen for the Ladies* (1723). I argue that the formal "hybridity" of the text attests to its affinity with the masculine tradition of Menippean satire. Barker innovatively adopts the metaphor of "a patch-work screen" as a device to sew up the otherwise loosely connected inset stories within the frame narrative. Such metaphor is associated with one etymological definition of satire: *lanx satura* in Latin, which literally means "a platter of mixed fruits offered to gods in religious ceremonies." Both metaphors denote the mixture of a variety of elements in one piece of work, which is a crucial feature in Menippean satire.

Barker's use of the "*harmonious Tea-Table Entertainment*" also forms a sharp contrast with Mikhail Bakhtin's theory of "heteroglossia" in the novel. Whereas Bakhtin emphasizes the *contesting* nature between dialogic voices or languages, Barker as a female writer underscores the significance of *harmony* despite the heterogeneity of the content and narrating voices in the metaphorical patch-work. Other characteristic elements of Menippean satire that I have investigated in Barker's text include: the mixture of prose and verse, the incorporation of various inserted genres, the creation of multi-tones and multi-styles, and the use of the convention of the satiric symposium in which all sorts of people from different walks of life are brought together to offer their distinctive opinions on certain topical issues or philosophical concepts. I also examine the implicit pattern of nature and country innocence as opposed to universal depravity in the City of London, which is reminiscent of "satirical scene" in classical satire.

By mapping out the Menippean features of Barker's prose fiction, this paper will contribute to the more ambitious project of formulating a female tradition of satirical prose fiction as opposed to and in relation to the masculine one.

Keywords: Jane Barker, *A Patch-Work Screen for the Ladies*, prose fiction, Menippean satire, Mikhail Bakhtin, the novel

珍·芭克《給仕女的拼布屏風》： 曼式諷刺傳統之女性散文小說

蘇靖茶

國立政治大學外文中心助理教授

摘要

本論文旨在探討珍·芭克散文小說《給仕女的拼布屏風》(1723)中的諷刺文類特徵。筆者主張該文本的形式「雜揉」乃顯示出其與男性曼式諷刺傳統的密切關聯性。芭克以創新手法採用「拼布屏風」之隱喻將文本敘事框架中看似鬆散的嵌入故事緊密縫合在一起。此隱喻與諷刺文類一字源定義有關：即拉丁文 *lanx satura*，意指「在宗教儀式中獻給神祇的混雜水果盤」。這兩種隱喻皆指明一件作品中包含混雜多樣的元素，此乃曼式諷刺文類之關鍵特徵。

芭克於文本中所創造之「和諧的茶几娛樂」與巴赫汀小說理論之「眾聲喧嘩」形成強烈對比。巴赫汀強調對話聲音或語言之**相互競爭**本質，而身為女性作家的芭克則強調**和諧**之重要性，儘管其拼布屏風之隱喻蘊含了內容與敘事聲音之異質性。筆者在芭克《給仕女的拼布屏風》文本中所探討的其他曼式諷刺文類元素尚包括：混合散文與詩歌形式、嵌入各種文類、創造多重聲調與風格，以及使用諷刺討論會，在其中來自社會上各行各業的人們齊聚一堂，針對某特定時事議題或哲學概念發表其個別獨特意見。筆者亦檢視文本中自然與鄉村天真無邪與倫敦市普遍道德淪喪之隱含對比模式，正呼應古典諷刺文類中的「諷刺場景」。

本論文藉由分析芭克散文小說中的諷刺元素，企圖對進一步建構相對於／相關於男性諷刺傳統之女性散文諷刺傳統有所貢獻。

關鍵詞：珍·芭克、《給仕女的拼布屏風》、散文虛構文類、曼式諷刺文類、巴赫汀、小說

Jane Barker's *A Patch-Work Screen for the Ladies*: Female Prose Fiction in the Menippean Tradition¹

Jing-fen Su

Introduction

In a review of Kathryn R. King's 2000 book *Jane Barker, Exile*, Josephine Donovan considers Jane Barker (1652-1736), who produced four "protonovels" and one volume of poetry, "the most interesting and important of early modern women writing in English," even above the universally acclaimed Margaret Cavendish, the Duchess of Newcastle, whom Donovan regards as "a close second" ("Review" 305). Descending from two royalist families of her father and mother, Barker received classical education along with her indulgent brother and was quite well read in classical texts, as evidenced by her frequent allusion to classical writers such as Horace, Juvenal, and Sir Philip Sidney in her own writings. Some critics such as Jeslyn Medoff (1988) and Carol Shiner Wilson (1997) suggest that as a royalist and Roman Catholic, Barker may have known the leading male satirist John Dryden in London and read his translations of ancient classical authors. Moreover, as Rebecca Mills points out, Barker "straddled the two worlds of the coterie tradition and the emerging scene of print culture" (103). The manuscript of her poetry was initially circulated privately among members of the privileged class before it was published "without her consent," as Barker claimed later (headnote, Magdalen MS 343, Part 3; qtd. in Wilson xxiv, n.5). However, while Barker condemned "literary commercialism as prostitution" in her poetry, in the dedication to *A Patch-Work Screen for the Ladies* (1723) published by Edmund Curll, Barker actually "claimed her place in that very literary marketplace" (Wilson xxxiv).

Kathryn R. King and other critics (e.g. Spencer, McArthur, Parsons, Eicke) have emphasized Barker's position as an exile in many aspects: as a

¹ This paper is revised and expanded from an earlier version I presented at the Canadian Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies Annual Conference held on October 16-19, 2013, in London, Ontario, Canada. I am indebted to the helpful questions and comments of other delegates at the conference, particularly Professor David Oakleaf (University of Calgary) and Professor Isobel Grundy (University of Alberta). I would also like to thank the anonymous reviewers of my paper for their insightful comments and advice through careful reading.

Roman Catholic convert belonging to the “ostracized” religion, as a Jacobite among the supporters of the defeated Stuart family, and as a spinster, treated as an outsider in a patriarchal society. Barker’s critics have long commented upon her exilic sentiments in politics and religion that are strongly reflected in her poetry and fiction. For example, Jane Spencer, in “Creating the Woman Writer: The Autobiographical Works of Jane Barker” (1983), maintains that Barker’s works can safely be termed “autobiographical” (166). In “Jane Barker and the Politics of Catholic Celibacy” (2007), Tonya Moutray McArthur endeavors to investigate the connections between Barker’s fictions to the political and religious contexts in which the works were produced. In *Reading Gossip in Early Eighteenth-Century England* (2009), Nicola Parsons demonstrates “how the productive tension between Barker’s nostalgia for the lost Stuart line and her struggle for expression in an encoded form allowed for the development of the novel as a private genre” (137). In “Of Needles and Pens and Women’s Work” (1995), Kathryn R. King comments that Barker’s “narrative is an assemblage of stories of loves, sufferings, and wanderings of survivors of the Jacobite diaspora” (165). In “Jane Barker’s Jacobite Writings” (2002), Leigh Eicke argues that Galesia’s screen metaphor in *A Patch-Work Screen for the Ladies* (1723) both “hides and displays” political messages in the text, by embedding political implications within captivating stories to an inattentive audience and by adopting “key words and phrases to signal political stance to the partisan reader” (143) respectively.

However, none of the criticisms mentioned above focuses on potential satiric elements in Barker’s writings. As I have been interested in and much devoted to exploring the potential relationship between women’s prose fiction and the dominant male satiric tradition in the Restoration and the eighteenth century, in my own reading of Barker’s writings, I discover the rich satiric elements in *A Patch-Work Screen for the Ladies* that have been much neglected by Barker’s critics. In this paper I will explore the Menippean satiric elements both in terms of form and theme in Barker’s text. Barker’s modern editor Carol Shiner Wilson regards this work merely as “a lively hybrid genre” (“Introduction” xxxix) in which romance, poems, recipes, philosophical reflections are sewn together. Taking this as a starting point, I argue that such “hybridity” in Barker’s text attests to its affinity with the tradition of Menippean satire as evidenced by the numerous elements characteristic of this sub-genre of satire, e.g., the mixture of prose and verse, the incorporation of inserted genres, the creation of multi-tones and multi-styles, and the use of the convention of the satiric symposium. Furthermore, what is strikingly uncon-

ventional about this text is the fact that Barker innovatively adopts the metaphor of “a patch-work screen”²—a “female quotidian” (Wilson xxxix)—as a device to sew up the otherwise loosely connected inset stories within the frame narrative, while at the same time suggesting a sense of “a work in progress” and “fragments of experience” (xl), two modern characteristics much ahead of her time.

Moreover, in Barker's *A Patch-Work Screen for the Ladies*, a special pattern is implicitly presented: nature and country innocence as opposed to universal depravity in the City of London. Such a pattern is reminiscent of the descriptions of “satirical scenes” in classical Roman satirists such as Horace and Juvenal, who condemned the vices in Rome and felt nostalgic of the exemplary golden Augustan age. In his influential study *The Cankered Muse: Satire of the English Renaissance* (1959), satire critic and theorist Alvin Kernan focuses on three aspects of satire by adopting theatrical terms: “scene,” “hero” (satirist), and “plot” (6), among which the first satirical aspect—“scene”—is of immediate interest to my study of Barker's text. As Kernan describes, “[t]he scene of satire is always disorderly and crowded, packed to the very point of bursting” (7). Kernan further indicates that satire is usually “set in the city, particularly in the metropolis with a polyglot people,” Rome and London for example (8). This prominent feature of satire has been detected in satirical works by a long list of ancient and modern male satirists, including Horace, Juvenal, Dryden, Swift, Pope, and Byron.

In his study “In Satire's Falling City” (1972), Earl Miner states that since “the city has long been a symbol of the state and of civilization” and country life of the “*vita beata*,” such long lasting human experience has led numerous writers to “identify the city with civilization, and the deterioration of the city with the satirist's art” (4). In other words, Miner argues that the “process of the ruin of an ideal city” has long been the primary concern of satire (5). As opposed to the mode of panegyric, which praises its subject to immortality, Miner stresses that the mode of satire views the man, the state, and the world as “degenerating before one's eyes” (19). Miner identifies three common forms depicting satiric regeneration: disease, lust, and death. As Samuel Butler writes: “Morall Representations . . . like Charmes easily Cure those Fantastique Distempers in Governments, which being neglected grow

² Wilson defines “patch-work” as “needlework consisting of pieces of fabric, varying in size, shape, color and type of cloth, applied to a single-fabric background,” and adds that “in Barker's time, the pieces were appliquéed directly to the background rather than pieced together first and then sewn to the background” (51, n.8).

too stubborn to obey any but . . . Rigid Medicines” (431-32; qtd. in Miner 19, n.31). The satirist assumes the role of “the harsh physician for the severe malady” in society (Miner 19). Other satire critics, Mary Clare Randolph for example, have similarly investigated the medical imagery in satire, according to which the satirist usually takes the role of “the harsh physician” undertaking the impossible mission of curing the severe social malady.

What I find lacking in the satire theories on cityscape proposed by Kernan, Miner and others is that they do not address any single satiric work by women writers. To fill up this gap, in this paper I explore Barker’s descriptions of the City of London as the predominant satiric scene in *A Patch-Work Screen for the Ladies*. By incorporating stories of country lads and lasses drawn to London where they encounter various vices, temptations, and frequently end in ruin, Barker paints an ugly picture of the degenerated City of London in stark contrast to the idealized “*Catechumen’s Elysium*” in one of her narrator’s dreams (*A Patch-Work Screen* 160). Moreover, the satirist’s sense of solitude and alienation, in addition to disgust and contempt, while standing at the corner of a busy city street, can be found in Barker’s narrators as well: “I was like a *Wild Ass* in a Forest, and liv’d alone in the midst of this great Multitude, even the great and populous City of *London*”; “crowding and pushing by the Mob, and the gathering Congregation gazing upon me as a Monster” (109).

By investigating the satiric elements in Barker’s text, I hope to contribute to the more ambitious project of formulating a female satiric tradition as opposed to and in relation to the masculine one, as has been represented by the much studied contemporary male satirists Swift, Fielding, Smollett, and Sterne.

Theories and Practices of Satire

Satire theorists traditionally divide the genre of satire into two major forms: formal verse satire and Menippean satire. The former refers to “a verse dialogue between a satirist speaker and an *adversarius*” to attack a single vice and praise a single virtue in the satiric debate (Guilhamet 4). Lucilius, a satirist in ancient Rome, is the renowned inventor of formal verse satire, with Horace, Persius, and Juvenal as his great successors. The latter form of satire, Menippean satire, usually involves a mixture of prose and verse. It is this second type of satire that is closely related to my analysis of Barker’s text.

Menippean satire obtains its name from Menippus, a third-century B.C. Greek Cynic philosopher. Menippus's works have been lost, so modern knowledge of Menippean satire comes from his imitators Lucian in Greece and Varro in Rome. Menippean satire in its ancient form usually mixes prose with verse, but it is gradually transformed into predominantly narrative in prose. This type of satire is "bold" in "imaginative and philosophical inventiveness, ranging from mystical utopias to fantastic adventures" (Wang 24-25). It is not easy to trace a linear development of Menippean satire because of its "proteanness and mutability," and also because it customarily "disguises itself under different generic labels" and "dissolves into a great variety of other genres" (Wang 25). As Leo Guilhamet argues, satire is "a borrower of forms": it imitates and transforms "the images, style, diction, characters" of other genres through parody (15). Unlike formal verse satire, Menippean satire does not simply focus on one single satiric object of attack; instead, it assails various human failings in different domains, for example, politics, publishing market, romantic love, military affairs, and domestic management of the servants.

The genre of satire underwent a radical change in Renaissance, when the scholars in favor of the concept of decorum and Aristotle's three unities discarded two distinctive features of satire, "multiplicity and ever-changing variety" (Wang 24). In his influential work "Discourse concerning the Original and Progress of Satire" prefaced to his translation of Juvenal (1693), John Dryden, the great critic and practitioner of satire in Augustan England, offered a prescriptive criticism of satire and underscored the moral purpose as crucial to good satire. Under the influence of Dryden's literary criticism, formal verse satire was thus favored by English verse satirists such as Alexander Pope, John Gay, and Samuel Johnson in the eighteenth century, whose works were modeled on Roman satirists Lucilius, Horace, Persius, and Juvenal. Yet with the emergence and development of the new genre of the novel in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, elements of Menippean satire also abounded in the prose satirical works by Jonathan Swift, Henry Fielding, Tobias Smollett, and Lawrence Sterne.

In his excellent work *Satire and the Novel in Eighteenth-Century England* (1967), Ronald Paulson views satire as a genre which focuses primarily on the vitality or vigorous activities of the evil. In satire, a man is regarded as evil for what he has done against certain social norms or moral standards (238). Therefore, the chief mission of the satirist is to vehemently censure the evil. Since satire aims at presenting the scenes of the evil, the satirist-observer

is employed as a tool of convenience to achieve the satiric purpose. The satirist usually acts like a fearless fighter against the evil with Juvenalian indignation.

In *Fictions of Satire* (1967), Paulson further contends that the fictions employed in satire are primarily “relationships between people,” e.g., between the fool and the knave, the patron and the dependent, husband and wife, parent and child, friend and friend (20). Paulson goes on to explore the relationship between the fool and the knave in the satires by Roman satirists Horace and Juvenal. In Horace’s satire, a fool is anyone “who fails to see his own best course of action, who mistakes a false for a real good,” whereas a knave is a villain, an evil character who impinges on the lives of other characters (Paulson 21). A fool can appear in a satire alone, but a knave is never without a fool to prey upon. That is, a knave must always have a fool, an innocent, or a dupe as his victim; if his villainy “backfires” and he is punished, he is no longer a knave but turns into a fool. While Horace focuses mainly on the follies of fools in his satires, Juvenal is more concerned with the destructive power of the knaves. To understand Juvenal’s satire, Paulson suggests, we should “relate his use of the fool-knave relationship to his use of the static contrast of an ideal and its corruption” (24). In Juvenal’s view, the various social relationships among the Roman citizens used to be ideal in a golden age, when everyone showed “reciprocal respect, duty, and responsibility” (Paulson 25). These ideals, having been lost, serve as the “norms” by which Juvenal measures and attacks the degeneration of Roman society, falling from its previous ideal social relationships.

Another typical Roman relationship that Juvenal writes about is that between a patron and the dependent. As Paulson argues, the ideal model of patron-dependent relationship can be found in Horace’s satire: “. . . where the solidarity of the Maecenas circle . . . served as the norm by which the deviant behavior of bores, misfits, and other outsiders was measured” (25). In Juvenal’s satire, such relationships have been corrupted and reversed in Roman society: the forces of the evil now take control and banish the good dependent, who is “the upholder of standards” and “maintainer of old values” (Paulson 26). As a result, instead of a positive model, Juvenal depicts the negative model of “both the corrupt patron and the corruptible dependent” (Paulson 26). In his satires, Juvenal attacks both the folly of the dependent, “who accepts the false values of his corrupt patron” and the knavery of the patron who imposes these false values and exploits his dependent (Paulson 26).

In the eighteenth century, the prominent satirist Jonathan Swift followed Lucian and Cervantes in creating his prose satires *A Tale of a Tub* (1704) and *Gulliver's Travels* (1726). Similarly, Henry Fielding emulated Lucian, Cervantes, and Swift, but invented his characteristic Fieldingesque intrusive narrator when he produces satiric-comical novels such as *Joseph Andrews* (1742) and *Tom Jones* (1749). Fielding calls this new species of genre a “comic Epic-Poem in Prose” (Preface to *Joseph Andrews* 3), pointing to his intention to parody epic in prose fiction after the manner of Cervantes's *Don Quixote*. The novels by Tobias Smollett and Lawrence Sterne, as well as by Swift and Fielding, all contain the conventions and devices from Menippean satire to varying degrees, such as parody, digression, satiric symposium, multi-styles and multi-tones, and open-endedness. As for satiric themes, their satirical novels usually aim at condemning and ridiculing universal human follies such as vanity, hypocrisy, pride, complacency, sycophancy and deceit.

Bakhtin on Menippean Satire and Novelistic Discourse

In his groundbreaking study *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics* (first published in Russia in 1929, first English edition in 1973), the Russian literary critic Mikhail Bakhtin discusses the literary form of Menippean satire that he terms “menippea.” Bakhtin first differentiates two groups of genres in classical antiquity: the “serio-comical genres” as opposed to the “serious genres.” The former includes the Socratic dialogue, Sophron's Mimes, the Symposiasts, Menippean satire, memoirs, pamphlets, and bucolic poetry, while the latter consists of the epic, tragedy, history, and classical rhetoric. In Bakhtin's theory, the serious genres are “monological” for it presupposes a steady and complete universe of discourse with a closed value system, whereas the serio-comic genres are “dialogical,” challenging established orthodoxy and implying alternative positions outside the dominating system. The serio-comical genres usually adopt the multi-styled and multi-voiced narrative against any stylistic unity.

In his discussions of Dostoevsky's novels, Bakhtin identifies fourteen basic characteristics of the menippea (*Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics* 114), including: (1) the comic element; (2) “an extraordinary freedom of plot and philosophical invention”; (3) “the fantastic and adventure”; (4) *slum naturalism*; (5) ultimate philosophical questions; (6) “a three-planed construction . . . from earth to Olympus and to the nether world”; (7) observations from unusual points of view; (8) the “abnormal moral and psychic state of man”; (9)

“eccentric behavior, inappropriate speeches and performances”; (10) “sharp contrasts and oxymoronic combinations”; (11) “*social utopia*,” “dreams and journeys to unknown lands”; (12) inserted genres; (13) “multi-styled and multi-toned”; (14) a “concern with current and topical issues” (114-18; italics in original). Bakhtin continues to comment that the genre of the menippea possesses the capacity “to absorb into itself kindred small genres,” including the diatribe, the soliloquy, and the symposium (119-20). The menippea can also penetrate into other large genres such as “Greek novels” and utopian works as a composing element, “subjecting them to a certain transformation” (121).

In the fourth essay “Discourse in the Novel” of *The Dialogic Imagination* (written in 1934-35, first published in Russia in 1975, first English edition in 1981), Bakhtin theorizes the dialogism and “heteroglossia” underlying the discourse in the novel. “Heteroglossia” in the novel, Bakhtin contends, “is *another’s speech in another’s language*, serving to express authorial intentions but in a refracted way” (324; italics in original). According to Bakhtin, heteroglossia in the novel is represented by four fundamental forms: parodic stylization, the language used by narrators, the language used by characters, and incorporated genres, all of which are dialogic/double-voiced discourses to express authorial intentions (324). It should be noted that in developing his theories of heteroglossia in the novel, Bakhtin examines works of only male novelists including Dostoevsky, Tolstoy and Turgenev in Russia; Cervantes in Spain; Rabelais in France; Fielding, Smollett, Sterne, Dickens and Thackeray in England; and Grimmelshausen, Hippel and Jean Paul in Germany (275, 283, 301, 315).

Moreover, Bakhtin foregrounds social-ideological aspects of the language used in the novelistic discourse. He describes the novel as “a dialogized representation of an ideologically freighted discourse” (333), and indicates that a particular heteroglot language in a novel always represents “a particular way of viewing the world” with its social significance (333). Since the “double-voicedness” in the novel frequently tends toward a “*double-*language*ness*,” novelistic dialogues with such a distinctive quality “push to the limit the mutual nonunderstanding represented by people *who speak in different languages*” (356; italics in original). For example, the “heteroglossia” found in low genres such as “buffoon spectacles,” “street songs, folksayings, anecdotes,” which do not have any language-center at all, is “consciously opposed to” and “aimed . . . polemically against” the accepted official literary language of the nation and the given time (273). In Bakhtin’s view, the dialogic nature of discourse pre-

supposes “a struggle among socio-linguistic points of view” in a “contradictory and multi-langued world” (273, 275).

Bakhtin especially stresses the “dialogical tension between two languages and two belief systems” in the narrator’s story involving various characters’ speeches, with “one point of view opposed to another, one evaluation opposed to another, one accent opposed to another” (314). In Turgenev’s novels, as Bakhtin illustrates, the apparent single, unitary language actually contains

substantial masses . . . drawn into the *battle* between points of view, value judgments and emphases that the characters introduce into it; they are infected by *mutually contradictory* intentions and stratifications; words, sayings, expressions, definitions and epithets are scattered throughout it, infected with others’ intentions with which the author is to some extent *at odds*, and through which his own personal intentions are *refracted*. We sense acutely the various distances between the author and various aspects of his language, which *smack* of the social universes and belief systems of others. (315-16; emphasis added)

The words such as “battle,” “mutually contradictory,” “at odds,” “smack” in the passage above reveals Bakhtin’s view of the distinctive orientation of dialogic discourse in the novel—as being “contested, contestable and contesting” (332)—for it deals with the unresolved hostility in the historical social struggle (331). The novelistic discourse in Tolstoy is similarly characterized by intensely internal dialogism. Bakhtin argues that the discourse in Tolstoy’s novels “harmonizes and disharmonizes (more often disharmonizes) with various aspects of the heteroglot socio-verbal consciousness ensnaring the object, while at the same time polemically invading the reader’s belief and evaluative system, striving to stun and destroy the apperceptive background of the reader’s active understanding” (283). Again this passage discloses Bakhtin’s emphasis on the “competing,” “invading,” and “destructive” aspects of dialogic discourse in the novel, in which various heteroglot languages come into interaction and create a distinctive style of the work.

Based on the aforementioned discussions of Bakhtin’s theories, it is clear that the “heteroglossia” in novelistic discourse as theorized by Bakhtin can also be found in the genre of the menippea, i.e. Menippean satire. It is in discussing Dostoevsky’s novels that Bakhtin brings forth an extensive analy-

sis of the menippea; also, Bakhtin foregrounds heteroglossia in the dialogic discourse when discussing the novels by Rabelais, Swift, Fielding, Smollett, and Sterne. The novel as prose fiction is deeply influenced by the conventions, devices, and structural designs in the tradition of Menippean satire, including the wide use of inserted genres through parody, digressions, satiric catalogue, satiric symposium, multi-styles and multi-tones, and structural open-endedness. Many of the novels by Swift, Fielding, Smollett, and Sterne in eighteenth-century England are highly satirical and comical, demonstrating their affinity with the tradition of Menippean satire. Prominent examples include Swift's *The Battel of Books* (1704), *A Tale of a Tub* (1704) and *Gulliver's Travels* (1726); Fielding's *Joseph Andrews* (1742), *Jonathan Wild* (1743) and *Tom Jones* (1749); Smollett's *Roderick Random* (1748) and *Peregrine Pickle* (1751); and Sterne's *Tristram Shandy* (1760-67).

In addition to the theories and criticism of satire as discussed in previous sections, I will base my analysis of Barker's text primarily on Bakhtin's theorization of the "menippea" and "heteroglossia" in the novelistic discourse. Among the list of Menippean characteristics that Bakhtin identifies, I will focus especially on the following features in Barker's text: (9) eccentric behavior, inappropriate speeches and performances; (10) sharp contrasts "with abrupt transitions and shifts, ups and downs, rises and falls, unexpected comings together of distant and disunited things, mésalliances of all sorts"; (12) absorption of small kindred genres such as the diatribe, the soliloquy and the symposium, and penetration into other large genres through parody; (13) being "multi-styled and multi-toned"; (14) a "concern with current and topical issues" as "the journalistic genre of antiquity" (*Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics* 117-18).

Barker as the Apologetic Dedicator and Innovator of the Novelistic Form

Before launching into detailed analysis of the satirical elements in *A Patch-Work Screen for the Ladies*, I would like to first discuss the underlying authorial gestures and strategies in Jane Barker's dedication. Like many of her predecessors, in her dedication "To the Reader" preceding the main story of *A Patch-Work Screen for the Ladies*, Barker shows her modesty as a humble female writer:

But I doubt my Reader will say, . . . why a History reduc'd into Patches? especially since Histories at Large are so Fashionable in this Age; . . . But indeed, I am not much of an Historian; but in the little I have read, I do not remember any thing recorded relating to Patch-Work, since the Patriarch Joseph (whose Garment was of sundry Colours), by which means it has not been common in all Ages; and 'tis certain, the Uncommonness of any Fashion, renders it acceptable to the Ladies. (51-52)

Barker is conscious of the “uncommonness” and originality of her approach to writing the book, though she conveys this idea indirectly and does not boast about it. This view of the work’s uniqueness is already reflected in Barker’s title-page, which reads “A Patch-Work Screen for the Ladies; Or, Love and Virtue Recommended: In a Collection of Instructive Novels. Related *After a Manner intirely New*, and interspersed with Rural Poems, describing the Innocence of a Country-Life” (49, emphasis added). Moreover, the plural form of “novels” in the term “a Collection of Instructive Novels” betrays the work’s connection to Donovan’s theory of the novella—the framed stories (here Barker calls “novels”) commonly adopted by women writers of fiction since the fourteenth century.³ And the term “interspersed with Rural Poems” hints at the work’s association with the tradition of Menippean satire, which usually blends prose with verse.

Barker goes on in her dedication:

Forgive me, kind Reader, for carrying the Metaphor too high; by which means I am out of my Sphere, and so can say nothing of the Male Patch-Workers; for my high Flight in Favour of the Ladies, made a mere Icarus of me, melted my Wings, and tumbled me Headlong down, I know not where. Nevertheless my Fall was amongst a joyful Throng of People of all Ages, Sexes, and Conditions! who were rejoicing at a wonderful Piece of Patch-Work they had in Hand; the Nature of which was such, as was to compose (as it were) a New Creation, where all Sorts of People were to be Happy, as if they had never been the Off-spring of fallen Adam. (52)

³ For the history and development of the framed novella in women’s prose fiction in France, Spain and England, see Donovan, *Women and the Rise of the Novel, 1405-1726* (1999), esp. ch. 3 and ch. 4.

On one hand Barker humbly apologizes for attempting to show off her knowledge of male-dominated philosophy and for advocating female patch-work entertainment, which will lead to her fall like the legendary Icarus. On the other hand, Barker aligns herself with “a joyful Throng of People of all Ages, Sexes, and Conditions,” who are happily undertaking patch-work projects in their hands. Here Barker alludes to the South Sea Bubble in 1720 (Wilson 53, n.7). With irony, Barker employs the patch-work metaphor for the paper of stock in people’s hands, with which these people dream about “a New Creation, where all Sorts of People were to be Happy” (52).

Yet, as Barker continues to describe, these people with the stock as their “Patch-Work Scheme” reject Barker “with Scorn and Derision,” and view her as a “Camelion” who live on a barren mountain, because they find Barker possesses “Manuscript Ballads,” not stock paper, in her pocket. Barker is forced to leave “these happy Undertakers” (53). However, it turns out that because these people “carry the Point too high,” their patch-work scheme is finally exploded and vanishes, leading to the ruin of thousands of people involved in the South Sea Bubble. It is at this time, when Barker leaves the throng of people and gets “into the open Field,” that she meets Galesia alone and comes to record Galesia’s Patch-Work, which is “still at Work” (53-54). Besides explaining the background behind the main narrative, this short description reveals Barker’s sense of alienation from the general public just because she chooses to walk on a different path as a publishing female writer. At the same time, it also betrays Barker’s implicit pride, like a scorning satirist, who willingly accepts her status as being separated from the “happy” crowd while examining them with disapproval and ridicule.

The Satiric Form of *A Patch-Work Screen for the Ladies*

Like many other women satirists of this period such as Delarivier Manley, Mary Davis, and Charlotte Lennox, in her prose fiction *A Patch-Work Screen for the Ladies*, Jane Barker chooses to blend the dialogical form of traditional formal verse satire with prominent features of Menippean satire. The formal verse satires by Roman satirists Horace and Juvenal are usually structured as a conversation *in verse* involving the first-person satirist-narrator “I” addressing a silent listener who sometimes responds. In contrast, Barker’s satiric fiction is primarily composed of dialogues *in prose* between the main character Galesia and an upper-class lady at their patch-work. While the majority of Alexander Pope’s *personae* in his satires are first-person speakers, in

A Patch-Work Screen for the Ladies, Barker presents an omniscient yet satiric third-person narrator who sometimes intrudes into the narrative, addressing the reader as “you,” and offers her comments on the on-going stories. All the dialogues are recorded by the first-person persona “we” or “I,” who claims to obtain the stories from Galesia herself. For example, in the dedication “To the Reader” preceding the main story, Barker depicts that she “*met with the poor Galesia, walking to stretch her Legs, having been long sitting at her work*” and that “*With her I renew’d my Old Acquaintance; and so came to know all this Story of her Patch-Work*” (53-54).

Although Barker’s multi-layered narrative frame is much more complicated than Horatian or Juvenalian conversational verse satire, when we focus on the dialogues between Galesia and the upper-class lady, a similar satiric spirit can still be easily detected in Galesia, as embodied by the primary speaker in Horatian or Juvenalian satirists. For example, like a Juvenalian satirist standing on a street corner watching various kinds of people passing by, Galesia observes “all Persons in a Hurry; suitable to what that great Wit, Sir John Denham, says; / —With equal Haste they run, / Some to undo, and some to be undone” (115).

Besides the satiric spirit in the dialogical form between the main characters, Barker also incorporates numerous Menippean features from the male satiric tradition, blended with the elements long developed in the female tradition of prose fiction. First of all, Barker innovatively adopts the metaphor of female patch-work for her fictional work. This metaphor can be curiously associated with one of the etymological definitions of satire⁴—*lanx satura* in Latin—which refers to a platter of mixed fruits offered to gods in religious ceremonies (Knight 136-37). Charles A. Knight suggests that this etymological derivation emphasizes the “mixed and abundant” form and content in satire, as the mixture of prose and poetry is characteristic to Menippean satire (139). Both metaphors denote one common feature, that is, the mixture of a variety of elements together in one piece of work, a crucial feature in Menippean satire. Accordingly, as many Menippean satiric works mix prose with verse and contain inserted genres, Barker’s *A Patch-Work Screen for the Ladies* similarly features mixture of prose with verse, and the reader is presented with a whole range of different kinds of stories, including scandalous tales,

⁴ The other three etymological definitions of satire are *satyroi* (satyrs), *forcimen* (a sausage or stuffing), and *lex per saturam* (omnibus law); see Knight 136-42.

amatory fiction of seduction, adventures at sea, ghost/horror stories, crime stories, gypsy stories, as well as inserted letters and poems.

Here we see a crucial difference between Barker's satiric work and conventional Menippean satire by male writers: while male satirists simply "mix" different "fruits" and randomly place them in a satiric plate, Barker consciously, painstakingly "sew" her various materials together to form one piece of artwork. The bond or interconnection among the various elements in male Menippean work is not as tight and close as in the female one. In other words, the "framing" technique adopted by many female novelists, which binds different levels of the narrative and substories together, is often more prominent and complicated than that in male writers' works. This is female writers' unique contribution to the male tradition of satiric prose fiction. In this light, Barker's decision to adopt the metaphor of female patchwork carries its special significance.

In fact, Barker connects these various stories through a narrative strategy which has long been developed in the female tradition of prose fiction: the framed-novelle, "a collection of stories encased in a narrative frame" (Donovan x). The whole work is written and signed by Jane Barker, who in the dedication "To the Reader" mentions her personal acquaintance with Galesia, the main character. In the following "Introduction" and four "Leaves" of the patch-work, the narrative points of view shift between first-person "I," "We," and the omniscient third-person point of view. For example, in the beginning of the "Introduction," Barker adopts "we" to narrate her story: "When we parted from *Galesia* last, it was in *St. Germain's Garden*; and now we meet with her in *England*, travelling in a Stage-Coach from *London* Northward; where she had the Luck to meet with good Company . . ." (55; italics in original).

While the most part of the work is written in the omniscient third-person point of view, along with many dialogues among the fictional characters, the narrator of the frame story does at times intrude into the stories she is relating in order to give her own judgment of, opinions or reflections on the events.⁵ For example, after describing how the passengers in the same coach with Galesia first apprehend they are to be robbed by high-way men and then relieved by the presence of possibly huntsmen from "the Gentry of that Neighbourhood," the narrator informs the reader: "this Accident put them in Mind of

⁵ The use of an intrusive narrator is later adopted by comic-satiric novelists such as Henry Fielding and Charlotte Lennox.

many criminal Adventures and Robberies, which they related, one Story bringing on another, as is usual amongst Company; some of which, perhaps, will not be disagreeable to the Reader; and therefore *I shall insert them here*; beginning with the following, as related by one of the Gentlemen” (55, emphasis added). Near the end of the “Introduction,” when the stage-coach journey comes to an end by Galesia’s being suddenly thrown into the river along with the coach and horses in an accident, the frame narrator turns her focus to Galesia again. She relates Galesia’s encounter with the upper-class lady, whose country seat Galesia accidentally trespasses and who charitably takes Galesia into her house to help her with the patch-work of the screen. The dialogues between Galesia and the lady, which include anecdotal stories and inserted verses, constitute the remaining four sections of the text, entitled “*A Patch-Work Screen for the Ladies*. Leaf I, II, III, IV,” respectively (75, 105, 134, 151).

In the opening of the story, Barker narrates how Galesia travels “in a Stage-Coach from *London* Northward” with “good Company, who entertained each other agreeably with Things indifferent, suitable to the Times” (55). Conversation among a group of diverse people in a stage-coach is a common device adopted by writers of satiric novels as a way to expose the characters’ attitudes and views toward life. This device resembles the satiric symposium in traditional Menippean satire, which aims at “caricaturing sham learnings and glorious philosophies” (Wang 23), or presenting conflicting opinions about certain topical issues (Bakhtin *Problems of Dostoevsky’s Poetics* 118-20). In satire the characters involved in the symposium are usually “flat” character types which stand for certain philosophical or psychological attitudes. Numerous examples of the satiric symposium can be found in satirists Varro, Lucian and Petronius in ancient Rome, Rabelais in early-modern France, and Swift, Fielding, and Sterne in eighteenth-century England.

Among the company with whom Galesia rides the stage-coach, three gentlemen take turns telling “proverbial-stories” (57). When it comes to Galesia’s turn, she tells a story of murder which takes place in Paris. The fifth passenger is a daughter to one of the previously mentioned gentlemen; she tells a love story involving a girl in the convent she has stayed before and a young cavalier who joins the army. The young lady’s story even includes copies of “genuine” letters written by the lovers involved, much like a typical amatory story by the notorious Aphra Behn, Delarivier Manley, or Eliza Haywood in the early eighteenth century. Within this symposium Barker in-

corporates different genres along with the multi-styles and multi-tones represented by different characters involved.

As the narrative continues, Galesia then encounters a stage-coach accident and falls into the river. After being helped out of the water, totally wet, Galesia is accommodated by a good alehouse woman, who kindly offers her food and shelter. When Galesia takes leave of the woman the next morning and intends to get to town to hire another stage-coach, she loses her way and trespasses into a park of a gentlewoman's estate, which next unfolds the sustained story recounting the conversation and interaction between Galesia and the gentlewoman at their patch-work. Getting involved in these series of unexpected accidents, Galesia resembles a heroine in a picaresque narrative, whose rambling in the world constitutes the whole line of narrative.

While Galesia gets lost in the park considering what to do next, she first hears a "Tomtit" singing "Sit thee down, sit thee down, sit thee down, sit" (72). After being seated, Galesia then hears the "Hedge-Sparrow" singing "Chear-up, Chear-up" to her in her hunger (72) and a crow saying "Good-Luck, Good-Luck!" in a hoarse voice (73). Galesia even muses, as she hears the noise of hunting men and dogs, how necessary the diversion of hunting is, that without the hunting dogs to curb the fox, she and others might not be able to enjoy the poultry and good lodging in the neighborhood. In relating this section of the story, Barker adopts the form of meditations in the countryside, personifying and even addressing the animals in a melancholy mood.

Barker's "Patch-Work" versus Bakhtin's "Heteroglossia" in the Novel⁶

As I have argued in the section of Barker's dedication, Barker is highly conscious of the originality in applying the term "patch-work" to her fiction as she is at the same time conscious of the more "fashionable" term "history" for the novels such as *Robinson Crusoe* (1719), *Moll Flanders* (1722), and

⁶ This section has been expanded from related passages in my original manuscript in response to the reviewers' comments and suggestions on the issue in question. I agree with one of the reviewer's explanation of Bakhtin's concept of heteroglossia, which underscores the way "how language or text itself would find otherness in itself" and how the potential messages of a speaker, in encountering another's language in discourse, would be refracted. However, I would like to clarify that I am not using Barker's text as an "antithesis" to Bakhtin's heteroglossia; instead, I am of the same opinion as the reviewer that it is an example of heteroglossia, as Bakhtin's concept can be applied to any other discourse in the world. What I endeavor to do here is to contrast Bakhtin's and Barker's views of the fundamental nature of the heterogeneous voices in the novelistic discourse: while one stresses contestation, the other focuses on harmony.

Colonel Jack (1723) by Daniel Defoe. Since the term “patch-work” is usually associated with insignificant female quotidian work, Barker imagines that some readers might have doubts about her adoption of this apparently “lowly” term in comparison with “history” (“... *why a History reduc'd into Patches?*” 51). In response to such potential readerly doubts, Barker tries to elevate this term by pointing out its “uncommonness” and recommends it to female readers in their conversation and needle work. To facilitate the following discussion, I quote the relevant passage from Barker’s dedication “To the Reader” again here:

. . . *I ought to say something in Favour of Patch-Work, the better to recommend it to my Female Readers, as well in their Discourse, as their Needle-Work; Which I might do with Justice, if my Genius were capable: But indeed, I am not much of an Historian; but in the little I have read, I do not remember any thing recorded relating to Patch-Work, since the Patriarch Joseph, (whose Garment was of sundry Colours) by which means it has not been common in all Ages; and 'tis certain, the Uncommonness of any Fashion, renders it acceptable to the Ladies.* (51-52)

The term “sundry,” which modifies the colors of Joseph’s garment, is of crucial importance to our understanding of Barker’s view of her own fiction. According to *OED*, the adjective “sundry” literally means “consisting of different elements, of mixed composition” or “consisting of miscellaneous items.” In selecting this term, Barker highlights the “miscellaneous,” “mixed,” or “hybrid” features of her text, which indicates its link with Menippean satire (i.e. *lanx satura*, “a platter of mixed fruits”).⁷ On the other hand, by pointing out the “uncommonness” of “*sundry Colours*” “*in all Ages*,” which might paradoxically become a new fashion in the present age, Barker also implicitly shows her pride in “innovating” this ingenious narrative structure with her text.

Barker continues in the next paragraph:

⁷ Coincidentally, modern critic Earl Miner mentions Joseph’s coat in describing the satirist’s art and satire’s transforming power: “In writing satire, a poet necessarily transforms by choices from a variety of alternatives, a part of himself and of that great city that constitutes his imperfect world. And we must recognize that the greatest English satirists wear singing robes as many-colored as Joseph’s coat. Their art, and their lives, are vast, . . . and contain multitudes” (26-27).

And I do not know but this may have been the chief Reason why our Ladies, in this latter Age, have pleas'd themselves with this sort of Entertainment; for, whenever one sees a Set of Ladies together; their Sentiments are as differently mix'd as the Patches in their Work: To wit, Whigs and Tories, High-Church and Low-Church, Jacobites and Williamites, and many more Distinctions, which they divide and sub-divide, 'till at last they make this Dis-union meet in an harmonious Tea-Table Entertainment. This puts me in mind of what I have heard some Philosophers assert, about the Clashing of Atoms, which at last united to compose this glorious Fabrick of the Universe. (52)

By incorporating the various kinds of stories, sub-genres, involving different narrative voices within the frame of the patch-work, Barker declares that she aims at making such political, religious, and social divisions as between “Whigs and Tories, High-Church and Low-Church, Jacobites and Williamites,” finally “meet in an harmonious Tea-Table Entertainment” of the patch-work among a group of ladies who bring different sentiments and patches to their work. As illustrated by the last sentence in the quoted passage above, Barker gives premium emphasis on the “union” of different sentiments (languages); she depicts how the “Dis-union” of the “clashing [i.e. contesting] of atoms” is finally “united” to compose a splendid fabric of the universe (52).⁸

Barker’s metaphor of female patch-work and the notion of “*harmonious Tea-Table Entertainment*” form a sharp contrast with Mikhail Bakhtin’s theory of “heteroglossia” in the novel. Bakhtin’s concept of heteroglossia, which derives from “dialogism” in his theory of language, emphasizes the coexistence of various voices with the languages of the novel, which embody conflicting social values, worldviews, ideologies, and consciousnesses. While Bakhtin emphasizes the *contesting* nature between dialogic voices or discourses, Barker maintains the significance of *harmony* involved in the female

⁸ Adopting the atomic theories proposed by ancient and late-seventeenth-century philosophers such as Democritus, Epicurus, Lucretius, Robert Boyle and Robert Hooke (Wilson 52, n8), Barker innovatively uses the “Fabrick” as a metaphor for the composition of the universe. The atomic theorists argued that “phenomena in the universe are explained by the random rearrangement of the smallest observable units, or atoms” (52, n8). I would like to thank one of the anonymous reviewers of my paper who suggests that Barker’s choices of words such as “clashing” and “united” can be glossed and elaborated as demonstrating the tension between the principles of contestation and harmony.

leisure activity, despite the heterogeneity of the content and narrating voices of the metaphorical patch-work.

I would like to further contrast Barker's and Bakhtin's views of the heterogeneous voices in the novel. Bakhtin focuses on the discourse in the novel in terms of social-verbal-ideological heteroglossia. He does not regard the novelistic discourse as harmonious. As mentioned earlier, when discussing Tolstoy's novels, Bakhtin emphasizes that Tolstoy "disharmonizes" more than "harmonizes" the discourses in his novels. For Bakhtin, the heteroglot languages in the novel are almost always opposed to or contest with the official socio-ideological language of the nation at a given time. Bakhtin highlights the situation that the ideologies of others in novelistic discourse are forever contesting with one another. On account of the unavoidable differences between self and the other in the discourse, the characters' potential messages would be constantly refracted by another's discourse, resulting in the ultimate "mutual nonunderstanding" among different characters who are all speaking their own languages (Bakhtin *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics* 356).

It should also be noted that in his theorization of heteroglossia, Bakhtin only considers male novelists such as Cervantes, Rabelais, Swift, Fielding, Smollett, Sterne, Dostoevsky, Tolstoy, among others; he fails to take any female writer into consideration. To probe into the gender issue in satirical novels, I will use Henry Fielding's novels as a good example in applying Bakhtinian theorization of novelistic discourse as well as of the menippea. In contrast to Barker's structural design in *A Patch-Work Screen*, most of Fielding's novels are not written in sustained conversations between two characters or contain long soliloquys by certain characters; rather, they are framed in a picaresque narrative and present numerous occasions for the satiric symposium to expose the failings of various characters. Fielding also composes long passages of parodic stylization, which are "unmasked and destroyed," to use Bakhtinian terms, "as something false, hypocritical, greedy, limited, narrowly rationalistic" and "doomed to death" as opposed to the official socio-ideological language of Fielding's time (*Dialogic Imagination* 311-12). Barker, like many other female novelists, does not resort to much parodic stylization in her novel, which therefore embodies less contestation between the languages represented by the parodic passages and that of the established orthodoxy. Finally, the novels by Fielding as well as by other male writers seldom focus on women's victimization in society; they do not contain (pro-to-)feminist messages but rather aim at satirizing more general social depravity.

Now we turn to Jane Barker and her work. Barker chooses to use the metaphor of “patch-work” for the heterogeneous voices in the novel. In contrast to Bakhtin’s focus on the contesting relationship between heteroglot languages, Barker underlines the novelistic harmony on two levels. On the external level, the actual conversation conducted by the ladies at patch-work is harmonious. On the internal level of harmony, the produced/completed patch-work screen looks harmonious and agreeable, in spite of the heterogeneous pieces of patches (of texts) on the big screen. To illustrate the first level of the “*harmonious Tea-Table Entertainment*,” we need to look closely at the conversation and interaction between Galesia and the high-class lady who invites Galesia to join her domestic work of the screen. Although the ladies are endowed with different sentiments and bring different patches to their collaborative work, they do the needlework/patch-work harmoniously at tea-table. They divide and subdivide many of the distinctions between their sentiments and patches, until the “Dis-union” is finally united in the universe of the patch-work as a harmonious tea-table leisure activity. Here the word “subdivision” means reducing the differences to smaller units so that they can finally be united together to form an agreeable piece of work.

During her patch-work together with Galesia, the lady listens attentively most of the time without making extensive comments on the patches of texts that Galesia just presents to her. Most frequently the lady would simply express her desire to have Galesia’s patches placed on the big screen despite the high or low sentiments contained in these patches, for example, “And now, . . . give me the Receipt, for it shall make a *Patch* in the Screen, as well as does that of the *Punch*” (143); “and they being seated, she read the foregoing Verses, which . . . should serve for another Patch in her Screen” (165). In one patch-work Galesia narrates the story of “The Unaccountable *Wife*” (144-49) to the lady; in the process of telling the story Galesia expresses “the greatest Amazement possible” at the eccentric behavior of the Wife of her friend. After Galesia comes to the end of the story, the lady expresses her opinion in agreement with Galesia’s intuitive response: “Sure, . . . [t]his poor Creature was under some Spell or Enchantment, or she could never have persisted, in so strange a manner, to oppose her Husband, and all her nearest Friends, and even her *Sovereign*” (149). At the end of their patch-work, to return Galesia’s favors in offering these patches of her writings, the lady presents an ode entitled “In Commemoration of the Nativity of *Christ*” (167-73) to her “dear Galesia,” hoping that she “may contribute a little to divert [Galesia] in [her] melancholy Hours, when the Remembrance of so sad an Occasion as [her]

Mother's Death, clouds too heavily upon [her] Thoughts" (166). These examples show that harmony and agreement dominates the discourse created in Barker's novel.

When there are potential differences in opinions between the two ladies, Barker demonstrates how the female characters accept disagreement with each other so as to achieve mutual understanding, rather than Bakhtinian "nonunderstanding." The Lady's comments on Galesia's South-Sea Bubble poems may serve as a good example. The lady once mentions to Galesia during their patch-work that her husband is going to "lay a Debt upon his Estate, to put into this profitable Fund" (151). Upon hearing this, Galesia quickly replies with emotion: "I beg you for God's Sake, your own Sake, your Children's Sake, and for the Sake of all the Poor, that depend upon your Charity, to endeavor to disappoint this Design" (152). The conversation between the two female characters continues as follows:

I know not what to say (reply'd the Lady) to these your earnest Entreaties; but for the Sake of this your Solicitation, I shall consider very well upon it, together with my Husband. And now we are all alone and quiet, turn over your Papers, and look out some *Patches*. (152)

It happens that the first patch of text that Galesia touches with her fingers is a "Prophecy" of the disastrous consequence of the South Sea Bubble in England (152). After reading this poem, the women continue their conversation as shown below:

I suppose, said the Lady, this Prophecy gives you so great an Aversion to the *South-Sea*. I cannot deny, said *Galesia*, but it strikes my Thoughts so far, that if I had never so much to spare, I wou'd not put a *Shilling* into *that* or *any other* Bubble. I will not inquire into your Reasons, said the Lady; it will but hinder our Diversion: So pray go on with your Story. (152; italics in original)

When Galesia accentuates again her strong opposition to investment in the South-Sea stock market, the lady chooses to accept their potential disagreement, with tacit understanding, without further inquiring into Galesia's reasons for opposition, which "will but hinder [their] Diversion." The last reply by the lady clearly signals the primacy of harmony in mutual understanding

and respect over the disharmony caused by vehement dispute out of conflicting views on a topic or an affair.

Next we will examine the second level of harmony in Barker's text, which is related to the finished patch-work for the screen. There are three different layers of signification of the "patch-work" in Barker's text. First of all, the patch-work refers to the tangible object in the real world, the patch-work for the screen as a handicraft produced by the ladies. Secondly, the patch-work is used as a metaphor for the literary manuscripts, including poems, prose, letters, recipes, etc. produced by the fictional character Galesia, which are in turn created by the author Jane Barker. Finally, Jane Barker uses the patch-work as a metaphor for her novel entitled *A Patch-Work Screen for the Ladies* published under her own name.

Within the narrative of the novel, Galesia joins the lady to help complete the patch-work on a screen of a piece of furniture made by the lady: "the Lady shew'd her an Appartment embellish'd with Furniture of her own making, which was Patch-Work, most curiously compos'd of rich Silks, and Silver and Gold Brocades: The whole Furniture was completed excepting a Screen, which the Lady and her Maids were going about" (74). In the beginning, the lady expects Galesia to offer some bits of cloth "that might be useful to place in the Screen" (74). However, upon opening Galesia's trunks and boxes, they find "nothing but Pieces of *Romances, Poems, Love-Letters*, and the like," but the lady still "resolve[s] to have these ranged and mixed in due Order, and thereof compose a Screen" (74). Following this narrative frame, four "leaves" of patch-work compose the rest of the novel, with each leaf depicting various stories told by Galesia to the lady and interspersed with diverse pieces of written works composed by Galesia. When they finish their patch-work, "the Lady looking over the Work, and finding there was enough to make Four Folds of a Screen, she said, she would have it made up, and fram'd, to see how it would look before they proceeded any farther . . ." (166).

In contrast to Bakhtin, who focuses on "internal contradictions," "struggle," "contested, contestable and contesting" orientation of discourse in the novel, Barker emphasizes the fact that there is no need for the different voices in the novel to *compete with* each other. As a female novelist, Barker simply accepts the differences and distinctions among those heterogeneous voices, allowing her characters to talk about them harmoniously at such a tea-table entertainment as their patch-work, and then places these pieces to decorate a larger work. In other words, Barker allows the different voices and languages

to coexist in discourse, but in her view these voices do not contest with each other. They are simply “appliquéd” (i.e. “attached”) unto the big screen as a female artwork; these various patches beautify and decorate the screen as a whole. Barker further likens the patch-work screen to a static painting: as patches of texts conveying different sentiments are appliquéd unto the background fabric of the big screen, these individual patches can be compared to shadow or lightness in a painting, leading to a positive, “agreeable” result. For example, after listening to one of Galesia’s country poems, entitled “The Grove,” which depicts country landscape and pro-country sentiment, the lady comments that “It will do very well, . . . , a Landskip [i.e. Landscape] in a Screen, is very agreeable; therefore let me have the rest” (79). On another occasion, the lady says to Galesia that “these melancholy dark Patches, set off the light Colours; making the Mixture of the more agreeable. I like them all so well, I will not have One lay’d aside” (92). “Agreeable” is a key word for Barker; like the lady and Galesia, Barker attempts to create her novel/patch-work screen as a whole to be “agreeable” to the eyes of the reader/viewer in spite of the mixture of heterogeneous voices and sentiments in the work.

The Satiric Themes in *A Patch-Work Screen for the Ladies*

By blending the elements of formal verse satire, Menippean satire, as well as framed-novelle, Barker deals with several satiric themes in her *A Patch-Work Screen for the Ladies*. In the following sections I will focus on two of the satiric themes as explored by Barker in the text: nature/country innocence versus London City vices, and the degenerated social relationships in London.

1. Contrasting Nature/Country Innocence with London City Vices

In numerous places Barker voices her preference for retreat to the countryside close to nature to the bustling, boisterous city life, where vices, wickedness, hypocrisy and depravity abound. As narrated by Galesia to the lady, after her father dies, Galesia and her mother “endeavour’d to make [them-] selves easy, by putting off [their] Country Incumbrance, and so went to live at London,” lodging “near *Westminster-Abbey*” (107, 112). Yet Galesia feels at odds with the people and ways of living in the big city: “This was a new Life to me, and very little fitted the Shape of my Rural Fancy; for I was wholly form’d to the Country in Mind and Manners; as unfit for the Town, as a Tar-

paulin for a States-man”; “The *Assemblées*, *Ombre*, and *Basset-Tables*, were all *Greek* to me; and I believe my Country Dialect, to them, was as unintelligible; so that we were neither serviceable nor pleasant to each other” (107).

Much later in the work Galesia inserts two poems that center on this theme: “The *Grove*” (76-79), a landscape poem, and “On Dreams,” her reflections on a dream after she wakes (162).

In “The *Grove*,” Galesia composes one of the stanzas as follows:

Methinks, I pity much the busy Town
 To whom these Rural Pleasures are not known,
 But more I pity those whom Fate intralls,
 Who can't retire when Inclination calls,
 By Business, Families, and Fortune ty'd;
 Beset, besieg'd, attack'd on ev'ry Sid,
 By Friends & Foes; Wit, Beauty, Mirth & Wine,
 Piques, Parties, Policies, and Flatterers join
 To storm one's Quiet, Vertue undermine. (78)

She then complains that “’Tis hard we must, the World's so vicious grown, / Be complaisant in Crimes, or live alone! / For those who now with Vertue are indu'd, / Do live alone, tho' in a Multitude” (78-79). These lines describe virtuous people's sense of mental alienation among a crowd of city people who are involved in crimes. Galesia continues to advise “all ye whom Fortune don't oblige / To suffer the Distresses of a Siege” to “Fly to some calm Retreat, and there retrieve / Your squander'd Time; ’Tis never too late to live. / Free from all Envy, and the tiresome Noise / Of prating Fools, and Wits that ne'er were wise: / Free from Ambition, and from base Design, / Which equally our Vertue undermine” (79). With these lines Barker implicitly expresses her desire to leave the vicious age, in which virtuous people like her are compelled to “live alone,” for a quieter, calmer retreat free of all of the worldly worries and troubles.

As for “On Dreams,” the latter half of the poem reads:

But as a Country Lady, after all
 The Pleasures of th' *Exchange*, *Plays*, *Park*, and *Mall*,
 Returns again to her old *Rural Seat*,
 T'instruct her *Hinds*, and make 'em earn their Meat,
 So comes the *Soul* home to her *coarse Retreat*. (160)

These lines reveal Barker's different attitude toward city life and life in her family country house. She labels herself as a "Country Lady," who is not used to the pleasures of the boisterous activities in urban public spaces; instead, she prefers to return to the "*coarse Retreat*" in rural area, which is her soul's true home.

Scholars like Nicola Parsons, Tonya Moutray McArthur, and Leigh Eicke have discussed the political implications of Barker's pro-natural-retreat sentiment, paralleling Barker's Jacobean sentiments and exile on the European continent with the king's exile. Parsons especially connects this to "Barker's nostalgia for the lost Stuart line" (137). In my analysis I focus mainly on the social implication entailed in Barker's work, including Barker's sarcastic ridicule of the vices of fashionable society and middle-class avarice and debauchery, both of which are common satiric targets of attack in satire.

On one occasion Galesia remarks to the lady: "I, one of the *free-born* People of *England*, thought I had full Privilege to rail at my Betters" (108). The tone of Galesia's remark is highly reminiscent of that of Juvenal's; the Roman satirist Juvenal was rumored to be either the son or adopted son of a rich freedman, i.e. a freed slave. Barker describes how at the "toilet" she is "as ignorant a Spectator as a Lady is an Auditor at an *Act-Sermon* in the University, which is always in *Latin*" (109), and then lists all the fashions that upper-class ladies are concerned with, in a tone that mixes humor with subtle irony:

I was not capable to distinguish which Dress became which Face; or whether the *Italian*, *Spanish*, or *Portugal* Red, best suited such or such Features; nor had I a Catalogue of the Personal or Moral Defects of such or such Ladies, or Knowledge of their Gallantries, whereby to make my *Court* to the *Present*, at the *Cost* of the *Absent*; and so to go the World round, 'till I got thereby the Reputation of *ingaging* and *agreeable* Company. (109)

By emphasizing what she is not capable of doing in company of fashionable ladies, Galesia effectively satirizes the immoral behavior of those people, who win admiration and company by showing off their skills in dressing themselves in different styles to suit their own features and by gossiping about the moral defects or secret love affairs of other people who are absent.

Neither is Galesia used to the distracting noises of the city when she stays at her own lodging:

At home, at our own Lodging, there was as little Quiet, between the Noise of the Street, our own House, with Lodgers, Visitors, Messages, Howd'ye's, Billets, and a Thousand other Impertinencies; which, perhaps, the Beau World wou'd think Diversion, but to my dull Capacity were mere Confusion. (116)

Again by ironically stressing her “dull Capacity” which makes her unable to enjoy the popular diversions of “the Beau World,” Galesia shows her condemnation of these fashionable social practices that actually disturb one’s quiet solitude.

Even when Galesia enters the church for a quiet worship, she fails to find “some Compeeresses, or Persons of [her] own Stamp” (109). Instead, “the Curtesies, the Whispers, the Grimaces, the Pocket Glasses, Ogling, Sighing, Flearing, Glancing, with a long &c. so discompos'd [her] Thoughts” that she finds herself “unfit for those Assembles” (109-10). Here the long list of unreligious transactions during the religious practice is presented in the form of a satiric catalogue sometimes used in male writers’ satiric works. Galesia further informs the lady that though her “purely Country” education renders her “unfit to live in the great World, amongst People of refin'd and nice Breeding” (110), she does not repent, for she could pay her duty to her mother with pleasure, and her thoughts have not been “levell'd at those gaudy Pleasure of the Town, which intangle and intoxicate the greater Part of Woman-kind” (110). Such statements indirectly expose the frivolity and hypocrisy of the fashionable society in London, which Galesia highly disapproves of.

Galesia even tells the lady a real story about “an elderly Man,” a goldsmith “living in good Repute in that Quarter of the Town,” who debauches a young, innocent girl, “one lately come out of the Country,” that he deliberately picks up at the “early Prayers” at the church (113). This “wicked Wight,” “old Whoreson,” as termed by Galesia, first accosts the pretty maid to “come along with [him]” for he will “give [her] a Breakfast, together with good Instructions how to avoid the Vices of the Town, of which [he is] convinced [she is] thoroughly ignorant” (113). This silly girl believes the old man so that the next day he “put the ring on the Wedding Finger, and took her for his Left-hand Wife,” ruining her (114). After this man gets tired of the girl, he abandons her, so she is “reduc'd to great Distress, and from Time to Time was

forced to sell what she had to relieve her Necessities” (114). As the girl never knows where this man lives, which Galesia supposes “his Cunning conceal’d . . . from her; whether by Sham or directly refusing to tell her,” the girl “ignorantly stumbled on his Shop to sell this Ring,” and is then seized by the man’s wife, “an elderly Matron,” “in order to carry her before a Justice to make her prove where, and how, she came by that Ring” (114). While the “Master of the Shop” happens to come in and sees the trembling girl, he only says: “*You impudent Slut, . . . I know you not; get you gone out of my Shop!*” and then pushes her out (114-15; italics in original).

Galesia comments that this is “an odd Piece of Iniquity,” and wonders that “a Man in Years shou’d break his Morning’s Rest, leave his Wife, House, and Shop at Random, and expose himself to the chill Morning Air, to act the Hypocrite and Adulterer; ruin an innocent young Creature, under the Pretence of a ridiculous Sham-Marriage, and at the same Time exhaust that Means which should support his Family and his Credit” (115). In telling this story, Galesia highly resembles the indignant Juvenalian satirist who rails at the iniquities prevalent in the city, which drive many innocent, silly victims into miserable sufferings.

2. Degenerated Social Relationships in London

Modeling on the traditional formal verse satire by Horace and Juvenal, Barker similarly addresses the degenerated social relationships in big cities like London. As Ronald Paulson argues in his *Fictions of Satire* (1967), the fictions adopted in satire are primarily based on “relationships between people,” which were once ideal in Rome, but then lost and became the “norms” by which the satirist measures and attacks the deviation of Roman society from its former ideal relationships.

In Barker’s *A Patch-Work Screen for the Ladies*, we find a relevant example involving role reversal between a mistress and her maid-servant residing in London. The story is entitled “The Unaccountable *Wife*.” As Galesia relates to the lady, the servant, “a vile Wretch” as Galesia calls, “had every Year a Child; pretending that she was privately married to an Apprentice” (144-45), though she is in greater likelihood impregnated by the master of the house. However, the Wife

. . . was extremely kind to this Woman, to a Degree unheard-of; became a perfect Slave to her, and, as if she was the Servant, in-

stead of the Mistress, did all the Household-Work, made the Bed, clean'd the House, wash'd the Dishes; nay, farther than so, got up in the Morning, scour'd the Irons, made the Fire, &c. leaving this vile strumpet in Bed with her Husband; for they lay all Three together every Night. (145)

When entreated to help redress this ridiculous situation, Galesia's mother comes to the house and finds the servant "sitting in a handsome Velvet Chair, dress'd up in very good lac'd Linnen, having clean Gloves on her Hands, and the Wife washing the Dishes" (145-46). This sight immediately inflames Galesia's mother with indignation, yet she is not able to change the Wife's stubborn mind as anybody else who has tried.

After the husband dies, the Wife, refusing the invitation by all her friends and relatives to leave that servant and come to live with them, "absolutely adher'd to this Woman and her Children, to the last Degree of Folly; insomuch, that being reduc'd to Poverty, she begg'd in the Streets to support them," in the "Remainder of her Days" (148-49). After finishing the story, Galesia does not offer further reflections; instead, it is the lady who comments that "[t]his poor Creature was under some Spell or Inchantment, or she could never have persisted, in so strange a manner, to oppose her Husband, and all her nearest Friends, and even her *Sovereign* [the Queen, who once offers to help the Wife]" (149).

This inset story involves several characteristics of the menippea in Bakhtin's theorization. First of all, Barker resorts to "sharp contrasts" and "oxymoronic combinations" by creating a "slavish" mistress and an "arrogant, commanding" maidservant in oxymoronic terms. Second, both the mistress and the servant demonstrate "eccentric behavior" and "inappropriate speeches and performances," which seriously violate the social decorum and normal expectations on the roles of a lady or of a maid in Barker's time. Third, as the lady has commented, this "Unaccountable *Wife*" seems to be "under some Spell or Inchantment" to such a degree that she behaves weirdly with ridiculous decisions and reactions to her circumstances contrary to common sense; this may entail Barker's interest in the "abnormal moral and psychic state" of mind in the ridiculous characters, which has appealed to many ancient and modern satirists. Finally, as the story of "The Unaccountable *Wife*" is highly sensational and controversial, it could be linked to certain topical issues in Barker's time; also, the manner in which Barker unfolds the story is "journalistic" with detailed descriptions of the actions, scenes, events, and dialogues

among the characters and without much direct authorial comments till the very end of the story.

Like the Roman satirists Horace and Juvenal, Barker presents the ridiculousness of this domestic situation to the degree of exaggeration and bizarreness, so as to expose the degenerated social relationships among people in the City of London, as represented by the distorted relationship between the “unaccountable” mistress and her maid servant.

Conclusion

Barker's *A Patch-Work Screen for the Ladies* does show affinity with Menippean satire and contain satiric messages. Barker resorts to third-person narrative involving long conversations between the heroine Galesia and her listener, the lady. With such structural arrangement, in many places the heroine's speeches sound like soliloquys of a satirist, usually Juvenalian, in formal verse satire. Moreover, like many other female writers of prose fiction, Barker uses framed narrative with inset stories and inserted genres, though she seldom employs parodic stylizations in her prose fiction, which device is favored by many male novelists of Barker's time.

When incorporating satirical elements in her prose fiction, Barker as a female writer inevitably concentrates on issues crucial to women from a female perspective. Barker's “patch-work” is an almost exclusively female work: it is written by a woman, of women, and for women. As can be clearly seen in her dedication “To the Rearder,” Barker's work is aimed at female readers. Barker focuses on women's victimization by the villainous, depraved men in the city, and assaults men's wickedness and indifference to innocent women's sufferings. By warning young women against men's infidelity, Barker aims to educate the female readers to learn a lesson from the failings of the credulous, foolish, deceived female characters. In contrast, male writers of the satirical novels such as Swift, Fielding, and Sterne seldom depict women's predicament and victimization in society as warnings for their female readers. Male writers' satirical novels usually center on the engaging adventures of the heroes (or anti-heroes) on the road. The female characters in Swift, Fielding, and Sterne, play negligible roles either as a good model of beautiful and virtuous virgins or as a bad model of repulsive and predatory women. Unlike women writers, these male novelists seldom focus on marriage; even in their depiction of love and courtship, women are treated as mere-

ly the objects of desire and admiration, without autonomy or self-consciousness, rather than as active, assertive, and desiring subjects.

Like Manley, who disguises her satiric attack on her political enemies within the frame of amatory stories taking place on an exotic island, Barker embeds political, social, and religious messages in her work under the cover of a female patch-work screen. With this gesture, Barker cultivates the image of herself as a modest author whose work could be easily dismissed as a product of female quotidian, and whose intent appears neither aggressive nor threatening. No matter how much this seems to be in conflict with the generally-believed aggressive attitude of a satirist, and notwithstanding the true intention of her gesture, Barker successfully conveys the implied messages to the reader through the satiric devices in formal verse satire, Menippean satires, and the strategy of framed-novella in the female tradition of prose fiction. Her vigorous humor and sometimes vehement indignation at the vices, wickedness, and depravity in the City of London unfailingly align her with the long list of more prominent male writers of satire in ancient and modern times, just as her innovative narrative strategies might have influenced other comic-satiric novelists to come, including the better-known Henry Fielding, Tobias Smollett, and Charlotte Lennox.

Works Cited

- Bakhtin, Mikhail. *The Dialogic Imagination*. Ed. Michael Holquist. Trans. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Austin: U of Texas P, 1981. Print.
- . *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*. Trans. Caryl Emerson. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1984. Print.
- Barker, Jane. *A Patch-Work Screen for the Ladies; or, Love and Virtue Recommended: In a Collection of Instructive Novels. The Galesia Trilogy and Selected Manuscript Poems of Jane Barker*. Ed. Carol Shiner Wilson. New York: Oxford UP, 1997. 49-173. Print.
- Butler, Samuel. *Characters and Passages from Note-books*. Ed. A. R. Waller. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1908. Web. 10 June 2014. <<https://archive.org/details/charactersandpas00butluoft>>.
- Cervantes, Miguel de. *Don Quixote*. Trans. Tobias Smollett. Intro. Carlos Fuentes. New York: Modern Library, 2004. Print.
- Donovan, Josephine. Rev. of *Jane Barker, Exile*, by Kathryn R. King. *Tulsa Studies in Women's Literature* 20.2 (2001): 305-07. *JSTOR*. Web. 12 Sept. 2013. [<http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/464492>]
- . *Women and the Rise of the Novel, 1405-1726*. London: Macmillan, 1999. Print.
- Eicke, Leigh A. "Jane Barker's Jacobite Writings." *Women's Writing and the Circulation of Ideas: Manuscript Publication in England, 1550-1800*. Eds. George L. Justice and Nathan Tinker. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2002. 137-57. Print.
- Fielding, Henry. *The History of the Adventures of Joseph Andrews and of His Friend Mr. Abraham Adams; and, An Apology for the Life of Mrs. Shamela Andrews*. 1742. Ed. Douglas Brooks-Davies. Rev. ed. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1999. Print.
- . *The Life of Mr. Jonathan Wild the Great*. 1743. New York: New American Library, 1961. Print.
- . *The History of Tom Jones, a Foundling*. 1749. Ed. William Allan Neilson. New York: Collier, 1917. Print.
- Guilhamet, Leon. *Satire and the Transformation of Genre*. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 1987. Print.
- Kernan, Alvin. *The Cankered Muse: Satire of the English Renaissance*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1959. Print.
- King, Kathryn R. *Jane Barker, Exile: A Literary Career 1675-1725*. Oxford: Clarendon, 2000. Print.

- . "Of Needles and Pens and Women's Work." *Tulsa Studies in Women's Literature* 14.1 (1995): 77-93. EBSCO. Web. 12 Sept. 2013. [<http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/464249>]
- Knight, Charles A. "Imagination's Cerberus: Satire and the Metaphor of Genre." *Philological Quarterly* 69 (1990): 131-51. Print.
- McArthur, Tonya Moutray. "Jane Barker and the Politics of Catholic Celibacy." *SEL: Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 47.3 (2007): 595-618. EBSCO. Web. 12 Sept. 2013. [<http://dx.doi.org/10.1353/sel.2007.0030>]
- Medoff, Jeslyn. "Dryden, Jane Barker, and the 'Fire-Works' on the Night of the Battle of Sedgemore (1685)." *Notes and Queries* 35.2 (1988): 175-76. EBSCO. Web. 15 Dec. 2014. <<http://nq.oxfordjournals.org.proxy.library.georgetown.edu/content/35/2/175.full.pdf+html?sid=8f2fa503-7e55-4e7c-8744-1f1b71b82089>>.
- Mills, Rebecca. Rev. of *The Galesia Trilogy and Selected Manuscript Poems of Jane Barker*, ed. by Carol Shiner Wilson. *Review of English Studies, New Series* 50.197 (1999): 103-04. JSTOR. Web. 12 Sept. 2013.
- Miner, Earl. "In Satire's Falling City." *The Satirist's Art*. Eds. H. James Jensen and Malvin R. Zirker, Jr. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1972. 3-27. Print. *Oxford English Dictionary*. Web. 10 June 2014. <<http://www.oed.com/>>.
- Parsons, Nicola. *Reading Gossip in Early Eighteenth-Century England*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009. Print. [<http://dx.doi.org/10.1057/9780230244764>]
- Paulson, Ronald. *Fictions of Satire*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1967. Print.
- . *Satire and the Novel in Eighteenth-Century England*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1967. Print.
- Randolph, Mary C. "The Medical Concept in English Renaissance Satiric Theory: Its Possible Relationships and Implications." *Studies in Philology* 38 (1941): 125-57. Print.
- Smollett, Tobias. *The Adventures of Roderick Random*. 1748. Ed. Paul-Gabriel Bouce. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1979. Print.
- . *The Adventures of Peregrine Pickle, in which Are Included Memoirs of a Lady of Quality*. 1951. Ed. James L. Clifford. London: Oxford UP, 1964. Print.
- Spencer, Jane. "Creating the Woman Writer: The Autobiographical Works of Jane Barker." *Tulsa Studies in Women's Literature* 2.2 (1983): 165-81. JSTOR. Web. 12 September 2013. [<http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/463718>]

- Sterne, Lawrence. *Tristram Shandy*. 1760-67. Ed. Howard Anderson. New York: Norton, 1980. Print.
- Swift, Jonathan. *The Battel of Books*. 1704. *The Basic Writings of Jonathan Swift*. Ed. Claude Rawson. New York: Modern Library, 2002. 115-40. Print.
- . *A Tale of a Tub*. 1704. *The Basic Writings of Jonathan Swift*. Ed. Claude Rawson. New York: Modern Library, 2002. 1-114. Print. [<http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/oseo/instance.00032862>]
- . *Gulliver's Travels*. 1726, 1735. Ed. Claude Rawson. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2005. Print. [<http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139540988.007>]
- Wang, An-chi. *Gulliver's Travels and Ching-hua yuan Revisited: A Menippean Approach*. New York: Peter Lang, 1995. Print.
- Wilson, Carol Shiner, ed. *The Galesia Trilogy and Selected Manuscript Poems of Jane Barker*. New York: Oxford UP, 1997. Print.
- . "Jane Barker (1652-1732): From Galesia to Mrs. Goodwife." *Women and Poetry, 1660-1750*. Ed. Sarah Prescott and David E. Shuttleton Basingstoke, England: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003. 40-49. Print.

[Received 14 February 2014;
accepted 17 November 2014]