

Jane Barker and Delarivière Manley: Public Women Against the Public Sphere

Marta Kvande
Valdosta State University

The names Jane Barker and Delarivière Manley have rarely been linked. When these women writers have been mentioned together, they have usually been seen as opposing types, with Manley identified as a lascivious scandalmonger and Barker as a straight-laced exponent of morality.¹ In considering each writer separately, more recent scholarship has moved beyond these labels.² Considering them together, however, not only reveals unexpected similarities but also suggests useful corrections to our understanding of writers' self-identifications and of the idea of

1. John Richetti's *Popular Fiction Before Richardson: Narrative Patterns: 1700–1739* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1992) is one of the rare instances of a work dealing with both.

2. Recent work that goes beyond the simplistic labeling of Barker and Manley in sexual terms includes (among others) Toni Bowers, "Jacobite Difference and the Poetry of Jane Barker," *ELH* 64 (1997): 857–69; Leigh A. Eicke, "Jane Barker's Jacobite Writings," *Women's Writing and the Circulation of Ideas: Manuscript Publication in England, 1550–1800*, ed. George L. Justice and Nathan Tinker (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2002), 137–57; Kathryn R. King, *Jane Barker, Exile: A Literary Career 1675–1725* (Oxford: Clarendon, 2000); Catherine Gallagher, *Nobody's Story: The Vanishing Acts of Women Writers in the Marketplace, 1670–1820* (Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1994); Ruth Herman, *The Business of a Woman: The Political Writings of Delarivier Manley* (Newark: Univ. of Delaware Press, 2003); Paula McDowell, *The Women of Grub Street: Press, Politics, and Gender in the London Literary Marketplace 1678–1730* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1998); and Ellen Pollak, "Guarding the Succession of the (E)state: Guardian-Ward Incest and the Dangers of Representation in Delarivier Manley's *The New Atalantis*," *The Eighteenth Century: Theory and Interpretation* 39 (1998): 220–37.

public-sphere discourse in the early eighteenth century. Harold Mah reminds us that in Jürgen Habermas's formulation, the public sphere is a fiction that requires speakers to surrender their social particularity in favor of an abstract and therefore apparently universal individualism. Both Barker and Manley, by contrast, insist on their social and political identities as authorizing elements of their public voices. Their assertions of political and social particularity in their autobiographical fictions show not only that in these works they did not seek to enter the bourgeois public sphere but also that they saw its dominance as threatening the very possibility of open access to critical debate on political and social issues.

Scholarship that reexamines Habermas's work points toward important ways to revise our understanding of the public sphere in our studies of early eighteenth-century writers. In his article, "Phantasies of the Public Sphere: Rethinking the Habermas of Historians," Mah points out that many historians (and by implication, the literary scholars who follow them) conceive of the Habermasian public sphere in spatial terms and treat it as a place where various social groups can "express their particular social character and interests" in order to "secur[e] the recognition of an identity."³ But he goes on to show that public expression of particular social identity belongs, in Habermas's theory, to the premodern "representative publicness"; the modern public sphere, developing in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, requires, by contrast, that those who participate in it surrender all the traits that give them social identity so that they

3. Harold Mah, "Phantasies of the Public Sphere: Rethinking the Habermas of Historians," *Journal of Modern History* 72 (2000): 162.

can be merged into a “single collective subject.”⁴ In other words, clinging to a particular social identity disqualifies one from the public sphere and renders one what we might call a special interest. Mah’s essay implies that scholars need to re-examine the claims we make about writers’ approaches to the public sphere, especially in the early eighteenth century when the idea was still being contested; we cannot assume that writers simply enter the Habermasian public sphere by default when they publish. The bourgeois public sphere was not the only option; as Nancy Fraser and others have noted, “Virtually from the beginning, counter-publics contested the exclusionary norms of the bourgeois public, elaborating alternative styles of political behavior and alternative norms of public speech.”⁵ We must thus consider how writers’ self-representations help to illuminate not only how

4. Mah, “Phantasies,” 165, 166–7. Habermas writes about this process in more positive terminology, describing “the implicit law of the parity of all cultivated persons, whose abstract universality afforded the sole guarantee that the individuals subsumed under it in an equally abstract fashion, as ‘common human beings,’ were set free in their subjectivity precisely by this parity.... The bourgeois public’s critical public debate took place in principle without regard to all preexisting social and political rank” (Jürgen Habermas, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*, trans. Thomas Burger and Frederick Lawrence [Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1989], 54.) Michael Warner explains the process specifically in terms of print: “Where earlier writers had typically seen the context of print as a means of personal extension—they understood themselves in print essentially to be speaking in their own persons ... the validity of what you say in [the bourgeois public sphere] bears a negative relation to your person. What you say will carry force not because of who you are but despite who you are” (“The Mass Public and the Mass Subject,” in *Habermas and the Public Sphere*, ed. Craig Calhoun [Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1992], 382).

5. Nancy Fraser, “Rethinking the Public Sphere: A Contribution to the Critique of Actually Existing Democracy,” in *Habermas and the Public Sphere*, ed. Craig Calhoun (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1992), 116. Paula McDowell makes a similar point, arguing that “the public sphere in England was not always already masculine or bourgeois” and that the “eighteenth-century ‘liberal model of the public sphere’ ... worked to shut down new opportunities for some” (*Women of Grub Street*, 9, 10).

some writers entered the bourgeois public sphere, but also how and why others—such as Jane Barker and Delarivière Manley—resisted the very emergence of that public sphere by stressing their social identities as central to their public authority.

Both Barker and Manley participated in the politics of their times—Barker as a Jacobite who went into exile with James II, Manley as a Tory polemicist active around important elections during Queen Anne's reign—and both wrote politicized works that form part of the early history of the novel. Each writer's body of work argues for the interconnection of political and personal events. Barker's writings, including her poetry, the prose romance *Exilius; or The Banish'd Romance* (1715), and the Galesia trilogy, interweave love and romance with issues of political allegiance. Manley's writings, most especially and famously *The New Atalantis* (1709), attack Whig politicians by arguing that their private crimes of seduction reveal the same tendencies as their public, political acts; only the connection of the private and public realms makes the crimes visible. Both writers depict the political dimension as inextricable from the private and personal. In making this polemical link between public and private actions, both women's texts implicitly contend for the value of the connection between public and private spheres. Not only does this stance align them with Habermas's "representative publicness" rather than the developing bourgeois public sphere, but it also helps to indicate how the Habermasian paradigm maps onto the party politics of the time. The older notion of publicity to which Manley and Barker appeal, because it roots public authority in markers of private identity, harmonizes with the conservative theories of political authority favored by Tories and Jacobites. Patriarchalism made little distinction between the political and the domestic, since it grounded political authority in the metaphor of the family; thus every individual was implicitly a political subject and could claim public voice. And because in patriarchalism and divine right theory the power of the monarch was anchored in signifiers of status and personal identity marking him as the chosen one, the authority of subjects could be based on markers of social and personal identity (often because they

established the speaker as having the proper relation to the ruler). By contrast, the bourgeois public sphere, because it claims to divorce public authority from such private specificity while concealing its real basis in property and gender, accords with the developing ideas about political authority associated with the Whigs. Theories of consent, propounded by Whigs in the aftermath of the revolution of 1688, implicitly depended on a definition of the political individual as a male, property-owning head of a family.⁶ And despite the apparent universality of the individual in the bourgeois public sphere, essentially the same definition covertly functioned to restrict access.⁷ The effect of these restrictions on the political individual was to differentiate between public and private realms; if only the property-owning man could attain the status of an individual and appear to shed his social markers, that left a large mass of persons who could not shed those markers of identity (such as gender) and thus remained outside the public sphere. For the Whigs, it became increasingly possible to treat the private as irrelevant to the public—precisely the position with which Barker's and Manley's novels contend. Both women's novels insist on the connected spheres, not only as a means of making their political points at

6. For the political subject as property-owning male, see John Locke: "because no *Political Society* can be ... without having in itself the Power to Preserve the Property ... there, and there only is *Political Society*, where every one of the Members have ... resign'd [this power over property] up into the hands of the Community" (*Two Treatises of Government*, ed. Peter Laslett [Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1988], 324). Similarly, Locke argues that "every Man, that hath any Possession ... of any part of the Dominions of any Government, doth thereby give his *tacit Consent*" (*Two Treatises*, 348).

7. On the way Habermas's bourgeois public sphere uses the fiction of parity to conceal a foundational inequality, see Fraser, "Rethinking," 113–15; Joan Landes, *Women and the Public Sphere in the Age of the French Revolution* (Ithaca: Cornell Univ. Press, 1988), 7–8; and Geoff Eley, "Nations, Publics, and Political Cultures: Placing Habermas in the Nineteenth Century," in *Habermas and the Public Sphere*, ed. Craig Calhoun (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1992), 308–9.

the level of plot, but also as the means to construct their authority to write and publish.

Of course, the two women took very different paths to publication. Early in her career, Barker wrote for a manuscript circle, which in itself suggests a very different understanding of what constituted the “public” and what authorized a writer’s voice.⁸ Indeed, manuscript circulation entailed “a different self-definition of authorship,” requiring of the critic “a concept of an author’s ‘public’ that does not involve ‘publication’.”⁹ It was only later in her career that Barker turned to print publication, first through the publication of works originally circulated in manuscript (including *The Amours of Bosvil and Galesia* [1713]) and then through works written for print. Manley, by contrast, wrote for print publication from the first and was actively involved in the world of early eighteenth-century print propaganda.¹⁰ But like Barker’s, Manley’s works do not fit the Habermasian paradigm requiring the surrender of personal identity in order to gain an authorized public voice. Each wrote a sustained autobio-

8. As Margaret J. M. Ezell has shown, the “practice of circulating scribal texts was ... a choice” that remained available through the early eighteenth century (*Social Authorship and the Advent of Print* [Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Univ. Press, 1999], 12). For specific discussions of Barker as a manuscript author, see Eicke, “Barker’s Jacobite Writings”; Kathryn R. King, “Galesia, Jane Barker, and a Coming to Authorship,” in *Anxious Power: Reading, Writing, and Ambivalence in Narrative by Women*, ed. Carol J. Singley and Susan Elizabeth Sweeney (Albany: SUNY Press, 1993), 91–104; and Kathryn R. King, “Jane Barker, *Poetical Recreations*, and the Sociable Text,” *ELH* 61 (1994): 551–70.

9. Ezell, *Social Authorship*, 12, 25.

10. For a study placing Manley in the emerging world of print culture, see McDowell, *Women of Grub Street*.

graphical narrative—Barker's *The Amours of Bosvil and Galesia*¹¹ and Manley's *The Adventures of Rivella* (1714)—that, like their other works, unites the public and the private by using amatory narratives to delineate their political faith and allegiance. Furthermore, while both texts fictionalize their protagonists,¹² both present authorial self-constructions that reject the conventions of the bourgeois public sphere. Both assert not only their political beliefs but also their gender and their genteel social status as central to the authority of their voices, and by doing so, they challenge the developing construction of the bourgeois public sphere and posit other possibilities.

One way Jane Barker challenges the idea of the bourgeois public sphere is by consistently identifying herself and her writings as Jacobite. By choosing such a specific identity to authorize her narratives, she rejects the abstraction of the bourgeois public sphere. As Kathryn R. King and Jeslyn Medoff argue, Barker's fiction functions as "a vehicle for projecting the experience of the Catholic and Jacobite oppositional communities with which she strongly identified";¹³ such an oppositional stance is exactly the

11. King argues that the initial title of this work, *Love Intrigues*, was imposed by the publisher Edmund Curll and that the title of the 1719 edition, *The Amours of Bosvil and Galesia*, is more likely to be Barker's (*Jane Barker, Exile*, 185–86). This novel appears in *The Galesia Trilogy and Selected Manuscript Poems of Jane Barker*, ed. Carol Shiner Wilson (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1997). All further references to *Bosvil and Galesia* will be to this edition and will be given in the text as *GT*.

12. Kathryn R. King and Jeslyn Medoff's work on Barker has shown that "in Barker's hands life writing is anything but unmediated life-story" and warn against reading her fiction as straightforward autobiography (Kathryn R. King with the assistance of Jeslyn Medoff, "Jane Barker and Her Life [1652–1732]: The Documentary Record," *Eighteenth-Century Life* 21.3 [1997]: 17). Similarly, Herman notes that "as a biographical source [for Manley's life] *Rivella* is unreliable" (*Business of a Woman*, 17). But each writer was clearly constructing a self-representation in these autobiographical texts (whether accurate or not), and it is these authorial self-representations that reveal how Barker and Manley disputed the growing hegemony of the bourgeois public sphere.

13. King and Medoff, "Barker and Her Life," 17.

kind of identity excluded by Habermas's "abstract universality." What is ostensibly a mere tale of thwarted romance can also be read as a guide to proper Jacobite faithfulness: the narrative insists on its particular political identity rather than seeking authority through abstraction. Without a public space that accepts authority based on such particulars, the novel implies, opportunities for dissent and for women to speak in public would be significantly limited. Galesia, who serves as a representative of Barker in *The Amours of Bosvil and Galesia*, sets the political context for her narrative from the start. The novel begins with a paragraph of third-person narration establishing the date and the political context: "It was in the Heat of Summer, when News is daily coming and hourly expected from the Campaigns; which, as it employs the Heads of the Politicians, and Arms of the Heroes, so it fills the Hearts of the Fair with a thousand Apprehensions, in Consideration of their respective Friends and Relations therein concern'd" (*GT*, 7). Such apprehensions go beyond the usual fears of uninvolved non-combatants. Since she goes on to specify that these battles are part of "King James's Affairs" (*GT*, 7), the time seems to be roughly during the Nine Years' War of the 1690s, which included James II's early efforts to recapture the throne; as King points out, these are "terms only a Stuart adherent would use."¹⁴ Galesia's terminology thus particularizes her identity and her narrative voice as Jacobite. Barker carefully makes women ("the Fair") parallel in her sentence to both "Politicians" and "Heroes," thus suggesting that women's engagement with the war, though obviously different in kind, is at least equal in quality. Because of their concern for "Friends and Relations," they have just as much at stake in the fighting as the combatants. The conversation between Galesia and Lucasia bears this out: the narrator says they discuss "the Adventures of the present and foregoing War and what they had to hope or fear from the Success or Overthrow of either or both Parties" (*GT*, 7). That is, they are interested not only in the fortunes of battle but also in the political results of the "Success or Overthrow" of the parties

14. King, *Jane Barker, Exile*, 171.

involved. Since the conversation takes place “in St. Germain’s Garden” (*GT*, 7), the women are established not merely as interested in politics but also as specifically belonging to the Jacobite court in exile, and therefore as holding a very particular political position. Because of their situation—the two women are waiting for news and suffering “apprehensions,” uncertainty, and fear as they wait—they are perforce already in the position of patient sufferers, a stance that alludes not only to the royalist idea of the passive obedience due to the monarch but also to a more specifically Jacobite posture of endurance until the hoped-for restoration of the Stuarts.¹⁵ The opening paragraph of the story thus positions Galesia and Lucasia as involved Jacobites who demonstrate political good faith through their patient endurance. This positioning implicitly refuses the abstraction of the bourgeois public sphere because surrendering Jacobite identity would both erase the authority and significance of the novel and constitute a surrender to mainstream Hanoverian politics.

When Galesia begins to tell her story, she prefaces it with an account of her family’s political credentials. As before, this account goes beyond simply identifying her family as Jacobites to create a kind of portrait of true political loyalty. She begins by noting that her “Father ... and all his Family [were] of the Loyal Party, in the Time of King *Charles the First*” (*GT*, 7), thus giving the family’s loyalty to the Stuarts a venerable history that helps to cement its *bona fides*, and by extension, her own. She goes further, however, by describing what the family suffered as a result of this loyalty “[S]ome were in Battel slain, and some in Prison dy’d; some ruin’d in their Estates, some in their Persons,

15. Paul Kléber Monod explains that for Jacobites “it was unlawful to resist the power of the monarch ... even if the ruler violated all the laws and behaved arbitrarily” (*Jacobitism and the English People 1688–1788* [Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1989], 18. Monod describes the recurring tropes of Jacobite verse, such as “the Jacobite view of ... history as a recurring struggle between rightful monarchy and a set of malicious conspirators” (50) and the tendency to demonize Jacobites’ enemies as the perpetrators of terrible suffering (54–62). These tropes create an image of the Jacobite as one who patiently endures the trials of the cycle of history with the faith that right will triumph in the end.

and so (like most of the Adherents to the Royal Cause) were unhappy. My Father, in particular, lost a very honourable and profitable Place at Court" (*GT*, 8). Such a listing of calamities illustrates the family's willingness to endure a great deal of suffering for "the Royal Cause" and thereby stresses its Jacobite loyalty; their suffering shows that their support goes beyond mere professions. Galesia's parenthetical aside even implies that such suffering and unhappiness is nearly a necessary condition of loyalism. Her family history, too, provides Jacobitism with a genealogy. Her discussion of her family's losses in the civil war follows soon after the initial third-person narrator's description of the current war as being "like a Civil War" (*GT*, 7). The obvious continuity between the Cavaliers' Stuart loyalty and that of the Jacobites indicates that true loyalty and faithfulness endure unchanged over time. Galesia's background exposition therefore establishes her political good faith and status as a true Jacobite by identifying her as a member of a steadfast family of Stuart loyalists. Furthermore, it emphasizes her family's status and gentility, factors that further strengthen her claim to social authority. The novel's first two paragraphs, in fact, imply that the whole story comes out of this specific political context and establish a particular identity for its narrator that is far from the Habermasian notion of abstract universality.

The novel continues to stress Galesia's Jacobite qualities with a narrative that alludes to Jacobite themes and tropes throughout. Indeed, despite King's claim that *Bosvil and Galesia* is "not strictly speaking a Jacobite work,"¹⁶ the novel consistently takes a Jacobite approach, claiming a very specific political identity for both its narrator and its audience. As already suggested, Barker develops Galesia's character through the trope of patient suffering and endurance, a trope that not only identifies Galesia as a Jacobite but also gives her story specific political resonance. Although critics have not given this trope detailed consideration, Barker draws on several Jacobite themes to create it: the sense of persecution by evil enemies, the belief that Jacobite success was di-

16. King, *Jane Barker, Exile*, 170.

vinely ordained, and the idea of the Pretender as a type of Christ.¹⁷ For Jacobites, these ideas meant that their persecution and suffering could be understood positively, as noble and sanctified endurance for a holy cause.¹⁸ The steadfast Jacobites therefore prided themselves on their heroic fortitude and faithfulness in enduring the hardships of exile and an illegitimate ruler on Britain's throne. An extreme version of this stance can be seen in the dying words of the executed Jacobite John Knox, who said, "I bless God, I suffer for well doing."¹⁹ For Barker to define Galesia and her story through this stance, then, is for her to give the narrative a highly particularized political identity. This stance would have disempowered her voice in the bourgeois public sphere; however, for the Jacobite audience to which Barker's novel was directed, it served to authorize the narrative. This Jacobite public, as both Kathryn King and Paul Kléber Monod have argued, was drawn from the gentry and was often defined not so much by open political activism as by sociability and the "pleasures of complicity and solidarity."²⁰ In other words, Barker's Jacobite audience read works like hers for their encoding of Jacobite sentiments and tropes, so the narrator's Jacobite identification was

17. For the sense of Jacobites as persecuted, see Monod, *Jacobitism*, 54–62; for the Jacobite "conviction of divine sanction and predestined success," see Daniel Szechi, *Jacobitism and Tory Politics 1710–14* (Edinburgh: John Donald, 1984), 42; for the idea of the Pretender as a type of Christ, see Monod, *Jacobitism*, 62.

18. Daniel Szechi also points to the "vision of self-sacrifice [that] matured into a mystical interpretation of the significance of the Jacobites" ("The Jacobite Theatre of Death," in *The Jacobite Challenge*, ed. Eveline Cruickshanks and Jeremy Black [Edinburgh, John Donald, 1988], 69).

19. Quoted in Szechi, "Jacobite Theatre," 65.

20. Valerie Rumbold, "The Jacobite Vision of Mary Caesar," in *Women, Writing, History 1640–1740*, ed. Isobel Grundy and Susan Wiseman (London: B. T. Batsford, 1992), 179.

precisely what made the text powerful for them.²¹ This relationship between narrator and audience thus depends on its oppositional status, its rejection of both mainstream politics and the abstraction of the bourgeois public sphere. Implicitly, then, Barker's novel challenges the dominance of the bourgeois public sphere because its force arises from the existence of a public that accepts (and indeed requires) markers of social and personal identity as the basis of authority.

In *Bosvil and Galesia*, the kind of suffering Galesia undergoes as a result of her relationship with Bosvil illustrates the ideal of Jacobite faithfulness. Her narrative highlights the intense agonies she experiences because of Bosvil's fickleness. She reveals that "interiorly I was tormented with a thousand Anxieties" (*GT*, 13) about her supposed lover's frequent changes in demeanor. At one point she even confesses, "I threw myself on the Bed, roll'd on the Floor, hoped that every Cramp I felt would be my Death's Convulsion, utter'd a Thousand Imprecations against him and my hard Fortune" (*GT*, 39–40). Such description helps to particularize her by emphasizing her physical embodiment (including her identity as a woman), which the bourgeois public sphere sought to deny or transcend. Michael Warner notes, "The bourgeois public sphere claimed to have no relation to the body image at all," so that despite its actual dependence on "whiteness and maleness," any reference to the body would have been seen as belonging to "the constraints of positivity ... from which self-abstraction can be liberating."²² Galesia's emphatically physical response sets her well outside this kind of abstraction and anchors her in a particular identity. Although this kind of emotional distress is different in kind from the deaths and ruins she lists as afflicting her loyalist family, it does help to connect her to them through its intensity and severity. Yet, even as she makes clear to readers how much pain she endured "interiorly," she

21. On elite Jacobite sociability, see Monod, *Jacobitism*, 269–307. On appealing to an audience reading for Jacobite codes, see King, *Jane Barker, Exile*, 171–76.

22. Warner, "Mass Public," 382–83.

stresses the fact that she did not allow others, particularly Bosvil, to see how much she was tormented. She explains, “[I]n *Bosvil’s* Presence I made a shift to keep up this seeming Insensibility” (*GT*, 13) and “he made the outward Grimaces of a Lover with an indifferent Heart, while I bore up the Outside of Indifferency with a Heart full of Passion” (*GT*, 17). No matter how acute her pain, she makes sure that it is invisible to others. Even after she had rolled on the floor in agony (alone) she carefully “endeavour’d to clear my Countenance, wash’d my Face, took the Air at the Window, and came down to the Company; some Time pass’d in Discourse of Things indifferent” (*GT*, 41). In this case, it is evident that she is doing more than simply concealing her pain so others cannot see it: by returning to the company and talking about neutral matters, she is deliberately seeking to create the impression that she is not suffering at all. In other words, Galesia’s narrative—by demonstrating to readers both that she experiences pain and that she seeks to minimize the appearance of that pain—works to create an image of herself as the patient, resigned sufferer very much like the faithful Jacobite who endures much for the cause. As she puts it, “I endeavour’d to be resign’d, and bring my Thoughts and Inclinations to a true Submission to the Will of Heaven” (*GT*, 29). Her mention of resignation and submission here, because those terms resonate with contemporary political debates about the obedience due to the ruler, helps to link her behavior to the political situation detailed at the opening of the novel. In both contexts, she must wait passively for a resolution of the problem despite the pain it causes her. And since Jacobites such as Barker often held that James II’s claim to the throne was justified by divine right, referring to the “Will of Heaven” also suggests a connection between Galesia’s personal relationship and political affairs: both are subject to the will of heaven, which guarantees, in the Jacobite world view, that right will prevail. In telling this story, then, Barker establishes a strong link between her narrative choices and her politics: her political good faith is the same faithfulness she displays in her feelings for Bosvil, and the proper behavior for a loyal subject is the same as the proper behavior for a faithful lover. So by refus-

ing public-sphere abstraction, Barker's narrative produces a template for properly faithful political behavior.

Another pattern of Jacobite allusion arises from the fact that Bosvil is not Galesia's only option: she can choose to live singly, and the single life acquires a variety of associations that make it an attractive and potentially fulfilling choice. She suggests that she had considered this option even before meeting Bosvil, since she "had arm'd my Thoughts with a thousand Resolutions against Love" (*GT*, 9), thus making clear that the single life is not simply the fallback position she is left with when Bosvil rejects her. It takes on political associations when she includes part of a poem about her commitment to poetry, alluding to a trope that would have had special resonance for a Jacobite public. In the poem, the muses exhort her to "*vow a Virgin to remain. / Write, write thy Vow upon this Tree*" (*GT*, 14).²³ Vows mattered a great deal in the politics of the late seventeenth and early eighteenth century, and it is significant that Galesia makes a vow to poetry but never to Bosvil. Barker would have been highly conscious, for instance, of the nonjurors who refused to take an oath to William III, and her reference to Galesia's vow associates it with the idea of political fidelity. This is not to say that her vow to remain single for the sake of poetry stands for a specific political oath; rather, such a vow, from a Jacobite perspective, contributes to the portrait of Galesia as someone whose political beliefs form a seamless whole with her personal and moral life. Since she has been identified from the start as a Jacobite, the issue of loyalty has already been raised, and her vow further demonstrates its centrality, underlining the importance of political loyalty as an identifying marker. It is this fidelity that a Jacobite audience would have recognized as making Galesia a good political subject and, in turn, making her narrative powerful and useful as a guide to behavior in trying political circumstances. Again, Barker's reliance on these specific markers to authorize her narrator subtly argues for the need for a public space where these markers are

23. This fragment is from Barker's poem "The lovers Elesium" (lines 99–100), which is included in full in Wilson's edition (*GT*, 320–25).

valued: without a space where personal and political unite in this way, the oppositional discourse of the Jacobites would lose its voice.

During the periods when Galesia returns to the single life, she also turns to various kinds of learning, such as the study of Latin and medicine, as well as to poetry, and her discussion of her education and writing makes clear that both are tied to her vow and to her political fidelity. Galesia links her learning to her ability to endure suffering—thereby associating it with her Jacobitism—and she couches this connection in defensive terms. Although she begins by saying that her studies “contributed much to this Victory over myself” (*GT*, 36), she goes on to qualify that statement:

Learning being neither of Use nor Ornament to our Sex; but on the contrary, many count a studious Woman as ridiculous as an effeminate Man In fine, the Men will not allow it to be our Sphere, so consequently we can never be suppos'd to move in it gracefully; but like the Toad in the Fable, that affected to swell itself as big as the Ox, and to burst in the Enterprize: But let the World confine or enlarge Learning as they please, I care not; I do not regret the Time I bestow'd in its Company, it having been my good Friend to bail me from *Bosvil's* Fetters, tho' I am not so generous, by Way of Return, to pass my Word for its good Behaviour in our Sex, always, and in all Persons, for sometimes it becomes a Rival to their Duty.... (37)

Yet this qualification of the value of education for women produces an ambiguous effect. Despite her assertion that learning is of no “Use” to women, she clearly explains that it was useful to her because it helped her deal with the pain she felt about *Bosvil's* desertion. And when she presents condemnation of female learning, she is careful to do so in terms that emphasize the element of opinion. She says not that a learned woman is ridiculous, but that “many count” it so; likewise, she does not say that learning is not a woman’s sphere, but that “Men will not allow it” to be so. Even in introducing the passage’s most vivid antife-

male image—the toad—she inserts the word “suppos’d,” again limiting the force of the condemnation. While she does seem to admit that she is a special case, she points out that the effects of study vary not simply “in our Sex” but “in all Persons.” She finally dismisses the accumulated weight of this view as irrelevant to her, since learning obviously did help her to endure. Galesia thus opposes her particular viewpoint to what she presents as a more widely accepted one, refusing to remain confined in any one “Sphere” and refusing to submit to the separation of male and female spheres implicit in the bourgeois idea of the public sphere. It is even possible that her willingness to become singular in this way is related to her willingness to endure social marginalization as a Jacobite. While rejecting mainstream politics and a mainstream public, she chooses a counterpublic that provides support and acceptance. The education and the writing that grows out of her vow to remain single thus become part of what sustains her in her patient suffering, both romantic and (implicitly) political. And she refuses to renounce this part of her identity as a learned female writer, even though it marks her as a socially particular person rather than the kind of abstract individual demanded by the bourgeois public sphere. Rather, Barker uses such particularity as an authorizing strategy; Galesia’s education makes her a staunch Jacobite and therefore an authoritative narrator.

When Galesia’s relationship with Bosvil temporarily improves enough to become a threat to this vow, she has a dream that suggests the fidelity at stake in the conflict: she dreams “that an angry Power ... made me climb a high Mountain, where I met *Bosvil*, who endeavoured to tumble me down; but I thought the aforesaid Power ... brought me to that Shade, where I had writ those Verses heretofore on the Bark of an Ash ... in which Verses I had seem’d to prefer the Muses, and a studious life, before that of Business and Marriage” (*GT*, 25). Given the anger of the unnamed “Power” and the fact that Bosvil tries to thwart her climb up the mountain, the mountain can be understood to represent her poetic achievement, perhaps even the mythological moun-

tain of the Muses.²⁴ Bosvil prevents her from attaining this success because he has tempted her away from her vow: she wants to marry him instead of remaining single and devoting herself to poetry. The power's anger, then, stems from the imminent breaking of the vow, and the trip to the scene of the vow is clearly meant to remind her of it. The dream continues with another fragment of a poem; the power tells Galesia, "*Since, since thou hast the Muses chose, / Hymen and Fortune are thy Foes*" (GT, 25)²⁵ and goes on to predict various forms of disaster for her. In the context of the dream, this warning implies that Galesia's sufferings are related to her nearly breaking her vow.²⁶ Since the poetic warning immediately follows the failed climb and the conflict with Bosvil, it serves as an explanation of those events. The dream thus suggests the importance of the vow and the consequences of vow-breaking—an issue with obvious Jacobite implications. Again, in focusing on such themes, the novel addresses a particular audience: not the broadly conceived public of Habermas's formulation but a focused group for whom these ideas would have been meaningful.

Neither Bosvil nor the vow to remain single can be said to represent a specific political choice, in large part because Galesia depicts herself as essentially remaining faithful to both.²⁷ Al-

24. For a contrary interpretation, which reads the mountain as representing sexual fulfillment, see Margaret Doody, "Deserts, Ruins, and Troubled Waters: Female Dreams in Fiction and the Development of the Gothic Novel," *Genre* 10 (1977): 534.

25. This fragment is also from Barker's poem "The lovers Elesium" (lines 106–7), which is included in full in Wilson's edition (GT, 320–25).

26. As Bowers notes, the poem as a whole presents ill-fortune as a necessary adjunct of poetry—"the poet's bargain was doomed from the start" ("Jacobite Difference," 863), but Barker's use of it in *Bosvil and Galesia* selects only an excerpt and sets it in a particular context, thus giving it a slightly different meaning.

27. King suggests that the Jacobite trope of the lost lover can be seen at work in the later works in the Galesia trilogy (*Jane Barker, Exile*, 162), and the resonance can also be felt here. For more discussion of this trope, see Monod, *Jacobitism*, 63.

though she never ceases to love Bosvil or to suffer because of his treatment of her, she repeatedly returns to the single life in her poetry, her study of Latin and medicine, and her stewardship of her father's estate. Because they are raised in a narrative that is clearly identified as Jacobite, the issues of fidelity and vows resonate with Jacobite political thinking; Galesia's behavior in her personal relationship follows the same moral ideals as those to which she adheres in politics. By touching on such issues and by portraying Galesia's sufferings, the novel alludes to the Jacobite image of themselves as loyal sufferers and presents a sympathetic picture of the kind of difficulty and struggle such loyalty entails. Moreover, Barker's careful intertwining of the personal and political issues in the novel suggests not only that the two are not separable²⁸ but also that it is their interconnection that grounds the authority of the narrator.

This appeal to Jacobite values to authorize the novel suggests that Barker did not aim for a wide public audience; indeed, it would have been dangerous for a Jacobite to do so, since Jacobites were considered treasonous by the British government. Rather, her novel's public is a specific social and political group: Jacobites. As King points out, "[T]he story of Bosvil and Galesia was written for, and meant to circulate within, a small, select, sympathetic ... circle of elite readers"²⁹ and was most likely intended to circulate in manuscript, which entails a different kind of assumed relationship between author and readers than does

28. King and Medoff also see Barker's work as "exhibit[ing] ... [a] refusal to separate private and national, personal and public history" ("Jane Barker," 28).

29. King, *Jane Barker, Exile*, 185.

print publication.³⁰ Given Barker's Stuart loyalty and its dangers, her circle would most likely have shared those political sympathies, and her novel would therefore not have been designed to represent Jacobitism to a wider public sphere. But this does not mean that her novel is, as King suggests, "essentially private."³¹ Indeed, Barker's participation in social authorship and in Jacobite political culture points to the existence of what Fraser might term a subaltern counterpublic, a Jacobite manuscript circle constituting one of the "parallel discursive arenas where members of subordinated social groups invent and circulate counterdiscourses to formulate oppositional interpretations of their identities, interests, and needs."³² Her novels are not so much argumentative polemics intended to persuade outsiders as they are consoling fictions, intended for the Jacobite underground, that work through the difficulties of Stuart loyalty and that sometimes offer hopeful visions of a Stuart restoration. The fact that these novels appear to have been circulated in manuscript form before their publication as printed books reinforces this sense of an audience defined by a specific set of political and social characteristics. The novel's insistence on the seamless integration of

30. As Ezell has shown, "[T]he manuscript text operates as a medium of social exchange, often between the sexes, neither private nor public in the conventional sense of the terms, and a site at which women could and did comment on public issues concerning social and political matters.... Likewise, a reader in a manuscript culture ... is responsible for participating in literary production as well as consumption" (*Social Authorship*, 40).

31. King, *Jane Barker, Exile*, 194.

32. Fraser, "Rethinking," 123. Eicke points out that the scribal publication described by Ezell would have been particularly appropriate for Barker's situation: "[W]hen a political group was proscribed, scribal publication became the method of choice ... because the personal connection a handwritten text suggests would have strengthened community ties" ("Barker's Jacobite Writings," 140). Barker's writings thus provide an ideal example of a counterpublic that depends on particular (and subordinated) social identity in order to offer critical discourse counter to the mainstream.

Galesia's political and romantic behavior directly undercuts the Habermasian notion of a division between public-sphere discourse and private identity. Barker's sense of what constitutes the public for her depends precisely on the particulars she would have to give up if she were trying to enter the Habermasian public sphere; in fact, her publication of a text first circulated in manuscript depends on the belief that there is space in public for dissent and difference from the dominant discourse. Barker thus implicitly argues for the need for a select, sympathetic, and (by implication) elite circle of writers and readers who could provide a home for the outsider's point of view—something that would be lost if the bourgeois public sphere, demanding the surrender of particular identity, became the only option.

Although Delarivière Manley, unlike Barker, aimed for a wider readership and for more direct political effect, she, too, challenges the idea of the bourgeois public sphere; her insistence on political and social identity as authorizing strategies indicates the restrictions entailed by such a public sphere. Just as in Barker's novel, Manley's construction of authority from personal and social identifiers rejects the abstraction required by the bourgeois public sphere and refuses to separate public from private. Moreover, Manley's novel dramatizes the conflict between the seamless public/private continuum and the developing bourgeois public sphere, showing how the bourgeois public sphere's demand for abstraction can be used to silence women and to exclude alternative political positions. The unusual narrative structure of *The Adventures of Rivella*, Manley's fictionalized autobiography, neatly illustrates the problem: Rivella—the fictional name used for Manley—does not tell her own life story. Instead, her life is narrated in a conversation between two men—Lovemore and D'Aumont—whose main interest in Rivella is sexual and whose depiction of her conflicts with her political self-representation. While such a structure differs from Manley's use of female narrators in works such as *The New Atalantis*, it is consistent with her efforts to create "a

specific place for the female writing subject as political agent."³³ Manley uses these male narrators to show how the concept of the bourgeois public sphere limits women's agency, and she undercuts the narrators' authority both by disclosing how they misrepresent Rivella and by showing that their motives for doing so are political. Because they adhere to a Habermasian definition of the bourgeois public sphere, the narrators treat Rivella's gender as a marker that disqualifies her from participation in public discourse. As Whigs, they have an interest in silencing Rivella's Tory arguments. When Rivella does speak for herself within the text, she finds ways to insist on her specific political identity as a Tory, a gentlewoman, and an injured woman—facets of her identity that work against Lovemore's and D'Aumont's efforts to reduce her to a mere purveyor of private sexuality. For her, those kinds of individual and social markers actually function to empower her public voice because her work appeals to a different paradigm of public discourse.

Both men talk about Rivella and her work as though the two were inseparable; they construe the sexual titillations of her writings as an invitation to sexual intercourse with the writer. By framing her in sexualized terms, they seek to enforce the norms of the bourgeois public sphere and thereby enclose Rivella in the private sphere, erasing her political authority. Indeed, this idea is what prompts the whole story. While Lovemore and D'Aumont discuss intellectual women and their attractions or lack thereof, Lovemore claims that an "*unhandsom*" woman could never attract him, no matter how witty or learned she might be.³⁴ D'Au-

33. Ros Ballaster, *Seductive Forms: Women's Amatory Fiction from 1684 to 1740* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1992), 120. For instance, Manley's main narrator in *The New Atalantis*, Intelligence, authorizes her gossipy narration by identifying herself as a courtier of the Princess Fame and defining her stories as a duty that is part of her political service. Intelligence is thus an example of the kind of female political agent the male narrators of *Rivella* seek to shut down.

34. Delarivière Manley, *The Adventures of Rivella*, ed. Katherine Zelinsky (Peterborough: Broadview, 1999), 44. Further references will be given in the text as *AR*.

mont counters that “there is no being pleased in their [i.e., women’s] conversation without a mixture of the sex which will still be mingling it self in all we say” (AR, 44); that is, he argues that gender is completely determinative. In his view, a man talking to a woman will always be conscious of her specifically *as* a woman. In other words, women are inherently incapable of escaping their gendered social identity and so cannot participate in public-sphere debate. As his comments on Rivella’s writings make clear, to be conscious of a woman in gendered terms, for him, is to be conscious of her sexually.³⁵ Rivella is introduced as the epitome of a woman whose writings “inspire immediate delight, and warm the blood with pleasure” (AR, 44). D’Aumont says that Rivella must be a desirable woman and a skilled lover because she can write so well about love. He equates her text with her body, reading both as no more than sexual. By putting these words in a male narrator’s mouth, Manley portrays that sexualized image as sorely limited, for any contemporary reader of Manley’s earlier works (e.g., *Queen Zarah* and *New Atalantis*) would have been

35. Carol Barash also notes that D’Aumont assumes “that between men and women all things are sexual” (“Gender, Authority, and the ‘Life’ of an Eighteenth-Century Woman Writer: Delarivière Manley’s *Adventures of Rivella*,” *Women’s Studies International Forum* 10 [1987]: 167). McDowell argues that this reduction is a sign that Manley is “not ... successfully manipulating the construct ‘femininity’, but ... angrily giving in to it when confronted with diminished alternatives,” and that she “represented her two male narrators as having the power over *her*” (McDowell, *Women of Grub Street*, 283). The fact that Manley so thoroughly shows the limitations of this construct and the narrators who use it, however, implies that she is not *simply* giving in but providing a thorough critique of “femininity” and undercutting the apparent power of the narrators.

aware that those works were highly politicized.³⁶ The reader who (like D'Aumont and Lovemore) sees nothing but a come-on in those texts would thus immediately appear rather naïve and uninformed—or perhaps just willfully ignorant. Either way, it is immediately obvious that something is missing from Lovemore and D'Aumont's initial assessment of Rivella. The two men are clearly leaving something out of their account of her in order to make her into an object of desire; they use her gender to strip her work of political content and to claim that it has no public-sphere significance. This move illustrates Fraser's point that "the view that women were excluded from the public sphere turns out to be ideological; it rests on a class- and gender-based notion of publicity."³⁷ Manley uses the male narrators to show exactly how the attempt at exclusion functioned.

Lovemore, who does most of the actual narrating, does so because of his personal acquaintance with Rivella, and it soon becomes clear that his interest in her is based on his early "hopes of touching her heart" (AR, 54). He seeks to authorize his narrative by establishing that he knew and loved her first. Because he claims to have a purely private interest in her, he implicitly claims that his discussion of her has no public or political motive or implication. In explaining that he and Rivella exchanged let-

36. Contemporary letters confirm this. Lady Mary Wortley Montagu's November 1709 letter to Frances Hewet, for example, implies that her primary interest in reading *The New Atalantis* was enjoyment of its political and satirical content (*The Complete Letters of Lady Mary Wortley Montagu*, ed. Robert Halsband, [Oxford: Clarendon, 1965], 1:18). Sarah Churchill wrote to Queen Anne shortly after *The New Atalantis* was published, denouncing the book because "in [it] I, and Lord Marlborough, and almost everybody I know, are abused" (*Private Correspondence of Sarah, Duchess of Marlborough* [New York: Kraus Reprint, 1972], 245)—obviously she was well aware of its political content. Thomas Hearne, commenting on the publication of *The New Atalantis*, noted that it "exposes the abominable Vices of several Great Persons, under fictitious Names" (*Remarks and Collections of Thomas Hearne*, ed. C. E. Doble, [Oxford: Clarendon, 1886], 2:292) and transcribed the key into his diary. The political nature of the book was common knowledge.

37. Fraser, "Rethinking," 116.

ters frequently at this time, he pauses to comment, "I must and ever will maintain, that all her other productions however successful they have been, come short of her talent in writing letters" (AR, 53). Such a claim partly serves to buttress Lovemore's claims to authority, since it suggests that he has special access to her best work and that no one can have a better knowledge of her or gainsay his judgment on this point.³⁸ Additionally, because writing letters was increasingly thought of as a feminine accomplishment,³⁹ stating that Rivella's letters are superior to her more public works reinforces the idea that she—and, indeed, women in general—do not belong in the public sphere. Although letters could be a public genre—writers such as Alexander Pope certainly treated them as such—Lovemore expressly presents Rivella's letters as a private genre, not available to or intended for the public but instead designed for a single privileged reader. In coding Rivella's letters as private, then, he implies that her gendered identity renders her less appropriate for the public sphere—precisely fitting the Habermasian paradigm. In effect, Lovemore's claims to authoritative private knowledge of Rivella function to confine her in private and erase her public authority.

Yet Manley shows that Lovemore's efforts to authorize himself at Rivella's expense ultimately backfire because he must admit that Rivella did not return his love; indeed, she rejected him

38. In 1696 a volume titled *Letters Writen [sic] by Mrs. Manley* was published, but, as Ros Ballaster notes, it is "an epistolary travelogue" (*Seductive Forms*, 123) including the tales of other travelers. Interestingly, the J. H. who signs the dedication and claims to have had the letters published also claims, like Lovemore, that the letters are a sign of his special relationship to Manley and that though the letters were not meant to be "Publick" (a2v) they offer "a true Taste of [Manley's] Thoughts and Sense" (a3v). Since Manley "promptly had the book withdrawn" (Ballaster, *Seductive Forms*, 124), she seems not to have looked kindly on such claims. The similarities between J. H.'s claims and Lovemore's suggest that Manley does not intend his assertions here to be accepted at face value. Ballaster also notes that Manley is mocking the idea of women's "artlessness" by making them "natural letter writers" (148).

39. Ruth Perry, *Women, Letters, and the Novel* (New York: AMS Press, 1980), 17, 68.

early and often. In light of this fact, his attitudes toward Rivella can be seen to have an underlying motive: because she has rejected him sexually, he wants to establish his superiority to her in other ways. By inserting this key detail, Manley undermines the authority Lovemore tries to assert. Since he was an unsuccessful suitor, his efforts to contain her and his criticisms of her could be motivated by bitterness over that rejection. Furthermore, one of the incidents Lovemore recounts parallels his own situation and suggests another possible motive. The man who publicly claims to have rejected Rivella's advances⁴⁰ slanders Rivella's sexual reputation, just as Lovemore does; in his case, however, the motive is "the prejudice of party" (AR, 113). The highlighting of the political element here reminds us of Manley's careful linking of gossip and politics in other cases,⁴¹ and thus suggests that Lovemore may have had just as much political motivation to spread scandal about Rivella as the unnamed Whig.⁴² His authority is undermined because even as he seeks to separate private from public in Rivella's case, his own behavior shows that the two cannot be separated. Interestingly, this incident is almost

40. He is not given a name in the text but is identified in the key as Richard Steele, who was a Whig. For more on Steele's political battles with Manley, see McDowell, *Women of Grub Street*, 278–81.

41. The best known instance, of course, is *The New Atalantis*, in which the narrator, Intelligence, uses gossip to perform what she calls a political "duty" (*Secret Memoirs and Manners of Several Persons of Quality, of Both Sexes. From the New Atalantis, an Island in the Mediterranean*, ed. Rosalind Ballaster [Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1991], 13) by distinguishing right from wrong and good from bad among the political figures of the day. For further discussion of this text's political aims, see especially McDowell, *Women of Grub Street* and Pollak, "Guarding the Succession."

42. The novel's key identifies Lovemore as Lieutenant General John Tidcomb. Interestingly, the *DNB* notes that Tidcomb was involved in conveying letters to the Duke of Marlborough in 1705 (*Dictionary of National Biography*, s.v. "Tidcomb or Tidcombe, John"). Since Marlborough was a Whig, and one of Manley's favorite targets, Manley's choice of Tidcomb as narrator may be another way of indicating political motives in his portrayal of her.

the last one in the novel. Immediately after mentioning it, Lovemore concludes by telling D'Aumont that he could have "brought you to her [Rivella's] table ... carried you ... to a bed ... and there have given you leave to fancy your self the happy man" (AR, 113). This blatant sexual fantasy of control over Rivella's various entertainments, coming right after the story of a man who falsely claimed to have ready access to Rivella's bed and body, can hardly seem anything but dubious. If Lovemore's claims do parallel the unnamed character's, the subtle implication, by extension, is that the public-sphere demand for the absence of gendered identity is a means to exclude women's political voices. Lovemore's false and politically motivated assertions of control over Rivella show that the definition of the bourgeois public spheres seeks the same result: the silencing of women through their restriction to the private sphere.

But the novel simultaneously demonstrates that such restriction is not necessarily effective, for Lovemore's authority is further compromised at the moments when Rivella does have a voice in her own autobiography. At such moments, she emphasizes her political identity, drawing authority from her Tory stance because for her it signifies the proper, loyal relation to the monarch. When Rivella is about to be arrested for libel for *The New Atalantis*, Lovemore's reaction is to "beg[i]n with railing at her books; the barbarous design of exposing people that never had done her any injury" (AR, 107). Here he seems perfectly well aware of the political nature of her books—and he does not like it. His argument that she should not meddle with things that do not concern her depends in large part on the idea of the bourgeois public sphere. He argues that personal injury would be the only valid reason for her to make a public complaint against anyone, thus divorcing the private sins of politicians from their public lives—exactly the position Manley presents as so dangerous in *The New Atalantis*. He further assumes that she cannot be injured by political problems; that is, he takes for granted that any malfeasance in political life does not affect her because she, as a woman, rightly belongs to the private sphere. He also implies that "exposing" politicians by making their private treach-

eries public constitutes inappropriate behavior for a woman because her gendered identity disqualifies her from public-sphere debate. Rivella's retort—that she was fighting those “who were busy to enslave their sovereign, and overturn the constitution” (AR, 107–8)—asserts once again that her work is political, that she has a right to be concerned with such actions, and that she has a right to engage in public criticism in such matters; in other words, her political identity as a Tory authorizes her to work for her political ideas in public. As a Tory, she has the right kind of loyalty to the monarch and can therefore recognize “enslaving the sovereign” as a crime. This political identity is linked to Rivella's social status as well because she is “unalterable in those principles of loyalty, derived from her family,” and because this family, like Barker's, has a history of loyalism dating back to the civil war (AR, 50–51). Again, Rivella uses markers of particularity, such as political stance and genteel status, to authorize her public voice and her resistance to Lovemore's attempts to define her as private. Lovemore later claims to have “brought her to be ashamed of her writings” (AR, 111) and to have convinced her “that politicks is not the business of a woman” (AR, 112); however, these claims seem suspect, not least because he is trying to convince her to become his mistress at that point. Moreover, she carefully exempts from shame “that part [of her writings] by which she pretended to serve her country, and the ancient Constitution” (AR, 111)—a telling exception, since it covers most of her work.⁴³ Furthermore, as Ros Ballaster points out, she did continue to write political fiction after this point,⁴⁴ further undercutting Lovemore's apparent victory. Rivella finds a way around Lovemore's constructions while seeming to acquiesce to them;

43. As Ballaster notes, “Manley's claims to be trafficking solely in love ... are ... transparent.... The disguise is meant to be seen through” (*Seductive Forms*, 117).

44. Ballaster, *Seductive Forms*, 148. McDowell also points out that this renunciation is further undercut by the fact that the translator's preface to *Rivella* bears the same date as a letter Manley wrote to Robert Harley of plans for another political work (*Women of Grub Street*, 282).

despite his argument that gender disqualifies her from the public sphere, she makes clear that she does have a voice in political debate and that she will not surrender the particular political identity that she sees as authorizing her.

Her particularized voice surfaces at other key moments in the text. One example is the well-known and oft-quoted statement that opens the story: “[Y]et as I have often heard her say, if she had been a man, she had been without fault” (AR, 47). Lovemore attributes this statement to Rivella herself, contradicting the essentializing judgments that he makes. As Barker does in her discussion of learning, Manley here draws attention to her particular gendered identity, implicitly rejecting the differentiation imposed by the bourgeois public sphere. Lovemore goes on to direct his audience to Rivella’s “own writings” for the idea that “what is not a crime in men is scandalous and unpardonable in women” (AR, 47). Yet while Lovemore simply accepts this idea—that women should be held to a different standard of behavior from men—the writings to which he directs readers do not. In *The New Atalantis*, Manley several times openly criticizes the double standard and calls for a reform of attitudes about “fallen” women. Obviously, then, Manley’s text does not support Lovemore’s position, and by pointing to that discrepancy, Manley highlights the problems with his construction of her identity. Lovemore’s double standard fits neatly with the kinds of gendered separation the bourgeois public sphere would seek to enforce, but Manley (and Rivella) clearly challenge such boundaries. If he can be wrong about a basic understanding of her ideas, the novel implies, surely he can also be wrong about her particular political identity and her right to engage in political argument.

Rivella further undermines Lovemore when he refers the reader to Rivella’s own writings as a source for part of her life, thereby foregrounding her political activity as well as her particular identity as an injured woman: “I must refer you to her own story, under the name of Delia, in the *Atalantis*, for the next four miserable years of her life” (AR, 60). The story in question, as recounted in *The New Atalantis*, is that after her father’s death, her

cousin and guardian deceived her into marrying him under the pretense that his first wife was dead. Significantly, Delia speaks for herself. She portrays herself as young and innocent, and she protests against having been sequestered by her deceitful husband so that she “was the last that knew” that her marriage was bigamous.⁴⁵ Furthermore, Delia delivers a broadside against the double standard that declares a woman’s loss of honor irretrievable, exclaiming that it is precisely “this inhospitality that brings so many unhappy wretches to destruction.”⁴⁶ Thus Lovemore’s reference to this text reminds us that his version is not the only one. For anyone familiar with *The New Atalantis*,⁴⁷ knowing the specific story further undermines Lovemore’s portrayal of Rivella, since his version—a woman made immoral by her initial fall, which nevertheless works out nicely for the men who wish to see her as a sexual object—directly contradicts hers, in which a deceived but good woman struggles to find her voice and a means to agency against the limiting constructions of female virtue and of the public sphere. At the moment when Lovemore refers to Manley’s other works, then, Manley opens a space in the text in which her voice can be heard, even if faintly. She declares herself as an established—and highly political—author by gesturing back to that earlier polemical work, and this gesture reinforces her insistence on her particular identity as a woman and a Tory and her insistence on those particulars as authorizing her public voice.

45. Manley, *New Atalantis*, 225. As Pollak notes, this version of the story is partly fictionalized as well (“Guarding the Succession,” 233). But it can nonetheless be read as a carefully constructed public self-representation.

46. Manley, *New Atalantis*, 227.

47. It seems likely that many readers of *Rivella* would have been familiar with *The New Atalantis*, since it had been so popular and influential. Indeed, since the subtitle of *Rivella* called it *the History of the Author of the Atalantis*, it would appeal directly to those who had read Manley’s earlier work.

Rivella's voice also comes to the fore near the end of the text, in the conversations Lovemore reports having with her about her political works. As we have already seen, she argues with him about her right to engage in political writing; she also argues with him about her right to take public responsibility for her work. When the printer and publishers of *The New Atalantis* are arrested for libel, Rivella announces to Lovemore her intention to surrender herself as a prisoner in order to save them. Lovemore presents two arguments against her doing so: he claims that the Tories will not help her, and he says that she has no obligation to the printer and publishers. Contrasting the lack of Tory support for writers with the Whigs' readiness to pay for propaganda, he says, "the Tories had no general interest, and consequently no particular, each person refusing to contribute towards the benefit of the whole" (AR, 108). The Tories did conspicuously fail to pay Manley for her work on their behalf, and she conveniently gets away with complaining about it without appearing to do so; nonetheless, Lovemore's argument sounds curiously like Manley's Tory view of the Whigs. That is, he describes the Tories as failing to support individuals out of a lack of public interest, yet the absence of public interest is precisely what Manley accuses the Whigs of. His accusation against the Tories thus reveals his political motives for trying to quiet her. When he asks her why she could "not sit quiet ... and not meddle her self about what did not concern her" (AR, 109), it becomes clear that he is, as usual, trying to get her to limit herself to private interest only. Furthermore, his next suggestion gives the whole game away: he proposes that she run away with him to France or Switzerland. What he advises is prompted by his desire for her. It is his private interest rather than anything else (such as concern for her) that motivates him. Rivella, naturally, repudiates this approach by refusing to look out for her best interests. Instead, she insists not only on taking responsibility for her work but also on protecting those who have, in a sense, served her. Since they have obliged her, she has a political duty toward them. She thus situates herself in a hierarchy that fits the pattern of Tory ideology: she serves both her sovereign and the

Tories who claim to support the public good, and in turn she fulfills an obligation to those who have served her. In this paradigm, the boundaries of what constitutes the public are much broader than the boundaries of the bourgeois public sphere, and Rivella can readily use her political positioning to authorize her public performance.

This performance of her “duty” (*AR*, 110) is not a meaningless act of sacrifice, for she manages to get herself, the printer, and the publishers released. She neatly manipulates her Whig accusers by claiming a merely private origin and purpose for her text. According to their own constructions of gender and of the public sphere, then, they are forced to let her go: they are “ashamed to bring a woman to her trial for writing a few amorous trifles purely for her own amusement” (*AR*, 111). Since Rivella’s defense fits so well with the privatized, sexualized idea of women constructed by the Whiggish social contract and the bourgeois public sphere—the construction Lovemore has been arguing for throughout the novel—the Whigs cannot find a way around it. Paradoxically, by manipulating both “Whig notions of the perfect separability of public and private life”⁴⁸ and the notion that women belong in private, she wins her release back into political agency. After her release, however, the issue is still a sore point with Lovemore. He had refused to see her during her imprisonment and is now forced to admit that he was in the wrong, since she so capably extricated herself without him. His response is to attack her work again; this is when he claims to have made her “ashamed of her writings” (*AR*, 111). But as we have seen, she cleverly excludes her political works, thus maintaining her public, political voice and rejecting Lovemore’s impositions. Manley uses Lovemore’s obviously biased narration to point out that his construction of Rivella as a sexualized and purely private figure is just that: a construction, and one that does not fit with Rivella’s own version of herself. Her power to write and to act publicly is enabled by the political and social identity she asserts; the male narrators demonstrate that taking away that identity in the

48. Pollak, “Guarding the Succession,” 234.

bourgeois public sphere would amount to taking away her power to write.

Though Lovemore's narrative authority is clearly subverted throughout the novel, Rivella's voice never quite replaces it. Instead, she makes herself heard at discrete moments within Lovemore's narrative frame, insisting on her identity as a Tory polemicist to authorize her work. Manley thus represents the restrictive effect of emerging ideas about the public sphere in the very form of her narrative; indeed, *The Adventures of Rivella* can be seen as encapsulating the debate over what authorizes public voice. While Barker's novels do not depict the same kind of overt conflict, they do depend on her Jacobite allegiance to give her the authority to write and publish; Barker's Jacobitism both gives her novels their appeal for a select audience and makes her novels powerful for that audience. Without the possibility of a different kind of public—a public constituted partly by manuscript publication and by underground political loyalty—Barker's work could not have found a space to offer its counterdiscourse. For Manley, as for Barker, the assertion of a particular political identity was key to gaining access to critical debate. Both writers illustrate how crucial politics were for early women writers—and how the bourgeois public sphere would restrict women's access by calling for the denial of such particular identity. By demonstrating the limitations entailed by the bourgeois public sphere, both writers not only refused to enter it but also decried its growing dominance over competing conceptions of public discourse.