Introduction
Breaking Open the Conversation on Delarivier Manley

Aleksandra Hultquist and Elizabeth J. Mathews

Delarivier Manley (c. 1667/72–1724) was the foremost woman writer in the age of Queen Anne, a master of exposing private information, as she did in her *Lady's Packnet Broke Open* (1707) or the more famous *New Atalantis* (1709). Eighteenth-century scholars unfamiliar with Manley's corpus may still have heard of her, perhaps as the sensationalist who penned a character who murders and chops up her bigamous husband to obtain justice, or the woman who contracted her own (possibly accidental) bigamous marriage, or the peer of contemporaries who have a bit more cultural cachet, like Richard Steele and Jonathan Swift, or the target of satires like *The Female Wits* (staged 1696) and *The Dunciad* (1728). Despite or because of her reputation, her writing earned her extreme popularity in her time and critical condemnation in the centuries after her death.

Recovery work has enabled the critical moment in which we find ourselves, where Manley is increasingly known and studied; however, she has yet to receive the attention devoted to Aphra Behn and Eliza Haywood, her fellow members of the “triumvirate of wit.” Early work from feminist critics, especially Ros Ballaster's *Seductive Forms* (1992), has done much to place Manley on the radar of scholarship and encourage the recuperation of her works. But much of that early work can be expanded upon. Twenty-first-century Manley scholarship, especially the work of Rachel Carnell and Ruth Herman, has established Manley as a writer who merits analysis in conjunction with subjects like party politics, imperialism, sexuality, violence, and genre. Yet, while the critical conversation grows, not enough voices have joined.

The attention of respected scholars over the last several decades has not yet erased the stigma of previous critics’ dismissal. In English departments otherwise inclusive of women writers and popular texts, some professors still discourage young scholars from working on such a marginal author, and though the most recent Norton anthology references Manley in its introduction, it does not feature her writing.1 Nevertheless, the study of Manley has burgeoned in recent years, with scholars exploring her life and work through conference papers, articles, and monographs. This book, the first multi-author collection on Manley, aims to give the author a firm push toward canonicity with the many rich and varied conversations contained herein.
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Biography

In addition to the longstanding trend of critical dismissal of Manley’s work, the lack of reliable sources on Manley’s life has posed a challenge to scholars who wish to situate this scholar in her milieu. Her life is a swarm of rumors, lies, and exaggerations surrounding a carefully crafted public personality. The actual documentary record of her life contains (to date) some letters to Robert Harley, Earl of Oxford; a debt transfer and notice of imprisonment in 1702; and her arrest for libel in 1709. Other than these, we have her published works and other people’s letters in which she is mentioned, and what Herman has called her scraps of correspondence. She requested that her personal papers be destroyed after her death. From various communications about her, we can gather she was witty, extremely charming, a very capable writer, and a poor speller.

Carnell has drawn attention to Manley’s sophisticated textual flexibility through the author’s creation of her own distinctive narrative style, which is quasi-autobiographical, quasi-political, and quasi-fictional. Manley spent much of her career creating herself rhetorically as a character; clearly her self-crafted emblematic image, that of Rivella in The Adventures of Rivella (1714) and of Delia in The New Atalantis, was the one she wanted to leave as her biographical legacy. As such, everything she states about herself (much of it through the voices of others, or through a third-person description) must be taken critically; the actual biography of Manley, once edited for self-aggrandizement, prejudices, and rumors, is rather scarce.

We know for certain that she was the daughter of Sir Roger Manley (c. 1621–1687) and Marie-Catherine (c. 1643–1675). Her father was a royalist who spent years in exile during the Commonwealth government as a military officer and historian; he was unexceptionally successful at both. Her mother was a French-speaking noblewoman from the Spanish Netherlands and died when Manley was quite young, maybe as early as her infancy or as late as when she was five years old. Because there is no surviving record of her birth, we cannot substantiate her birth place or year, but Manley was likely born on the Isle of Jersey, where her father was lieutenant governor, between 1667 and 1672. We have little information on her early childhood. Her father’s will notes that she was one of five children at the time of his death. She seems to have been educated at home, and though her specific education is unclear (scholars disagree about whether it was a typically feminine education or the “liberal” education of a young man, as she claims), she was obviously widely read and proud of her ability to be conversant on many topics.

By her father’s death in 1687 Manley was of a marriageable age, and she claimed in her works that she had been hoping for an appointment to the court of Mary of Modena prior to James II’s 1688 abdication. Her father’s modest career success and fortune provided little dowry, and her face was severely scarred from a childhood bout of smallpox. Neither wealth nor beauty would have secured her a suitable marriage, but it seems that her
man, charming personality, quick wit, and pleasing manners almost made up for these deficiencies. From what we can tell, she would have made a charismatic courtier.

In *The New Atalantis*, Manley claims to have been seduced, married, possessed, and ruined by her cousin (and possibly one of her legal guardians), John Manley, about fifteen years her senior, whose wife was alive at the time. Scholars and biographers often see this incident as the pivotal point in her life—this social “ruin” led to her needing to financially support herself with a career in writing.6 There are several ways of interpreting this marriage: John as bored enough to seduce his cousin, or anxious enough to need ready cash (Manley’s moderate inheritance was quickly run through); Delavier as anxious to leave a quiet life in the country for a residence in London; their need to hide an illegitimate pregnancy; her possible delusions about the viability and legality of polygamy. We, of course, do not know if she was aware that his wife was still living, if they had been sexually involved before the marriage, or even by whom the ceremony was performed (though it was likely a dissenting minister). Regardless, they had a son christened in Westminster in 1691. Manley seems to have discovered about this time (if she didn’t know before) that the marriage was bigamous and therefore illegal. By 1694 she was living with Barbara Palmer (nee Villiers), Duchess of Cleveland, and she left the household soon after, having been accused of trying to seduce Cleveland’s son, an illegitimate child of Charles II. Manley seems to have left London and lived in Exeter or somewhere else in the “West Country” until about 1696, when two plays were produced in London and she had composed a draft (at least) of *Letters Written*. This, along with her published poems in *The Nine Muses*7 in London in 1700, marks (for the modern scholar) the beginning of her professional writing career.

She was the mistress of John Tilly, governor of Fleet prison, between 1697 and 1702. There are hints of risks and schemes—this is the time when she was involved with the infamous and (so she hoped) profitable Bath-Albemarle trial, recounted in *Rivella* (her involvement yielded no financial benefit). The years between 1702 and 1709 were likely tumultuous ones for her. Tilly married a wealthy widow; Manley was very ill; she was in Fleet prison in 1705 (for debt?); she may have had up to three children to provide (or arrange for) and worry about,8 she met and fell out with Richard Steele. J. A. Downie has suggested (and Carnell’s work deeply supports) that she was not yet writing political propaganda.9 (In this collection, however, Chris Mounsey argues that her political writing strategies may have started as early as 1696.) In 1706 her play *The Royal Mischief* (written 1696) was rather unsuccessfully produced, and in 1707 came the publication of *The Lady’s Pacquet of Letters... Or, The Lady’s Pacquet Broke Open*, which documents her friendship with Richard Steele.10 By 1709 *The New Atalantis* was published, and this text inaugurated the main interpretation of Manley as a political satirist. She was arrested and interrogated as its author in 1709, though the charges were dropped. We are unsure what portion of the text, exactly, caused the arrest.
Between 1711 and 1713 she was known as a leading figure for Tory propaganda, distinguished by publications of the second part of The New Atlantis and Memoirs of Europe in 1710. In 1711, she became editor of the Examiner (issue numbers 46–52), replacing Jonathan Swift, a friend whom she seems to have met through her printer (and likely lover) John Barber. She wrote several pamphlets for Swift, including The D. of M.—b’s Vindication and Learned Comment, in 1711. By 1712, her health was not good; Barber feared her death by dropsy, and though she lived another twelve years, she was severely affected by ill health for the rest of her life.

The Adventures of Ritella was published in 1714, and she seems to have been enjoying a run of fame and perhaps fortune from the reprints of New Atlantis. Her final play, Lucius, the First Christian King of Britain, was produced in Theatre Royal in Drury Lane in 1717 and ran for fifteen successive nights to crowded houses.13 So despite the Hanoverian succession, a political change that might have ended her career as a Tory satirist, Manley appears to have been clever and flexible enough to write, publish, produce, and get paid. She was living independently near Oxford by 1717, gaining respectability and reputation through her talent, political acumen, and literary friendships.

By 1719 she had written The Power of Love in Seven Novels, a collection of adapted novellas published in 1720. It was her final recognized published work, though Herman claims that she was writing and publishing poetry at the time.12 Manley died in 1724 after prolonged illness. Her reputation as a witty conversationalist, clever writer, and attentive mentor lasted for several decades after her death, but as soon as 1785 Clara Reeve in The Progress of Romance declared Manley to be scandalous, exceptionable, and gradually sinking into oblivion.13 As Carnell has argued, various revisionist perspectives—the ascension of Whig politics, increasingly restrictive Victorian morality, personal grudges (like Winston Churchill’s biography of his ancestor the Duke of Marlborough), and the “rise” of the novel—had a great amount of power in diminishing her latterly acquired reputation for respectability.

Breaking Open Bibliography and Criticism

Along with the slippage of biography is the slippage of bibliography. We still have no extensive bibliography, as Mary Ann O’Donnell and Patrick Spedding have provided for us for Aphra Behn and Eliza Haywood.14 Scholars have been questioning the bibliographical lists to be sure that what we are reading is in fact attributable to Manley, such as J. A. Downie’s above-mentioned casting of well-considered doubt on the authorship of Queen Sarah, and Herman’s recent poetic attributions.15 While her outright plagiarism is not entirely confirmed by Carnell, the “flexibility” of Manley’s borrowings is certainly clear.16 But scholars also wonder what more might belong to Manley’s oeuvre. Just as the information about Manley
is piecemeal and scattered, so are the modern publications of her works. Most eighteenth-century scholars are familiar only with *The Adventures of Rivella* and *The New Atalantis*, in part because of twentieth-century reprints. Today, only Katherine Zelinsky’s Broadview edition of *Rivella* (1999) is still available in an affordable edition. Meanwhile, the rest of her work is difficult for new scholars to read, and sometimes illegible due to errors in scanning. The only scholarly collection of works by Carnell and Herman is “Selected,” and its price makes it too rich for students or studying for most young scholars. (Many contributors to this collection found it too difficult to get hold of Carnell and Herman’s edition.) While numerous eighteenth-century writers’ works have become available online in recent years, Manley’s have lagged behind this trend. We hope that this edition inspires accessible editions of her works so that future students and scholars have the chance to break open the critical conversations that has happened in Aphra Behn and Eliza Haywood studies.

Scholarship on Delarivier Manley has provided an excellent solid foundation on which the literary scholar can draw. Ros Ballaster, Rachel Carnell, and Ruth Herman have especially ensured that Manley is properly positioned in terms of her historical trail, not just her historical reputation. Last century’s energetic scholarship revolving around the rise of the novel suggests her important contributions to early prose fiction, but recent criticism points out that this association may have done her more harm than good by depicting her as a “bad” novelist, as Toni Bowers’s Afterword in this collection emphasizes. Manley’s central place as a writer of secret histories has been firmly established. Important discussions concentrate on gendered aspects of Manley’s writing and its connection to social and political realms, especially as she contributes to party politics. Even so, much remains to be done, and the existing scholarship is ripe for reconsideration in light of growing awareness of Manley’s multifaceted contributions to eighteenth-century literature. This, the first critical collection on Manley, begins that vital work by revisiting the most heated critical discussions and adding new perspectives that will change the conversation.

**Breaking Open Power, Sex, and Text**

We organize the chapters in three distinct but interconnected sections where Manley scholarship currently is being broken open: “Power,” “Sex,” and “Text.” Individually, each essay distinguishes itself by its particular engagement with an aspect of Manley studies that many have considered closed for discussion or that has never been opened in the first place. As a compilation, the essays demonstrate the wide range of thinking about Manley’s literary production and the significance of this influential author. While authors reconsider some of her well-known texts through her generic...
inter$textuality or unresolved political moments, the collection focuses more on those works that have been less studied: her dramas, her correspondence, her journalistic endeavors, and her late prose fiction. The methodological approaches in this collection incorporate traditional approaches to Manley, such as historical research, gender theory, and comparative close readings, as well as some of the recently influential approaches such as geocriticism and affect studies.

We begin the collection with the section “Power,” which reexamines an area of particular energy in Manley studies thus far. One of the most fruitful discussions of Manley to date has to do with her relationship to the Tory Ministry and her complicated association to the propaganda machines of both Whig and Tory governments, especially in conversations begun by Ros Ballaster, Toni Bowers, Rachel Carnell, and Ruth Herman. Such readings have situated Manley’s work in terms of “new-Tory” writing, political vows, and the close relationship between imaginative writing and law. Additionally, scholars like Bernadette Andrea have addressed Manley’s presentation of imperial issues. The section on “Power” in this collection builds on these political perspectives on Manley’s work. In this section, scholars use historical, political, and geographical contexts to reconsider the power dynamics that play out in Manley’s literature—particularly the political dimensions of personal matters. This section demonstrates that never far from Manley’s texts is the insistence that the power the privileged wield can be countered by the more furtive, and very disruptive power, available to the disenfranchised, the secretive, and the subtle.

Rachel Carnell, the initiator of many vital conversations on Manley, opens the section with her contribution, “The Adventures of Rivella as Political Secret History.” In this essay, Carnell demonstrates that recontextualizing Rivella as a political secret history rather than a generically unstable autobiography illuminates the political nature of Manley’s maneuverings within and around this work. By refocusing attention from her own scandals, which could have been exploited by political opponents, to the scandals of others, Manley announced herself to be a continuing threat to whoever was unwise enough to make an enemy of her. In this way, Carnell shows that Manley’s deft use of information for personal and political gain creates surprising commonality with Sarah, Duchess of Marlborough, her political opponent. Carnell looks past the history of reframing Rivella as personal to assert the text’s, and Manley’s, political context and influence.

Earla Wilputte also clarifies the political nature of what appears to be Manley’s apolitical work. In contrast to scholars who have dismissed The Power of Love (1720) as overly didactic and disengaged from current affairs, Wilputte reads the Husband’s Resentment novels from the collection as equivocal, and thus critical of established social and political norms. In her essay “The Politics of Servitude: The Husband’s Resentment. In Two Examples,” Wilputte delineates Manley’s subtle depiction of abuses of power. While carefully considering the distinctive power dynamics of
different relationships, Wilputte draws parallels among servants, wives, subjects, and authors to reveal the complexity of servitude.

In “Vengeance, Vows, and ‘Heroick Vertue’: Reforming the Revenger in Delarivier Manley’s Almyra: or, The Arabian Vow,” Misty Krueger analyzes another understudied work in the Manley corpus. She shows how Almyra (staged 1706) was at the forefront of a nationalistic trend in theater toward reason and bloodless resolution. Focusing on Manley’s portrayal of revenge, Krueger evaluates the way in which Manley’s heroine uses persuasive speeches to embody masculine civic virtue while countering vengeful men’s dangerous effeminacy, establishing the importance of women’s peacekeeping role.

Bernadette Andrea’s essay “Through the Black Sea and the Country of Colchis: A Geocentric Approach to Delarivier Manley’s The Royal Mischief (1696)” expands the section’s consideration of power to a global scale, situating Manley’s play within its setting’s multilayered imperial investments. Andrea maps Colchis’s long history of depiction as a space of cultural interaction, which resonates in The Royal Mischief to create a work that destabilizes the prevalent binary of East/West and centers feminine capability. Using geocriticism, Andrea delves deeply into the sometimes misidentified setting of Colchis, drawing on sources that Manley could have been aware of. The tradition of the region as a borderland and its role in early modern Europe’s imperial narrative highlight Manley’s participation in a larger discourse on gender, place, and power.

The “Sex” section extends work on gender and sexuality in Manley. Previous scholarship has engaged in feminist readings of her texts, and Terry Castle, Ruth Herman, David Michael Robinson, and Jane Spencer have begun the work of queering Manley, especially in the scenes of the Ladies of the New Cabal of The New Atalantis. Sex demonstrates the ways in which Manley’s corpus investigates the subtleties of the political and emotional aspects of sex, sexuality, and gender. While overt sexuality, adultery, and violence have been explored in Manley’s works, the nuances of queerness, asexuality, emotionality, and affective perspectives have not. The scholarship in this section reexamines the reiteration of sex and love in her works, exploring the generative possibilities her portrayals suggest.

Erin M. Keating examines an old favorite in a new light in her essay, “Interrupting Pleasure: Ideology and Affect in Delarivier Manley’s The New Atalantis.” Keating describes the affective dynamics of Manley’s treatments of virtue, sex, and physicality in general, showing how Manley draws attention to the construction, aesthetics, and destructiveness of ideas of feminine virtue and contrasts their artificiality and eroticized distress with the fully material body. Keating complicates the accepted views on Manley’s signature text and her approach to feminine virtue by revealing a critique of the erotic spectacle of female suffering. However, she argues that Manley cannot present a satisfying alternative to this spectacle, given the strictures of genre and society.

Jennifer Frangos picks up the thread of Manley’s alternatives but views these possibilities as more promising for women. In “Manley’s Single Ladies,”
Frangos focuses on the hitherto neglected subject of asexuality. Through the lens of the new asexuality movement, Frangos sees coherence between the choices of some of Manley’s single characters and the presentation of her fictionalized self. This reading extends Manley’s critique of the sexual double standard to the decision of some of her characters to opt out of heterosexual exchange altogether. Frangos’s essay adds to a body of work that challenges a heteronormative approach to eighteenth-century studies.

Kim Simpson also presents a nonheteronormative reading of Manley’s work in “Manley’s Queer Forms: Repetition, Techno-performativity, and the Body,” which asserts that her maligned use of formula can be read as proto-queer. Simpson considers the citationality and materiality in Manley’s work and the relationship between the two. She argues that Manley’s repetitions in relation to gender and sexuality establish a world of oppressive necessity and constructed identities, while also creating openings for productive disruption. Like Keating, Simpson reads Manley’s fictional pregnant bodies as not just warnings against sex, but textual opportunities with transformative potential.

Aleksandra Hultquist concludes the section by demonstrating how Manley’s portrayal of desire in The Power of Love was in conversation with her source material and a body of work on the passions in “From Pleasure to Power: The Passion of Love in The Fair Hypocrite.” Taking seriously the creative work of Manley’s adaptation (as her contemporaries would have), Hultquist reveals that Manley’s alterations to Painter’s tale qualify his message about the destructive nature of desire and saving grace of virtue. Manley’s Fair Hypocrite instead emphasizes the virtuous quality of desire itself, both for the state and for individuals. This essay asserts the importance of one of Manley’s most dismissed literary productions as a significant player in the discourse of the passions that permeated eighteenth-century philosophical conversations.

Finally, the section “Text” demonstrates how Manley has made vital contributions to the full range of forms in which she wrote, synthesizing existing genres and creating new ones that resonate in literature for generations. For decades, Manley has carried the stigma of being a “bad” writer, both morally and aesthetically. The critical tendency to read her secret histories as novels caused her to be perceived as a weak novelist rather than a clever political stylist. Her repetition of seduction scenes, violent betrayals, and powerful and sometimes violent women became a practice readers could not see past, much less see an inherent value in. These essays reconceive the ways in which Manley plays with genre and texts, writing and thinking, and argue that Manley influenced her own and others’ approaches to satire, periodical writing, and drama. Her textual forays created the satiric prose author that we know. The essays in this section explain how that occurred.

Recognizing Manley’s contribution to the creation of sentimental comedy, Victoria Joule argues that the often-dismissed play The Lost Lover (1696) deserves serious consideration. In “Manley’s ‘Sentimental’ Deserted Mistress,
Women Writers in Literary History, and *The Lost Lover,*" Joule shows how Manley’s play departs definitively from previous comedic tradition, claiming sympathy for the deserted mistress type and punishing rather than reforming the rake. Her analysis of the play’s performance history explains the play’s lack of success and the resonance Manley likely intended it to have. Finally, Joule touches on Manley’s treatment of models for women writers and the investment of sympathy for women more broadly.

Like Joule, Katharine Beutner addresses Manley’s treatment of women writers, as well as her treatment as a woman writer. In “Delarivier Manley Understands the Ladies Better Than You: *The Female Wits,* Genre, and Feminocentric Satire,” Beutner presents the possibility that the depiction of Manley in *The Female Wits* reveals a truer portrait of the author (or at least a facet of her) than Manley scholarship currently acknowledges. She suggests a broadening of the term *feminocentric* to include not only positivist, proto-feminist agendas, but also reciprocal female-authored satire, regardless of its cruelty. Linking the attacks on Manley and her own attacks on female writers to Manley’s literary ambition, Beutner argues that a clear view of Manley’s career is only possible when looking at her work holistically, across the many genres in which she wrote.

Chris Mounsey, in “A Manifesto for a Woman Writer: *Letters Written as Varronian Satire*” approaches the beginning of Manley’s career with a similarly transgeneric perspective. Mounsey suggests that the first three of Manley’s known published works form a previously unrecognized strategy, the key to which lies in *Letters Written* (1696), which he reads as an early experiment with Varronian satire. Mounsey finds Varronian techniques and political attacks in the preface and epistolary narrative of *Letters Written,* which could shed light on Manley’s political allegiances and career hiatus and forge a connection to Manley’s work in the later *Atalantis.* By reframing Manley’s initial dabbling in different genres as the canny work of a satirist, he makes a case for Manley’s early importance as a satirist.

Jean McBain also addresses Manley’s epistolary technique in her essay, “Examined in Manley Style: Epistolary Modes in the Periodical Writings of Delarivier Manley.” Focusing on the neglected aspects of form and style in Manley’s *Examiner* writing (1711), McBain reads Manley’s *Examiner* work in the context of the epistolary tradition within periodicals, which entails a different relationship to authenticity, authority, impartiality, and publicity than the epistolary secret history. By attending to the rhetorical functions of letters within periodicals, McBain contributes to an understanding of Manley’s stylistic range and to the study of eighteenth-century periodicals in general.

In the final chapter of the collection, “The Miscellaneous *New Atalantis,*” Nicola Parsons revisits Manley’s most famous work from a previously overlooked formal perspective. Parsons directs attention to the structure of the text, arguing that its fragmentary, digressive features engage deliberately with a literary tradition. By detailing this tradition and exploring the effects
of Manley's own miscellaneity, Parsons complicates our received understanding of the text's political intent and furthers the work of attending to the textual details that have long been neglected in Manley studies.

Though we have grouped these essays under the larger rubrics of the themes of power, sex, and text, many of them could move fluidly between such organizational themes. Most of the essays in this collection address genre in some way, which reflects the extent of Manley's abilities as a writer, the tendency of her work to blur formal boundaries, and the way that critical readings and misreadings of generic categories shape perceptions of the works themselves. Connections among the personal, social, and political appear often in these essays, illuminating Manley's interest in power dynamics. Reputation also figures heavily, as Manley's fictional concern as well as the object of careful and skilled negotiation in her real life. More than one essay addresses the affective dimensions of Manley's texts, which are ripe for this approach. It is a strength that arguments about genre, gender, politics, perception, and emotion cross in work on Manley. In addition to making these essays rich, this complexity also indicates that we have arrived at a generative critical moment in Manley studies.

The current Manley scholarship is invested in contradiction. Contradiction not just in the sense of contesting previous claims or correcting ahistorical readings, but also in reconciling what appear to be contradictory interpretations. Manley invites many such contradictory interpretations: she can be read as a genius or a hack, proto-feminist or antifeminist, Orientalist or counter-Orientalist, classist or not, a staunch Tory or a political opportunist, canny or vicious. In contrast to the many ways Manley has been too easily dismissed, this collection carefully considers many points of view, and opens the way for new ones on the subjects in this volume as well as the many aspects of Manley's work and life that remain to be addressed. The "breaking" of this collection performs is neither violent nor divisive; it is the work of scholars who are ready to crack the seal on critical conversations old and new, and to let the discussion unfold.

Notes

3. Both catalogs of the British Library and the United States Library of Congress have her listed as "Mrs. (Mary de la Rivière) Manley." There is no evidence that she was christened as a "Mary" nor that she ever referred to herself as such. She used the name "Dela" in her correspondence and publications.
6. Carnell, 71. Ballaster suggests that the break with John Manley may have taken several years, vii–xi.
7. This was a collection of elegies in honor of John Dryden; all four contributors to the collection—Sarah Fyge Egerton, Mary Pix, Catharine Trotter, and Susanna Centlivre—were later satirized as disloyal friends and Whig loyalists in The New Atlantis. Ballaster xii.
10. Part 2 of the Lady’s Jacquet was published one year later (1708) as The Unknown Lady’s Jacquet. Manley’s works are published along with Marie Catherine La Motte, Baronne d’Aubigné’s Memoirs of the Court of England and The History of the Earl of Warwick.
11. Carnell, Political Biography, 220.
12. Herman, Business of a Woman, 32–33. Herman also has found evidence of a possible additional volume of The New Atlantis, though such a text, if it exists, has never been found. It may simply have been an advertising ploy.
18. Published facsimiles include Mary Delarivier Manley and Patricia Köster, The Novels of Mary Delarivier Manley, Vol. 2 (Gainesville, FL: Scholars’ Facsimiles and Reprints, 1971) and Stephanie Hodgson-Wright, Delarivier Manley (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006).
19. Ballaster’s 1992 Penguin edition of The New Atlantis contains a bibliographic list of her works, though some attributions are currently in doubt and others may be missing.
22. See especially Ballaster, Seductive Forms; Eve Tavor Bannet, “‘Secret History’: Or, Talebearing inside and Outside the Secretaire,” Huntington Library Quarterly 68,
12. Aleksandra Hultquist and Elizabeth J. Mathews
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