Preface

We have not many patrons amongst the men; let us hear all that has been said by any of the ungenerous sex in our favour, since we are pretty sure to hear their abuses.

—Hester Chapone to Elizabeth Carter

The title of this book is bold, deliberately so, and in its boldness is likely to surprise all but those university men who dubbed Milton “the Lady of Christ’s.” Nevertheless, the title is also freighted with significance. On the one hand, it is intended to counter the cynicism evident in Lytton Strachey’s self-answering question “Is it possible to test a poet’s greatness by the largeness of his ‘view of life’? How wide, one would like to know, was Milton’s ‘view of humanity’?”¹ On the other hand, the title is meant to ally Milton with a specific community of readers and a special critical consciousness within that community which, at least in its current manifestations, has come to be called “feminist.” If the feminist enterprise involves deconstructing “dominant male patterns of thought” while “reconstructing female experience previously hidden or overlooked,”² that enterprise provides this book with an agenda. And that agenda, once pursued, yields the conclusion that, in Milton studies, women have a history and have had an influence of their own—and perhaps more unexpected, that Milton was not just an ally of feminists but their early sponsor.

In reviewing women’s observations on Milton from about

¹Lytton Strachey, *Books and Characters: French and English* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1922), p. 18.

²Gayle Greene and Coppelia Kahn, “Feminist Scholarship and the Social Construction of Women,” in *Making a Difference: Feminist Literary Criticism*, ed. Gayle Greene and Coppelia Kahn (London and New York: Methuen, 1985), p. 6.

1700 to 1830, this book restores a female perspective to Milton's writings. In the process, it revises usual paradigms of female response and simultaneously reveals not only how, in unpredictable ways, women were reading Milton but also how their readings of his poetry affected—and in some instances determined—interpretation. This is especially true for the Romantic period when, for example, the last books of *Paradise Lost* receive their first sustained critical appreciation and illumination. Milton's epic-prophecy is in part a woman's text—indeed, a lost feminist text—a large part of which has been buried by patriarchal culture. It is a text that invites and has its own hidden agenda for a feminist criticism that would remove from literary works incrustations of patriarchal interpretation.

This book reconstructs a female perspective on and experience of *Paradise Lost* as a poem that was itself engaged in the dethroning of authority and in the formation of new gender paradigms, as a poem inscribed with, not by a received ideology concerning the sexes which, instead of transmitting, it would transform. No poem is a better witness to Gayle Greene and Coppelia Kahn's proposition that "even when literature is potentially subversive, it has been made to function as part of a literary tradition that inscribes the dominant ideology and marginalizes women. . . . Critical tradition reinforces—even when literature does not—images of character and behaviour that encourage women to accept their subordination, either ignoring or degrading women, or praising them for such virtues as obedience, meekness and humility."³ The concerns of this book are manifold: historical readerships, especially women; the politics of reading, writing, and interpretation; the canonizing of Milton's poetry and the institutionalizing of certain interpretations of it, at what cost and at what loss; the complicated relation between literature and ideology and the collusion of criticism with ideology. In short, the book is about the ideological capture of Milton by one constituency of readers and his recapture by another. In fact, many of the concerns of this book are implicit in what Hannah Mitchell heard and said at a debate on women and politics:

³Ibid., p. 22.

At that time the idea of women in politics was very unpopular. . . . I was both surprised and indignant at the sex prejudice displayed by most of the debaters, and sat in a silent rage listening to speeches which ranged from the frankly contemptuous to the sloppily sentimental, from Adam to St. Paul, until a callow youth, eager to show his learning, ended a high-flown, but rather silly speech with the statement that his opinion of women coincided with Milton's:

"He for God only; she for God in him,"

and sat down amidst great applause.

Without premeditation I sprang to my feet, congratulated our "young friend" on his intimate knowledge of the Almighty's intentions regarding the status of women, and suggested that he extend his reading to more democratic poets, then flung at him and the meeting a chunk of my recently acquired Tennyson:

"The woman's cause is man's; they rise or fall together,
dwarfed or Godlike, bound or free."

"If she be small, slight natured, miserable, How shall
men grow?"⁴

Milton has obviously been co-opted by a male readership; his words are hurled at women but not now hurled by women back to men.

The time has passed when women could and would enlist Milton as a rebel in their cause. This book tells the whats, whys, and hows of the history of women's shifting attitudes toward Milton: *what* the horizons of expectation were on the part of Milton's early readership (male and female), *why* those expectations changed, and *how* and with what consequences they changed. The paradigmatic response of women to Milton's poetry shifts perceptibly at the onset of the Victorian period (that is another book) toward what, as represented by Hannah Mitchell, it now typically is. What that response now is, or seems to be, in its apprehension of *Paradise Lost* as a principal document of and powerful sanction for patriarchal culture is simply different from what in Milton's century and in the eighteenth and early nine-

⁴Hannah Mitchell, *The Hard Way Up: The Autobiography of Hannah Mitchell, Suffragette and Rebel*, ed. George Mitchell (London: Faber and Faber, 1968), p. 98.

teenth centuries it had been—at least for women who then taking “hold of the signs and symbols of a male-dominated culture . . . made them speak female truths to other women.”⁵ *Paradise Lost* especially was regarded as a woman’s text—not just one through which women could challenge the cherished beliefs of Milton’s male readers, but one through which Milton himself had challenged those beliefs by fashioning a new female ideal with the intention of forging a new social and political reality. We are left with the irony, so finely formulated by Nancy Armstrong and Leonard Tennenhouse, that “when Milton abandoned political writing and retired into his poetry, he did not actually abandon politics. Rather, he entered directly into a struggle through which the values he held as a Protestant reformer and political activist would come to dominate British culture.”⁶ The ironies of criticism proliferate when one remembers that, in the eighteenth century, a fictionalized and libertarian wife justifies walking out on her husband by quoting Milton’s *Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce*, the same tract that in the twentieth century provides the “real” and reactionary Anita Bryant with passages to be recited in the divorce court to sanction her own walking out on a husband.⁷

History’s images of Milton are as significant as the image of Milton that seems to prevail in our own time.⁸ This hermeneutic difference is as striking as it is illuminating. In the twentieth cen-

⁵See Nancy Armstrong’s review of Mary Poovey’s *The Proper Lady and the Woman Writer*, in *Modern Language Notes*, 100 (1985), 1251.

⁶See Nancy Armstrong and Leonard Tennenhouse, “The History of Sexuality in *Paradise Lost*,” *Representations*, forthcoming.

⁷See Mary Walker’s *Le Village de Munster* (2 vols.; Paris and Rotterdam, 1782), I, 141–42; and “Notes on People: Anita Bryant Calls on Milton for a Few Words,” *New York Times*, 26 July 1980, p. 20.

⁸See Christine Froula’s “When Eve Reads Milton: Undoing the Canonical Economy,” *Critical Inquiry*, 10 (1983), 321–47; Froula’s “Pechter’s Specter: Milton’s Bogey Writ Small; or, Why Is He Afraid of Virginia Woolf?” *Critical Inquiry*, 11 (1984), 171–78; and Sandra Gilbert’s “Patriarchal Poetry and Women Readers: Reflections on Milton’s Bogey,” *Publications of the Modern Language Association*, 93 (1978), 368–82, along with the exchange in the same journal between Sandra Gilbert and Philip J. Gallagher, “Milton’s Bogey,” 94 (1979), 319–22. Cf. Sandra M. Gilbert and Susan Gubar, *The Madwoman in the Attic: The Woman Writer and the Nineteenth-Century Literary Imagination* (New Haven and London: Yale Univ. Press, 1979), pp. 187–308; and Joan Malory Webber, “The Politics of Poetry: Feminism and *Paradise Lost*,” *Milton Studies*, 14 (1980), 3–24.

ture, women may contrast the jubilation and admiration Milton engenders in a male readership with the despair he elicits from women and with which he darkens the pages of their writings. From the late seventeenth century until about 1830, women simply thought differently. Writing in the nineteenth century, Lady Morgan—who can mention in rapid succession Milton's defenses of the English people and his antiprelatical tracts, who remembers how "the untiring Stuarts thirsted for . . . [the] blood . . . of [this] defender of the British republic," and who insists upon ideological continuity between the prose works and *Paradise Lost*—typifies the response to Milton, and representation of him, by an early female readership that more characteristically complains about male establishmentarian appropriations of Milton. Such appropriations, usually achieved by ideological emptyings of Milton's poetry, were intended as counters to those who "deemed the name of the inspired author of 'Paradise Lost' a profanation . . . of regal and prelatial greatness"; these ideological counters then contravened the spirit, deflecting the subversive thrust of Milton's poem. Where all columns to greatness are erected by and in memory of "conservativism," there are, as Lady Morgan laments, no gardens to memorialize the "full and teeming mind" that, envisioning *Paradise Lost*, imbued it with a liberal, aggressive republicanism.⁹ Milton's female readers, then and now, do not always exhibit the same ideological commitments and thus find decidedly different messages encoded within the texts of Milton's last poems. An early female readership found comfort and support in Milton's poetry, although those same benefits disappeared from the text for later women readers. This observation raises the question, addressed throughout this study, whether such features are in Milton's poems by design, or by superimposition, or (what seems more likely) by virtue of both.

Then, as now, some women were schooled into submission to patriarchal culture, even sometimes through the agency of *Paradise Lost*. Witness, for example, the "imaginary" conversation composed by John Clowes, a clergyman for the Church of Eng-

⁹Lady Morgan, *The Book without a Name* (2 vols.; London, 1841), I, 126, 128–29.

land, and presented as a “treatise” intended “to restore marriage to its primitive sanctity, purity, and bliss” by bringing it into accord with the principles of Christian religion. Such principles are being subscribed to “not [as] a mere science to enlighten and amuse the intellect of man, but [as] . . . a rule of life, . . . a living principle, . . . infus[ing] into the whole man a new life and spirit, new ends and intentions, new hopes and delights, by forming him after the image and likeness of that Heavenly Father,” and it is clear from the ensuing conversation that “man” here is gender-specific.¹⁰ In that conversation, the nineteen-year-old Miranda tells her clergyman-father Paternus that “marriage, properly so-called, must mean an union of minds; and that if minds are not united, it cannot be properly called marriage.” In turn, Paternus explains to his daughter what constitutes a union of minds between the different sexes: “God, my child, . . . has manifestly by creation, distinguished the man from the woman, and the woman from the man, not only as to body, but as to mind, not only as to corporeal strength and energy, but as to mental faculty. . . . Thus the proper distinguishing character of the man is intellect, but the proper distinguishing character of the woman is the love of man’s intellect.” As if having learned her lesson, Miranda then cites her “favourite poet Milton . . . : His words are these” (see Appendix A):

For contemplation he and valour form’d,
For softness she, and sweet attractive grace;
He for God only, she for God in him.

This conversation between a clergyman and his teenage daughter, in every particular, epitomizes what feminist critics today tell us about how Milton *was* read—with submission and obsequiousness. Miranda’s comments fit their paradigm of how women, educated into deference and obedience, willingly submit to the “wisdom” of the benevolent father who is a guardian for the morality of patriarchal culture, and how, in the process, women “often take on the father’s contemptuous devaluation of and

¹⁰See John Clowes, *The Whole Duty of Woman; or, A Guide to the Female Sex . . . By a Lady. To Which Is Added . . . The Golden Wedding-Ring; or, Thoughts on Marriage* (Stourbridge, 1815), pp. iii, 6.

contemptuous attitude for the mother and, by extension, for women as a group.¹¹ When the subjected woman happens also to be a writer, this argument goes, Milton is there in the background as a literary father engendering “a dynamics of dependence, as well as the subversion of the independent self” by snaring woman into “patriarchal literary tradition” and thus making her accept a place “in a literary heritage that is not her own and does not express her interests.”¹² Such is supposed to be the predicament of these self-styled daughters of Eve who are also Milton’s daughters and from whom compliance (not comprehension) is sought—and also concession—not just to patriarchal literature but also to the various patriarchal hierarchies implicit in its traditions. If the conversation between Miranda and Paternus is paradigmatic of the relationships here described, it should be remembered that those relationships, as well as the values implied by them, are forged by a male writer who in turn would make of his daughter their representative and spokesperson. It should also be remembered that even if it is evidence for what modern-day feminists tell us about women submissively reading and interpreting Milton’s poetry, this conversation, in its own time, is an anomaly, not at all typical of how *female writers* were regarding Milton or of how *they* were reading and interpreting his poetry.

Such are the uses and abuses of Milton’s poetry by patriarchal culture, now *and* then. But an early female readership was for the most part determined to rescue *Paradise Lost* from those abuses. Milton may sometimes stand in his own way, but from the perspective of most early female readers he never meant to stand in their way. It was just this sort of prejudice and bigotry that most women and some men (more as the eighteenth century turned into the nineteenth) opposed, and more often than not they registered their opposition by invoking the authority of Milton. Occasionally, through a tactic just the reverse of the one employed by Clowes, they create male characters who become mouthpieces and sanctions for distinctly female and even sometimes feminist

¹¹Beth Kowalski-Wallace, quoting Jane Flax, in “Milton’s Daughters: The Education of Eighteenth-Century Women Writers,” *Feminist Studies*, 12 (1986), 281.

¹²Kowalski-Wallace, “Milton’s Daughters,” pp. 277, 284.

perception and observation. In fact, what complicates both the presentation and the argument in the following pages is that, while women may make men the spokespersons for what they would like to hear about their sex, men—by inverting the strategy and even by presenting their texts as written “By a Lady”—make women mouth the platitudes, thus making them seem to submit to the tenets of patriarchy, which at times is a patriarchy that is patently misogynistic.

The presentation and argument of this book are further complicated by educational, class, political, and ideological differences among the represented women. Some are wealthy and well connected: Lady Mary Chudleigh (1656–1710), Anne Finch, Countess of Winchelsea (1661–1720); Lady Mary Wortley Montagu (1689–1762); Catherine Macaulay (1731–1791); Mary Walker, Lady Mary Hamilton (1739–1816); and Elizabeth Smith (1776–1806). Some are not so well connected; Mary Ann Radcliffe (1740?–1810?), whose husband ate away her fortune, and Jane West (1758–1852), whose husband was a simple farmer. Although social status and sometimes political allegiance determine the themes they chose, few of these women seem to have been straitjacketed by either. Mary Walker, for example, can write about the problems of marriage for aristocratic women but also campaign for the rights of all women to an education. The Royalist connections and sympathies of her family do not prevent Anne Finch from becoming a poet of female consciousness, nor does high social standing dissuade Catherine Macaulay from presenting a Whig interpretation of the Stuarts and the Civil War or from promoting radical feminist positions.

Some, such as Mary Robinson (1758–1800), come from a bourgeois background, while others, such as Ann Yearsley (1752–1806), come from working-class families. Some are daughters of clergymen: Elizabeth Carter (1717–1806), Catherine Talbot (1721–1770), and Anna Seward (1747–1809). Some are daughters of intellectuals and educators: Margaret Collier (fl. 1735–1757) and Hannah More (1745–1833). Some are daughters of merchants and shopkeepers: Mary Astell (1666–1731) and Eliza Haywood (1693?–1756). And still others are daughters of landowners: Sarah Fyge Egerton (1669–1722), and Charlotte Smith

(1749–1806). Some come from families with a tradition of intellectual or religious dissent: Anna Letitia Barbauld (1743–1825), Mary Wollstonecraft (1759–1797), Mary Hays (1760–1843), Lucy Aikin (1781–1864), and Mary Shelley (1797–1851). Others, such as Jane Adams (1710–1765), died in the poorhouse; Mary Robinson and Charlotte Smith spent time in debtors' prison. Some, such as Sarah Siddons (1755–1831) and Sydney Owenson (Lady Morgan; 1783?–1859), were quite famous; others were nearly anonymous: Mary Wray, Caroline Symmons, Lucy Hutton, and Eliza Bradburn. The lives of a few were marred by scandal: Eliza Haywood, an actress, left her husband without his consent and allegedly was mistress to many men and mother of two illegitimate children; and for a year, Mary Robinson was mistress to the Prince of Wales. More had lives touched by disaster: Charlotte Smith entered into a miserable marriage with Benjamin Smith; Priscilla Poynton (1750–1801) was blind by the age of twelve; and Phillis Wheatley (1753?–1784), a black poet, was taken to America, went to England, then when her mistress fell ill returned to Boston.

Some of these women such as Mary O'Brien (fl. 1790) were poets; others, such as Jane Porter (1776–1850), were novelists. A few were bluestockings, and one was patronized by bluestockings. Even if self-educated, most were well educated; they knew their classics, and often classical languages, and, like both Elizabeth Bentley (1767–1839) and Susannah Blamire (1747–1794), knew their Milton. Like Ann Murry (fl. 1778–1799), many were themselves educators, often with powerful literary connections. Often, too, they register decidedly different views on topics where one might expect shared opinion. Mrs. Barbauld, for instance, would put some restraints on female education, whereas most others were advocates of female education. Anna Seward loathed conduct books, but many of these women wrote them. Priscilla Poynton thought that, while Homer and Milton could find inspiration in other authors, women would have to find their inspiration in nature—but most of these women sought inspiration in Milton. Elizabeth Smith accepted the intellectual inferiority of women and defined it in terms of Milton and Newton: "It is the fashion now to consider the abilities of women as be-

ing on an equality with those of men . . . ; but there never was among women a Milton, a Newton."¹³ However, most of these women, aspiring to the learning of Milton and disseminating the knowledge of Newton, were challenging patriarchal notions and simultaneously questioning whether Milton's poetry really provided a sanction for them.

Predictably, these women represent various shades of opinion on the political spectrum—from Mary Astell and Jane West, both supporters of the Church of England and Tory politics; to the essential independence of Mary Ann Radcliffe; to the avowed liberalism of Lucy Aikin, Catherine Macaulay, and Charlotte Smith; to the thinly veiled radicalism of Mary Hays and Mary Shelley. Some, such as Mary Robinson and Mary Wollstonecraft, were so blatant in their radicalism that they were accused of unsexing their sex and corrupting its morals. Even if Anna Barbauld and Elizabeth Smith balked at the notion of general education, both were highly and impressively educated. Like them, Hannah More may have submitted to the values of patriarchal culture, but she nevertheless urged women's education and the cultivation of female understanding. Mary Astell proposed establishing women's colleges, and Ann Murry, Anna Seward, and Mary Wollstonecraft were all avid supporters and powerful advocates of female education. With Catherine Talbot, many of these women bridled at the assumption of female inferiority; Catherine Macaulay, Charlotte Smith, and Mary Wollstonecraft urged the equality of the sexes, and both Eliza Haywood and Mary Walker used arguments for sexual equality to advocate divorce. If Haywood thought the world was a perilous place for young women, Hays explained why: because women were everywhere being victimized by its moral conventions. And early on, Sarah Fyge Egerton expatiated on how women might free themselves from victimization: with a change of attitude and by refashioning their self-image in the realization that, contrary to popular opinion, they are the superior sex. Unpredictably, perhaps, Milton seems to have held an important place within the zone of female con-

¹³Elizabeth Smith, *Fragments in Prose and Verse* (Boston, 1810), p. 68. First and second editions both appeared in 1808, and another in 1809.

sciousness and to have elicited from many women a shared understanding. For the most part, that understanding achieves articulation not in formal essays but in critical asides, not in commentaries on Milton but in treatises on education and politics, particularly sexual politics, where Milton's writings are rifled for proof-texts. Not all *but most* of these women regarded Milton as an ally in their cause, an advocate for the female, who in *Paradise Lost* turned the tables on patriarchal culture and its misogynistic traditions. That their perception of Milton differs so markedly from that of present-day feminists opens the question of which group of feminists, yesterday's or today's, has been seduced by patriarchal culture and is, while promoting its traditions, purveying its attitudes by perpetuating its readings and interpretations.

What is said of women writers currently—that Milton is their “bogie,” darkening the pages of everything they write; that Milton provokes jubilation in male (not female) writers who, unlike their male counterparts, groan to be delivered from the weight of patriarchal tradition—cannot be said so easily of women writers before the Victorian period whose relationship with Milton is ambiguous, not antithetical, and whose writings, if they register uneasiness with the Milton Tradition, are dubious less of Milton than of certain ideological positions his poetry was being made to serve. Women were not usually intimidated, as was the blind Priscilla Poynton, into forgoing the visionary tradition of Milton for the inspiration of nature or, as was Elizabeth Smith, into submitting to the belief that there never was and never could be a Milton among women. The dark age ceases with Chaucer, says Lady Mary Chudleigh, and under the aegis of Milton, who chases away the night and all its phantoms and specters, the world begins to flood with light.¹⁴ And if Elizabeth Bentley represents herself as wishing for the expanded wings of Milton, she is represented in the preface to her poetical volume as already in possession of them: “not the last or meanest in the train who ‘fol-

¹⁴Lady Mary Chudleigh, “To Mr. Dryden, on his Excellent Translation of Virgil,” in *Poems on Several Occasions*, 3d ed. (London, 1722), p. 30. The first edition of this volume was published in 1703; the second, in 1709 and reissued in 1713.

low where seraphic Milton led.'"¹⁵ Mary O'Brien is another poet who, following in Milton's train because "more perfect truths beam forth in Milton's song," believes that Milton's blindness should not be figured in monuments to the poet, but instead "his lamps of light" that "in higher regions burn" (see Appendix B). The following pages witness to the Blakean adage that the eye altering alters all.

This book is owing to Sandra Gilbert first—for throwing down the gauntlet and for firing my interest—and second to Joan Malory Webber, who had she lived would doubtless have written something like it herself. This coupling of names is not meant to valorize the Gilbert-Webber controversy as one between feminist and nonfeminist or between a deconstructionist who destabilizes texts and an old historicist who stabilizes them by asserting meanings valid for all time.¹⁶ Gilbert and Webber each bring to Milton's text a feminist consciousness that is natural, not acquired, and read the text differently, the former attending to how Milton was read and the latter to how he ought to be read. Historically, both these concerns have their genesis in the writings of Milton's female readership, and those concerns are usually intertwined. Occasionally Gilbert and Webber lock arms, but at one crucial juncture, tracking the same territory, they cross swords: as Gilbert invokes historical paradigms to authorize twentieth-century readings of Milton, Webber (also in search of historical readings as a sanction for her own way of reading Milton) questions the validity of Gilbert's paradigms—or rather the validity of Gilbert's representation of them. The crucial issue is not whether *Paradise Lost* summarizes a long misogynistic tradition, but whether in doing so the poem would annihilate or advance such a tradition, and further, whether women historically (that is, before the twentieth century) were revising Milton's myth or instead following Milton's lead in revising the traditional myth of origins. Webber would carve a niche for Milton in the very liter-

¹⁵Elizabeth Bentley, *Genuine Poetical Compositions on Various Subjects* (Norwich, 1791), sig. A3, p. 68.

¹⁶Their controversy is misrepresented in this way by K. K. Ruthven, *Feminist Literary Studies: An Introduction* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1984), p. 90.

ary history from which Gilbert would exclude him, Gilbert arguing, contrary to Webber, that *Paradise Lost* “must have seemed even in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries to illustrate the historical dispossession and degradation of the female principle.”¹⁷

Though, like Webber, I am doubtful about some of Gilbert’s premises and question certain of her conclusions, I remain deeply indebted to her intelligence and snappy wit and, more, am exhilarated by the opportunities her special turn of the critical lens has opened for Milton studies. Gilbert’s pioneering work stands behind this book although the real prodding to write it came first, and unwittingly, from Susanne Woods and then from Stuart Curran, Kenneth Gross, and especially John Shawcross, who presided over the Milton Institute (in 1985) at Arizona State University. Without them, this book simply would not be. Nor could it have been written without the sharp focusing of the issues involved in a feminist critique of Milton afforded by the East Coast Milton Seminar, particularly through the presentations of my colleague Wally Kerrigan, my adopted colleague Maureen Quilligan, my former student Jackie DiSalvo, and my friends (old and new, respectively) Joan Bennett and Mary Nyquist. Indeed, this book would never have been written at all without the released time made possible by the University of Maryland and the National Endowment for the Humanities—time spent at the Henry E. Huntington Library and Art Gallery in San Marino, California, the Keats-Shelley Memorial House in Rome, the British Library, and the Fawcett Library of the City of London Polytechnic. Nor would it have been written as it is without the encouragement, but also hesitations, of my 1985 Milton seminar at the University of Maryland and those rich but all too infrequent conversations with Annabel Patterson. I am also indebted to Richard Helgerson, Michael O’Connell, and Donald Pearce, who provided the occasion, as well as a fit audience, for airing these ideas at the University of California, Santa Barbara; to Michael Lieb, Stella Revard, and one anonymous reader who provided Cornell University Press with shrewd, perceptive, *useful* reports; to two learned, gracious, reliable friends, Deirdre David and

¹⁷Gilbert, “Patriarchal Poetry and Women Readers,” p. 374.

Tom Oveis, who read the manuscript in penultimate draft and showed me the way to an ultimate one; to three colleagues—Richard Brecht, Marie Davidson, and Brit Kirwin—who, showing its author a way out of another kind of dilemma, as only they can appreciate, saved the book; and to my favorite typist, Noelle Jackson, and expert copyeditor, Peggy Hoover. Any of the above, or all together, deserve the dedicatory page and would receive it, were it not for the overriding obligations I have to two very important women in my life, and two very important men. They have, singly and collectively, provided me with the idealisms—personal and professional, private and public—that even if I am a slow learner I shall forever aspire to realize. To each of them, I owe immense gratitude, not forgetting that “a grateful mind / By owing owes not, but still pays, at once / Indebted and dischargd.” *No burden that.*

JOSEPH WITTREICH

Philadelphia, Pennsylvania