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ABSTRACT

This thesis examines the day to day practices that constituted Anne Lister’s (1791–1840) sexuality and sociability within the range of her writings, as well as her society. Anne’s writings were a detailed account, spanning her lifetime, of her own love and relationships with the ‘fairer sex’ (Whitbread 1988, 145). Anne’s sociality, seen in her correspondence and plain handwritten journal entries, has been explored by Muriel Green in Miss Lister of Shibden Hall and Jill Liddington in Female Fortune and Nature’s Domain (Green 1992; Liddington 1998; 2003). As a gentlewoman of adequate means, Anne has garnered some attention from women’s historians interested in her agency within an early nineteenth century social and historical context. Anne’s sexual identity has been extensively analysed over the past nearly twenty years by lesbian feminists, queer theorists, women’s historians and historians of sexuality concerned with the history and development of modern Western female homosexuality and gender. The source for theorising Anne’s sexuality has been the edited selections of the crypted journal entries, published by Helena Whitbread in I Know My Own Heart and No Priest but Love (Whitbread 1988; 1992). However, many analyses deal either with the theorisation of Anne’s sexuality or her sociality; the theoretical difficulty with reconciling these categories has troubled the analysis of her complex subjectivity.

Drawing upon the archival materials, I have used an interdisciplinary feminist approach to analyse the sexual and social processes of Anne’s everyday interactions in her writings. Taking the seven month period of the sojourn to Paris in 1824–25, I have focused upon Anne’s textual practices within her journal volume and letters during her residence in Paris, her social practices with the other guests at the guesthouse 24 Place Vendôme and her sexual practices with her lover, the widow Mrs. Maria Barlow. The journal volumes and correspondence are a valuable historical record of one gentlewoman’s engagement with early nineteenth century British culture.
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INTRODUCTION

Anne Lister (1791–1840) was an early nineteenth century West Yorkshire gentlewoman, mistress of the Lister family estate at Shibden Hall. She was a regular correspondent to her network of family and female friends, a careful accountant of her personal and estate finances and an evocative travel writer of her journeys to other cultures or climates. The collection of Anne’s writings contains nearly two thousand letters, numerous account books and some travelogues. Anne was also an expert journalist of her own life: the greater part of her writing was concentrated on her intimately detailed journal volumes. She kept her journal volumes from 1806, when she was fifteen, until she died in 1840 at the age of forty nine. Anne was not unusual in this respect. Journal keeping was so extensive amongst early nineteenth century British women that feminist literary theorists, such as Harriet Blodgett in *Centuries of Female Days*, have argued it constituted a distinct women’s tradition of writing (Blodgett 1989). Less common amongst women diarists was the fact that Anne wrote approximately a sixth of her journal entries in a ‘crypt hand’ she had devised (Liddington 1994, 9; Whitbread 1988, 96, 142).\(^1\) The contents of the crypted journal entries were extraordinary. It was in these sections that Anne wrote candidly and unequivocally about her female homosexuality and intimate embodied relationships with women, Anne’s own love of the ‘fairer sex’ (Whitbread 1988, 145). To date, only a fraction – approximately five per cent – of the total mass of the Anne Lister papers has been transcribed, decrypted and published.\(^2\) The vast majority of Anne’s writings have not yet been analysed.

Born on 3 April in 1791 in Halifax, Anne was the second child of Rebecca Battle (1770–1817) and Jeremy Lister (1752–1836) (Green 1992, 9; Whitbread 1988, 29; Wilson 1956). Anne had three brothers, but only she and her younger sister Marian (1798–1882) survived to adulthood. In her childhood, Anne often stayed with her uncle, James (1748–1826), and his sister, Anne (1765–1836), at Shibden Hall for extended visits. Uncle James and Aunt Anne were both unmarried and childless, and the three Listers established a strong familial and affective bond. When Anne was in her early twenties, Uncle James invited her to reside permanently with them and, following the deaths of her brothers, he focused his inheritance hopes for the Lister estate on Anne.
Such a flexible arrangement of kinship and inheritance was not an uncommon practice in the middle classes of the early nineteenth century, according to Leonore Davidoff and Catherine Hall in *Family Fortunes* (Davidoff and Hall 1987). With the move to Shibden Hall in 1815, Anne became a working member of the gentry class and managed the property for her aged Uncle James. While heir apparent, Anne was financially dependent upon her relatives, but she budgeted her small income to save for important things, like the sojourn to Paris in 1824–25. Anne was not to become financially independent until her Uncle James died in 1826 and she inherited the Shibden Hall estate. From her mid thirties, Anne managed the estate in her own right for the next fourteen years, expanding upon the mining possibilities of the estate, as Jill Liddington has analysed (Liddington 1996). Anne died whilst she was travelling with her partner Ann Walker (1803–54) in the Caucasus region on 22 September 1840. The terms of Anne’s will entailed Shibden Hall on the Swansea Listers, a distant branch of the family. When the last of the line, John Lister (1847–1933) died, Shibden Hall became a local museum, as it is today.

Anne was an energetic and extremely organised woman. At home in Shibden Hall, her daily routine was divided between estate affairs, walking, reading, writing, attending the Anglican church, or visiting the library and acquaintances in Halifax. Incredibly, Anne also managed to find time to study Greek, Latin, French, mathematics, geometry and history with her teacher Reverend Samuel Knight (1759–1827), the Vicar of Halifax. At election times, as Cat Euler has detailed, Anne involved herself in politicking for the Tory party (Euler 1995, 231–87). Anne was a great traveller and she enjoyed travelling locally and abroad. In July 1822, she went on a tour with Aunt Anne to North Wales, which included a visit to the Ladies of Llangollen (Whitbread 1988, 192–207). Before Anne travelled to Paris in 1824–25, she had made two other trips to the French capital for three weeks in May and June 1819 with Aunt Anne, and again in August and September 1822, with her father and sister Marian for a month (Whitbread 1988, 90, 216–24). Regardless of the activities that occupied her day, Anne’s emotional life was absorbed in her affairs, flirtations, romances and relationships with women. In her life, Anne had some notable attachments that were established and intimate relationships. There was her intense romance with Eliza Raine (1791–1839) in her teen years, the enduring relationships with Isabella Norcliffê (1785–1846) and Mariana Lawton (nee Belcombe) (1790–1868), the amorous romance with Maria Barlow (b. 1786) of her mid thirties and the mature companionship with Ann Walker in her forties.
Until recently, Anne’s relationships were actively suppressed from historical accounts of her life. Before the late 1980s, she was known as a person of regional historical interest in the West Yorkshire area. Awareness of Anne’s public achievements in education, charity, politics and travel was due to the historical pieces written by her relative and eventual heir, John Lister, which were published in the district paper *The Halifax Guardian* from 1887 to 1892. Later, other scholars like Vivien Ingham and Phyllis Ramsden worked on Anne’s papers, but their analyses presented carefully censored representations of her history (Ingham 1969; Ramsden 1970). However, the situation dramatically changed in 1988 with the publication by Helena Whitbread of an initial volume of journal entries *I Know My Own Heart*, followed by the second volume *No Priest but Love* in 1992. Whitbread’s volumes focused on the intimate accounts of Anne’s life written in the crypt handwriting. The contribution of Whitbread’s work was the controversial content of these crypted writings: the disclosure of Anne’s frank exploration of same-sex love and sexuality. The instance of an early nineteenth century British self-identified homosexual gentlewoman aroused great interest amongst the public, as well as scholars. The fascination about Anne’s sexual identity and life generated radio plays such as *Such Sweet Possession*, as well as stage productions like Emma Donoghue’s play ‘I Know My Own Heart’ and an episode in a television series such as ‘A Skirt through History’, all focusing upon her life (Cooper 2002; Donoghue 2001; Lowthorpe 1994). Anne has become a primary subject of interest in public histories of sexuality over the last decade and a half.

There has been a developing recognition of Anne’s writings as an incredibly rich source of historical information for women’s historians and feminist, lesbian and queer theorists. Some theorists have focused upon the proof of ‘lesbianism’ provided by Anne’s writings. Anne’s case has been incorporated into accounts of early modern lesbian history like Emma Donoghue’s *Passions between Women*, or has confirmed, for Rictor Norton, an essential lesbian existence through time in *The Myth of the Modern Homosexual* (Donoghue 1993b; Norton 1997). Anne’s active homosexuality was, as Terry Castle phrased it, a resounding rebuff of ‘the no-sex-before-1900 school’ (Castle 1993, 93). Castle referred to the model of asexual romantic friendships that has dominated modern analyses of Western women’s same-sex friendships since the Renaissance, most notably propounded by Lillian Faderman (Faderman 1978; 1981). However, Carroll Smith-Rosenberg’s analysis of women’s homosociality in nineteenth century America was more open to the suggestion of women’s same-sex intimacy...
Presaging Adrienne Rich’s notion of a ‘lesbian continuum’, Smith-Rosenberg suggested a ‘spectrum of love-object choices’ for women at this time (Rich 1980, 648; Smith-Rosenberg 1975, 8–9). However, the analytic difficulty with reconciling the apparently ‘private’ sphere of historical women’s sexuality with the ‘public’ aspects of women’s sociality confronted these formative approaches to women’s intimacy in the past. It was, and continues to be, a problematic that has plagued the biographical and historical theorisation of women’s sexual and social lives.

That problematisation of women’s sexual and social lives resulted in a troubling tendency to perceive Anne as anomalous, especially in relation to her own historical context. Lillian Faderman, for instance, could not reconcile Anne’s passionate sexuality with the model of ‘romantic friendships’ analysed in her earlier work (Faderman 1981). Faderman could conceptualise the complexity of Anne’s gender representation only as a modern congenital sexual invert, an isolated forerunner of sexologist theory (Faderman 1994, 198). Queer theory analyses like that of Lisa DeBoer and Jennifer Frangos, have similarly transhistoricalised the categorisation of Anne’s lesbian sexuality and gender deviance. Both DeBoer and Frangos have treated Anne as typical of a modern butch and femme dynamic more recognisable within American culture of the 1950s (DeBoer 1995; Frangos 1994; 1997). These analyses elide the specificity of the rich history of these roles, as seen in Joan Nestle’s evocations in her book *A Restricted Country* (Nestle 1987). Other queer theorists have been concerned with Anne’s behaviour and appearance. Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick described Anne’s sense of self in a peculiarly clinical fashion, through her genital interactions with women and the duration of her relationships (Sedgwick 1994). The difficulty these theorists had in conceptualising Anne within her own historical context has cast her as ‘other’ to early nineteenth century women’s affective relationships. As Jeffrey Weeks has persuasively argued, we need to ‘think beyond the boundaries of existing categories and to explore their historical production’ (Weeks 2000, 139). Anne was a subject not outside the constraints of her own history or the potential for agency within her own society.

Partly because of these difficulties, little attention has been paid to the historical, material, social and sexual contexts of Anne’s life and writings. Initially, a critical response to the journal record was scepticism. Elizabeth Mavor, for instance, doubted Anne’s account of her homosexuality and questioned the authenticity of the journal volumes (Mavor 1988, 18). Mavor, known for her work on the ‘Edenic’ relationship of
the Ladies of Llangollen, found Anne’s sexuality a contradiction to the idyllic relationship of her contemporaries, Lady Eleanor Butler (1739–1829) and Sarah Ponsonby (1755–1831) (Mavor 1971, xvii). Based upon his earlier research on Sapphists in London in this period, Randolph Trumbach suggested Anne’s homosexuality was evidence for the modern lesbian role of Sapphist existing from 1770 onwards (Trumbach 1991; 1994, 294). However, Anne rejected the taxonomy of Sapphic sexuality available in early nineteenth century culture. Sapphism had ‘artifice in it’, she told Mrs. Barlow on 13 November in Paris (Whitbread 1992, 49). Anne understood her desires as natural and God-given. On 29 August 1823, she wrote, ‘mine are not affections to be returned in this world. Oh, that I could turn them with virtuous enthusiasm to that Being who gave them’ (Whitbread 1988, 289). Modern attempts to fit Anne into a historic taxonomy of sexual identity reveal the inappropriateness of these constructs to understanding her sexual identity as she understood it for herself.

The focus on Anne’s homosexuality has shifted more recently to the question of her construction of a positive sexual identity. As women’s historian Anna Clark analysed, Anne was isolated from a collective or subcultural understanding of identity such as those developed by the intellectual bluestockings, theatrical cross-dressers or Sapphists (Clark 1996, 26). Instead, Anne negotiated early nineteenth century cultural meanings to construct a positive self-image of sexual identity (Clark 1996). In her consideration of the journal account, feminist literary theorist Lisa Moore analysed the sorts of literary and judicial representations that could have enabled the production of a female homosexuality (Moore 1992; 1997). Anne’s gender representation of a potent female masculinity drew closely on the contemporaneous literary example of The Female Husband (1746), as queer theorist Judith Halberstam has argued (Halberstam 1998). Anne’s sexual and gender representations were complicated by contemporaneous notions of Romantic love, Byronic passion and gentlemanly manners, as lesbian literary theorist Terry Castle has considered (Castle 1993). With the exception of Anna Clark who consulted the manuscripts, all the theorists who have accessed Anne’s writings have done so through Helena Whitbread’s editions of the journal entries (Clark 1996; Whitbread 1988; 1992). These analyses contextualised Anne’s homosexuality and female masculinity sourced from Whitbread’s books, making visible the cultural heritage that Anne drew upon in her early nineteenth century society. These scholars have opened up alternative understandings of Anne’s sexuality, but the exploration of her sexual and gender differences has remained the primary theoretical concern.
Following Helena Whitbread’s publications, other editors of the papers have attempted to balance the exclusive focus on homosexuality in their own publications of Anne’s writings. Muriel Green worked on the correspondence for her thesis in the 1930s, titled ‘A Spirited Yorkshirewoman’ (Green 1938). Only a quarter of her early work on the correspondence was published by Green in the early 1990s as Miss Lister of Shibden Hall (Green 1992; Liddington 1994, 51). The publication of Green’s archival work added another representation of ‘Anne Lister’ to that given by Whitbread: of Anne as the consummate traveller and letter writer. Similarly, Liddington has focused on Anne’s ability to negotiate gender restrictions and constraints on women’s work, legal options and land ownership in early nineteenth century society (Liddington 1995; 1996; 1998; 2003). However, an analytical account of Anne’s sexuality was not included in Liddington’s latest book, Nature’s Domain, which focused on the initiation of Anne’s courtship of Ann Walker in the journal entries (Liddington 2003). In her first book Female Fortune, which focused on later years of Anne’s long-term relationship with Ann Walker, Liddington was unable to incorporate an account of Anne’s homosexuality that was historically appropriate (Liddington 1998). Liddington instead relied on the modern sexological categorisation of homosexuality for her understanding. Anne’s identity, Liddington concluded, ‘was still largely defined by class, by landownership, by dynasty, by education – rather than, as for later generations, by an open labelling of sexual “deviancy”’ (Liddington 1998, 251). The publication of Liddington’s various analyses of Anne’s papers thus added another representation of ‘Anne Lister’. This Anne was socialised and gendered, but marginally sexualised.

Other than the three editors of Anne’s writings, there have only been two scholars who have worked directly with the papers, although neither has published their transcripts. Both Cat Euler and Anira Rowanchild researched the manuscripts and have successfully integrated an account of Anne’s sexuality within a social and material history of her life, gender and writing. Cat Euler worked on the journal entries of Anne’s later years (Euler 1995). In a discursive analysis of Anne’s engendered agency in the 1830s, Euler’s doctoral thesis examined the ways Anne’s gender and sexuality were powerfully interconnected (Euler 1995, 288–344). Anira Rowanchild, also in her doctoral thesis, utilised the papers to examine Anne’s literary, readerly, crypted, amatory and social construction of herself as an author (Rowanchild 1999). Situating Anne’s writing within her Gothic landscape and Georgian history, Rowanchild has given an intricate account of Anne’s textual and spatial production of her own identity (Rowanchild 2000a; 2000b;
It has only been recently that a theorist has produced a contextualised account of Anne’s sociality and sexuality without access to the manuscripts. Clara Tuite managed to balance the socialised account of Anne’s history from Jill Liddington with the sexualised account from Helena Whitbread (Tuite 2002). Examining Anne’s emulation of the Enlightenment writer Jean-Jacques Rousseau (1712–78) and the Romantic poet Lord Byron (1788–1824), Tuite analysed Anne’s stylising of her literary heroes in her sociability and sexuality with others of her society (Tuite 2002). These situated histories of Anne’s sexuality and sociality in her writings have demonstrated that it is possible to produce rich and complex understandings of Anne within her early nineteenth century society.

The controversies and impassioned debate that have dominated the recent historiography of Anne’s sexuality do need to be negotiated to enable productive analyses of Anne’s writings. As Martha Vicinus has warned, we should be cautious about creating universal assumptions about taxonomies, or concerning homosexual history itself, based upon the sole example of Anne’s life and writings (Vicinus 1994). However, Anne’s writings about her life remain a prime historical source of an early nineteenth century gentlewoman’s embodied love for women; they remain too plentiful and too crucial to be treated generally or disregarded. It is critical to find productive ways of theorising these prolific writings to enrich our understandings of Anne’s life, sexuality and society, as well as shedding light on other women’s historical writings about their sexuality. Liz Stanley, like Martha Vicinus, has tackled the question of how to use, analyse and theorise such highly particularised knowledge for lesbian feminist history (Stanley 1992c). What is needed, Stanley has argued, is an understanding of the mentalities of the past, especially as women defined themselves through their own agency, combined with a detailed investigation of a subject’s relationships within the primary sources (Stanley 1992c, 197). The more particular and driving concerns with my project on the papers has been to produce a feminist analysis of Anne’s history which begins from the writings as the most authoritative source of the material experience of her sexuality within early nineteenth century British society.

Given the debate regarding Anne’s homosexual relationships, I was most interested to examine in my thesis the experiential development of a homosexual romance in the early nineteenth century. I wanted to analyse the ways that Anne may have initiated an amorous relationship with another woman, as she recorded it in her writings. The
establishment of Anne’s relationships with her first lovers Eliza Raine, Mariana Belcombe (later Lawton) and Isabella Norcliffe, are not accessible as many of the earlier journal volumes have not survived intact. The later story of Anne’s relationships with Mariana, and more incidentally with Isabella, had been examined by Helena Whitbread (Whitbread 1988; 1992). Some of Anne’s other relationships, such as the intense flirtation with Miss Elizabeth Browne (b.1794), did not develop into sexual relationships, although the fellow affinity with Miss Frances Pickford (n.d.) has been analysed as such by Jennifer Frangos (Frangos 1994; 1997). Jill Liddington had detailed the story of Anne’s later years with Ann Walker (Liddington 1998; 2003). However, relationships like Anne’s cohabitation with Ann Walker were already skilled and experienced affairs, less revealing of Anne’s sexual practices in the process of creation and negotiation. Anne’s relationship with Mrs. Maria Barlow in 1824–25 looked promising and I was already intrigued by the other relationships Anne had with a close circle of women in the Parisian network. It was the first serious romance after Anne’s long-term relationship with Mariana became less idealistic, and the intense friendship with Miss Browne ceased. It was well documented in the journal entries and correspondence, for the short but intense seven month period of the Parisian sojourn.

Readers of Helena Whitbread’s second volume of the journal entries No Priest but Love will be familiar with the time Anne spent in Paris from 1 September 1824 to 31 March 1825 (Whitbread 1992, 9–90). In late August 1824, when she was thirty three, Anne left Shibden Hall for Paris to seek specialist treatment for her venereal disease and to learn French. The journey constituted an enterprise of some magnitude and challenge for Anne. It was not her first journey to Paris, but it was an exceptional trip in many ways, for Anne travelled accompanied only by her maid Cordingley (n.d.). Anne was a more mature adventurer in her early thirties. She had a better grasp of the language and was capable of spending a considerable length of time reliant on her own resources (and of course, on those of her maid Cordingley). Whilst she resided in Paris, Anne began courting the widow Mrs. Maria Barlow and their relationship became sexually intimate. When gossip in the Place Vendôme household cast aspersions on Mrs. Barlow’s reputation, Anne and Mrs. Barlow moved out together to their own residence at 15 Quai Voltaire. Anne stayed a further two and a half months before she departed from Paris in late March 1825, to return home to Shibden Hall. Paris had become a temporary home; as she departed from Paris, Anne summarised her experience in the journal entry for 31 March. ‘I felt almost at home in Paris’, she wrote (Whitbread 1992, 88). However,
neither the future potential for Anne’s relationship with Mrs. Barlow, nor the hope for a cure for her venereal disease, were resolved by the time she departed.

Analysing the materials that Anne wrote in Paris offers an opportunity to study the relationship with Mrs. Barlow in more depth, away from the influence of the dominating relationship with Mariana. Anne’s courtship of Mrs. Barlow was a sexual relationship that appeared to have been formative in her life. It was the only sexual relationship that was established during the period of both of Helena Whitbread’s volumes. It was a period of Anne’s life that was recorded by Whitbread, but it has not previously been analysed from the papers by any other theorist. Anne’s love for Mrs. Barlow was treated as inconsequential to the ‘primacy of Marianna’s[sic] place in Anne’s life’, which was the principal focus of Whitbread’s narrative (Whitbread 1992, 204). This crucial period of Anne’s sexual history has not been given the detailed and serious theoretical attention I consider it deserves. When Whitbread incorporated Anne’s relationship with Mrs. Barlow into her representation of the grand romance with Mariana, she made possible an entirely different understanding of the romance in Paris. Mrs. Barlow was dissimilar from Anne’s past and subsequent lovers: she was a mature woman of thirty seven when Anne met her, who had been married, was a mother and a widow of the late Lieutenant Colonel Barlow (1770?–1812) (Whitbread 1992, xx, 16). Although Mrs. Barlow came from Guernsey, she had lived at 24 Place Vendôme with her thirteen year old daughter Jane (b.1810) for some time (Whitbread 1992, 17). Mrs. Barlow had a small income, sufficient for her to choose her future marital status. The relationship with Mrs. Barlow seemed to have offered Anne new opportunities to explore areas of intimacy and sexual knowledge.

Although many theorists have historicised Anne’s sexuality, or socialised her life, none has yet contextualised Anne’s sexuality within the day to day interactions that comprised her engagement with her social environment. Whilst she was in Paris, Anne formed other relationships with a number of English and French gentlewomen. The presence of a community of gentlewomen, indicated but also not investigated by Helena Whitbread, allowed an analysis of Anne’s social interactions over a substantial time. The journal entries and letters Anne wrote in Paris highlight conditions of her social, sexual, cultural and even national environments that are frequently unremarked background within the journal entries she wrote at home in Halifax. In Paris, Anne was firmly ensconced within a social milieu of women. The scope for comment on living
and loving within a community of gentlewomen was great. The insistent construction and maintenance of Anne’s social, class and especially national patterns of interaction are clearly visible in her journal entries and letters of this period. In the wonderful evocation of place and enculturated impressions, Anne’s writing provides rich historical detail about her life and loves within her social context. These Parisian narratives of sociability and sexuality underscore the emotional, erotic and embodied friendships and intimacies amongst women of a similar class or country, making these relations intensely visible in a way that Anne’s writings from other periods and places do not.

The period Anne spent in Paris was also interesting for a number of textual reasons. From earlier research on her sartorial style and venereal condition, I established that Anne produced a space in her society to exercise her sexual agency through the construction of specific and significant rituals, which she recorded in her journal entries (Orr 2004a). Anne’s writing was intricately connected to her ability to negotiate her own agency and to represent her own sexual and gender identity: the process of writing was bound up with her subjectivity. Yet, Anne’s material and subjective practices of writing in her journal volumes or letters had not been analysed by the three editors of the papers. Helena Whitbread considered that the crypt writing was connected to Anne’s sexuality, but she did not demarcate the different types in her volumes (Whitbread 1988, xxiii, xxvii–xxviii; 1992, xv–xvii). Jill Liddington’s revelation that Anne used a cross to mark her masturbatory practices in the journal entries suggested there was least one textual process intertwined with sexual practice that was yet to be examined (Liddington 1998, 62, 264). There was evidence in Muriel Green’s edited letters that after the sojourn in Paris, Anne and Mrs. Barlow established a correspondence (Green 1992, 81–87, 90–91, 92–96). How were Anne’s sexual relationships, so well examined in her journal entries, related to her letter writing? The development of a sexual relationship with Mrs. Barlow in Paris brought to the fore patterns and practices of textual signification not seen in Anne’s everyday life at Shibden Hall. Anne’s sojourn in Paris presented her with many occasions to create and employ the particular writing practices that constructed her subjectivity and sexuality.

My concern with understanding Anne’s subjectivity from a feminist lesbian and women’s history perspective has contextualised the central matters of this thesis. However, the thesis was also driven by the difficulties I had in the past with theorising Anne’s history from the edited publications and analyses by Muriel Green, Jill
Liddington and Helena Whitbread (Green 1938; 1992; Liddington 1994; 1995; 1996; 1998; 2001; 2003; Whitbread 1988; 1992; 2004). Anne’s writings were not easily accessible, for when the journal entries were not densely crypted, she wrote in a closely abbreviated form. For scholars working on Anne’s life, these publications thus constitute the most effective means to access some of Anne’s writings. The majority of research, including my previous work, on Anne’s life relied upon these publications of Anne’s primary sources. Yet, reading across these edited sources resulted in very different and complex biographical and historical accounts of ‘Anne Lister’. Each of the editors has focused on particular aspects of Anne’s history, dealing with specific formats of her textual materials, in select periods of her life. With this project, I have been fortunate enough to be in the same position as past editors, to work directly with Anne’s extant manuscripts on microfilm. The labour of my work on Anne’s writings, of transcribing, decrypting, editing and interpreting, comprised the fundamental archival work of this thesis. My archival work has underwritten my engagement with, and differentiation from, these three scholars and their histories of Anne’s life. The main work of my thesis addresses some of these omissions and misreadings to produce a new representation of ‘Anne Lister’.

**REPRESENTATIONS OF ‘ANNE LISTER’**

The Anne Lister papers are held at the Calderdale District Archives in Halifax, part of the West Yorkshire Archive Service in England. For most of her life, Anne sat down at some point every day and wrote. The papers consisted of twenty seven journal volumes, which covered thirty four years of her life from 1806, and totalled approximately four million words (Liddington 1994, 8–9). There is a massive collection of correspondence also in the papers, which includes both letters to and from Anne, and copies and drafts of letters from Anne. There are, according to Jill Liddington, nearly two thousand items altogether, dated from 1800 to 1840 (Liddington 1994, 53). Apart from the journal volumes and correspondence, the papers contain the account books, dated from 1805 to 1840. In her later years, the account books became a more extensive feature of Anne’s writing when she took over the Shibden Hall estate finances, which she controlled first as heir, then as inheritor, of the family estate. As mentioned earlier, Anne came into an independent income in 1826 in her mid thirties when her Uncle James died and she inherited Shibden Hall. With this financial support, Anne travelled more widely. The travelogues of her journeys from 1827 to 1839 have also been collected in the papers.
Many historians of sexuality will know Helena Whitbread’s representation of Anne’s homosexuality from her archival work. However, the earlier representations of ‘Anne Lister’, which focused on Anne’s social character and context, may not be so familiar. The historiography of these various accounts of Anne’s life has been thoroughly documented by Jill Liddington (Liddington 1994, 7–47). In the past century, the first scholars to have worked directly with the manuscripts all produced accounts centred on the social or public aspects of Anne’s history. The emphasis on social in these representations of Anne’s life was due to the censorship of her sexuality from the historical record. Such censorship was achieved initially through the family’s suppression of the crypt (Liddington 1994, 15–16). The extent of the suppression of Anne’s homosexuality was not surprising given the climate the early researchers worked in, subsequent to the trials of Oscar Wilde in 1895 and Radclyffe Hall’s novel *The Well of Loneliness* in 1928, as well as the development of Freudian and sexological theories of modern sexuality and gender at the turn of the century. The suppression of Anne’s homosexuality was later formalised into official censorship restrictions on publication, governed by officers and committees of the District Archive Service (Liddington 1994, 18–20). The long history of suppression of Anne’s homosexuality bifurcated the history of representation of ‘Anne Lister’. The long-standing censored representations of the social ‘Anne Lister’ have been partially succeeded by the representation of sexuality that outed ‘Anne Lister’ by Helena Whitbread.

John Lister, Anne’s eventual heir to Shibden Hall, was the first person to develop a social representation of Anne’s life. He was interested in historic events recorded in Anne’s journal volumes and he published his analyses in the local newspaper, the *Halifax Guardian*, from 1887 until 1892 (Liddington 1994, 13). It was John Lister and his colleague Arthur Burrell who originally cracked the crypt, Jill Liddington found (Liddington 1994, 15). After John became aware of Anne’s homosexuality, he suppressed the key to the crypt and discontinued his work on the papers (Liddington 1998, xv). Fortunately, the key to the crypt alphabet did survive in Burrell’s copy that was supplied to Muriel Green when she came to work on the correspondence in the 1930s, and to Phyllis Ramsden and Vivien Ingham when they worked together on the journal volumes from 1959 to 1969 (Liddington 1994, 17, 18). According to Liddington, each of these researchers decrypted enough journal entry passages to become aware that Anne was a self-identified lover of women (Liddington 1994, 17–19). However, these Anne Lister scholars, Muriel Green, Vivien Ingham and Phyllis
Ramsden, all chose Anne’s travel accounts as their main theme. Their research had voluntarily and discretely bowed to, or was censored by, the committee governing the collection, so as not to highlight Anne’s homosexuality (Liddington 1994, 18, 20). Thus, as far back as 1892, the written accounts of Anne’s homosexuality in her journal volumes were known and actively suppressed.

Muriel Green worked on Anne’s papers from the 1930s, Vivien Ingham from the Second World War to the late 1960s and Phyllis Ramsden from the late 1950s to the early 1970s (Liddington 1994, 16–21). These early researchers all focused upon Anne’s travels. Yet, each displayed some degree of awareness of Anne’s sexuality in their publications. Each scholar touched upon her mannish dress or masculine appearance, but these references left open the question of Anne’s sexuality. Green noted that Anne’s ‘mode of dress, her masculinity, and her rather eccentric behaviour amused her friends, and earned her the name “Gentleman Jack” among the populace’ (Green 1992, 17). Anne was ‘tall’, as Ramsden described her, and ‘not blessed with any of the fashionable graces of face and figure’, but with a ‘sturdy constitution’ (Ramsden 1970, 4). Ingham commented that when Anne dressed in her ‘long black coat and stout leather boots she could easily be mistaken for a man’ (Ingham 1969, 56). These comments aside, the three scholars celebrated the characteristics that made Anne an interesting traveller. The youthful Anne, Ramsden wrote, already showed the ‘exceptional physical energy and force of character which were her chief personal characteristics in later life’ (Ramsden 1970, 3). In Ingham’s opinion, Anne was a ‘splendid tourist’ who explored beyond the guide books (Ingham 1969, 56). Green’s later published work on the letters focused on Anne’s many adventures (Green 1992). These earliest researchers, working directly with the manuscripts, had focused upon descriptive accounts of Anne’s person as masculine, adventurous and enquiring in their representations of her travel writings.

Until Helena Whitbread’s publications of some of the crypted journal entries in 1988, the historiography of Anne’s documents was dominated by these social representations of ‘Anne Lister’. The social, and socially acceptable, representations of Anne’s history were the only publicly available biographies for this period. In 1970, a new Halifax archivist discontinued the publication censorship of Anne’s writings, but it would not be for another eighteen years that Anne’s passionate relationships became publicly revealed (Liddington 1994, 22). Originating with John Lister and upheld for almost a century, the censored representations of Anne’s life were not challenged until
Whitbread’s publication of the journal entries, which included details of her sexual relationships and identity. The revelations of Anne’s homosexuality by Whitbread problematised the earlier censored accounts, publicly outing and acknowledging the long history of denial for the first time. Yet, Helena Whitbread’s archival work was the exception to the censored historiography, for her publications of the journal entries remained the only work over the past century centred upon Anne’s homosexuality. Whitbread’s publications have partially redressed the history of denial, but they have produced another distinct representation of ‘Anne Lister’, which was a highly sexualised one. This ‘Anne Lister’ was the sexual representation we have inherited, as the sole resource for the theorising of Anne’s homosexuality.

The first ‘Anne Lister’ that I was introduced to in my initial research was the representation in the publications by Helena Whitbread. This Anne Lister was in her twenties, a passionate young homosexual gentlewoman increasingly unhappy with the established relationship she had with her married lover, Mariana Lawton (nee Belcombe). Whitbread’s first book I Know My Own Heart published in 1988 offered a selection of seven years of the journal entries. In 1992, Whitbread’s second book No Priest but Love contained selections from the subsequent two years of the journal entries. Altogether, these two books covered nearly a decade in Anne’s life, from her mid twenties in 1817 to her mid thirties in 1826. Whitbread has focused her attention in both books only upon the journal entries, presumably upon the crypted sections of the writings, the space Anne employed to discuss her homosexuality. Of Anne’s intimate sexual history revealed in the journal entries, Whitbread’s principal focus was on the grand romance of the ‘long-running love affair’ of Anne’s passionate, but unhappy relationship with Mariana (Whitbread 1992, xvi). The journal entries were the only resource utilised by Whitbread for the two books; there were no inclusions from the correspondence, account books or travelogues. The representation of ‘Anne Lister’ by Whitbread at this intense time of Anne’s life was of the single story of the romance with Mariana, from the single source of the journal entries.

The period of Anne’s sojourn in Paris from 1 September 1824 to 31 March 1825 was included in Helena Whitbread’s second book, No Priest but Love (Whitbread 1992, 9–90). I calculated that the journal entries for these dates totalled approximately 172 000 words. The word count for the same period in No Priest but Love was approximately 30 000 words, a sixth of the total. The editing of the Paris sojourn by Whitbread
marginalised Anne’s amatory relationship with Mrs. Barlow. Certainly, the development of their courtship was given sufficient coverage by Whitbread, but there was inadequate detail regarding Anne and Mrs. Barlow’s intimate relationship. The central narrative of Mariana as Anne’s principal passion remained intact, and was even consolidated; Anne’s romance with Mrs. Barlow was characterised as the ‘added twist of Anne’s infatuation’ within the grand passion narrative (Whitbread 1992, xvi). Yet, Whitbread’s work did impart a real sense of immersion in the daily state of Anne’s affections during this decade of her life. It was not an affirmative representation, for the portrayal of Anne and Mariana’s relationship was ultimately a story of unrequited and thwarted homosexual love. In *No Priest but Love*, Whitbread documented Anne and Mariana’s distance from their dream to be together, alongside Mariana’s increasing involvement in her marriage. The edited traces of Anne’s concurrent romances with other gentlewomen like Mrs. Barlow were difficult to retrieve in such a framework. These need to be fully restored for lesbian feminist study.

A rather different Anne appeared in Jill Liddington’s research which extended the social representations of ‘Anne Lister’ produced over the past century. Liddington’s earliest analysis, the booklet *Presenting the Past*, examined the past portrayals of Anne’s life and the historiography of the papers (Liddington 1994). It was in her subsequent analyses that Liddington presented her own representation of ‘Anne Lister’, based on a broad use of the archival sources. This was Anne in the 1830s, a mature and educated gentlewoman in her forties, a recognisably assured member of the gentry class of the Halifax community and a sophisticated traveller. Anne was firmly established in her role as owner and manager of the Shibden Hall estate, capably developing its associated industries like mining (Liddington 1996). In matters of love, this Anne determinedly set about establishing a long-term relationship with another woman of her own class, Ann Walker of Crows Nest, as elaborated in the journal entries in *Nature’s Domain* (Liddington 2003). Experienced in commerce, Anne legalised the settlement issues surrounding the partnership, to create an inheritance legacy with their estates (Liddington 1995). Liddington explored the history of the Lister family, the Walker family and Anne’s peers in Halifax society in *Female Fortune* (Liddington 1998, 3–13, 27–56). The wider social environment was analysed for Anne and Emily Brontë’s (1818–48) possible acquaintance, from the winter at Law Hill in 1838–39 which was the inspiration for *Wuthering Heights* (1847) (Liddington 2001). The representation of
‘Anne Lister’ by Liddington of Anne in the last decade of her life was solidly focused upon the social and class context of her early nineteenth century time and place.

My project on the sojourn in Paris is not contemporaneous with Jill Liddington’s research on Anne’s later life, which focused upon one of her most serious sexual relationships. This was the eight year relationship and ‘marriage’ with Ann Walker, which only ceased with Anne’s death in 1840. Yet, Anne’s sexuality was not substantially integrated into Liddington’s social history in Female Fortune (Liddington 1998, xiii–xxi, 242–51). The journal entries Liddington included in Nature’s Domain detailed Anne’s twin interests in a homosexual relationship with Ann Walker and the husbandry of building a moss hut, but a theoretical analysis was nonexistent (Orr 2004b, 532). Liddington’s consideration of Anne’s gender agency within her society was excellent and detailed, but her analysis of Anne’s sexual agency reductively represented Anne’s homosexuality as a psychological strategy. In Female Fortune for instance, Liddington claims Anne was ‘calculatingly cruel’, ‘harsh’, ‘cruel and callous’ and, at the most pejorative, seemingly capable of ‘calculatingly cruel manipulations’ (Liddington 1998, 242, 244–45). Although sexuality was not analysed in Nature’s Domain, Liddington’s characterisations of Anne’s psychosexual nature as a ‘predatory woman’ with a ‘predatory reputation’ were included without explanation or critique (Liddington 2003, 11, 35). Psychologising rather than theorising Anne’s homosexuality was problematic, yet Liddington’s work on the gendered aspects of Anne’s agency was relevant to my thesis. The value of Liddington’s work lay in the historical representation of Anne’s social and class agency, sourced widely from other historical materials.

The third editor of Anne’s writings in print was Muriel Green. Green’s representation of ‘Anne Lister’ was of a different social character again. This was a portrayal of Anne the intrepid traveller, compelled by her highly developed autodidacticism to explore foreign cultures and places. Muriel Green was the only scholar to have focused exclusively on the letters as a material and historical source for Anne’s life. As I outlined earlier, Green’s research on Anne’s writings began in the 1930s with her thesis work, ‘A Spirited Yorkshirewoman’, submitted in 1938 (Green 1938). A small selection of the letters from the thesis was later published as a book Miss Lister of Shibden Hall in 1992 (Green 1992). Green’s thesis had included some of Anne’s more intimate letters amongst the travel accounts, like those to her first love Eliza Raine, perhaps escaping official restrictions on publication given the academic nature of her work.13 However,
the letters selected for publication in *Miss Lister of Shibden Hall* in 1992 were principally focused on Anne’s travels.\(^{14}\) Yet, Green’s published compilation of the letters gave a rich longitudinal account of Anne throughout her life. In the edited correspondence, Green included Anne’s earliest letter to Aunt Anne in 1800, as well as the last letter she drafted to Mariana before she died in the Caucasus in 1840 (Green 1992, 27–28, 199–204). Green clearly demonstrated not only the importance of travel in Anne’s life, but the distinctive writing style in her correspondence. The representation of ‘Anne Lister’ by Green of Anne throughout her life was as an exceptional and intellectually demanding traveller, drawn from the single source of the correspondence.

Of the three editors, Muriel Green was the only one to focus completely upon the letters as a fertile source for biographical and literary information on ‘Anne Lister’. The letters, considered in their own right as Green has done, revealed quite different aspects of Anne’s life to the journal entries for the Paris sojourn of 1824–25. The initial research carried out by Green in the 1930s predated the revelations by Helena Whitbread of Anne’s homosexuality in the late 1980s. Even so, for the sojourn to Paris, Green’s archival work presented valuable insights into Anne’s character, which were elusive and less discernible in the edited journal entries from Jill Liddington or Helena Whitbread. In *Miss Lister of Shibden Hall*, the letters to Aunt Anne from this period invigorated a sense of their close familial relationship. ‘Accident yesterday made my friend Mrs. Barlow acquainted with the real cause of my being here’, Anne wrote about her venereal disease to Aunt Anne on 29 October 1824 (Green 1992, 73). Anne’s distinctive epistolary style was also highlighted in Green’s work. ‘What buildings! What shops! You must come again, by and by, to see the improvements. I am as busy as a bee – not ever on the wing, but ever on the foot’, Anne wrote to Aunt Anne on 27 August, from London en route to Paris (Green 1992, 67–68). In foregrounding these aspects of Anne’s life, Green has provided a partial counterpoint to Whitbread’s emphasis on Anne’s homosexuality in the journal entries. The critical contributions Green has made were her recognition of the significance of the correspondence and of the complex sociality of Anne’s life these letters documented.

These three complex representations of ‘Anne Lister’ were separate, partial and edited accounts of Anne’s life. The most particularist of all the editors’ work, Helena Whitbread’s books especially focused on Anne’s sexual life, and one of her sexual loves, presumably from the crypted sections of the journal entries. This has resulted in
an account of Anne’s homosexuality that was highly specific to her love of Mariana, not counterbalanced by the use of other textual sources. This particularist approach has since been recontextualised by Jill Liddington’s research work. Liddington’s analyses are characterised by the scope of her use of the archival resources, and a more generalist focus on the social history of Anne’s gentry Halifax community in her later years. The thesis work Muriel Green carried out fifty odd years before on the letters was not published until after Whitbread’s first book had appeared. Green’s published work also balanced the specificity of Whitbread’s analysis with a longitudinal extension of the representations of Anne’s life. As well, Green’s discreet focus on Anne’s adventurous character and recognition of the historical importance of the correspondence all added breadth to Whitbread’s representation of Anne’s sexuality and Liddington’s representation of the society Anne lived in. These three archival accounts of ‘Anne Lister’ are not easily related to each other, or necessarily analytically reconcilable. The differences in chronology of Anne’s life, coverage of the materials and analysis of Anne’s sexual and social identity have produced an uneven and abridged history with almost incompatible representations of ‘Anne Lister’.

The abridgement of the secondary sources was evident from the editing of Anne’s writings. Helena Whitbread selected from seven and a half years of the journal entries from March 1817 to August 1824, the majority probably from the crypted journal entries, for her publication of *I Know My Own Heart*. Approximately thirteen per cent of the journal entries were included by Whitbread, Jill Liddington estimated, from the original amount for this period of Anne’s life (Liddington 1994, 23). The journal entries Liddington published, mostly plain handwritten, covered a discontinuous three and a quarter years from April to December 1832 in *Nature’s Domain*, and from December 1833 to May 1836 in *Female Fortune*. In total, Liddington selected approximately thirty three per cent for publication from the original amount in Anne’s journal volumes for the period (Liddington 1998, 77; 2003, 107). Muriel Green’s life-spanning analysis of the correspondence began with Anne’s first letter written in 1800 and ended with the draft Anne wrote before her death in 1840. From the original correspondence, Green published approximately five per cent, a reduction on her thesis work which presented about twenty two per cent of all of the letters (Liddington 1994, 51, 53). To recognise the contingency of these textual sources is not to question the validity of contemporary or past historical projects on Anne’s life. Rather, these figures illustrate the editorial structuring of these representations of ‘Anne Lister’.
My interest in presenting another representation of ‘Anne Lister’ in this thesis has been motivated by the challenges I have had theorising Anne’s homosexuality and writings in the past. All of these editors, Muriel Green, Jill Liddington and Helena Whitbread had difficulties analysing Anne’s active sexuality within her social context, as other than absent, marginalised and psychologised, or singularised and sanitised. Green’s published work on the letters had a material gap, due to the editing out of the more intimate letters of the thesis, where a consideration of Anne’s sexual relations could be inserted. However, it would be a difficult project without some preceding analysis of Anne’s subjectivity within the unfamiliar textual format of her correspondence. In the known and recognisable terrain of the journal entries, the two representations of ‘Anne Lister’ separately developed by Liddington and Whitbread can be directly compared. Liddington’s research illustrated the specificity of Whitbread’s focus on Anne’s sexuality and its achievement at the expense of a socialised account of Anne’s life and writings. Whitbread’s narrative of grand passion between Anne and Mariana gave only a partial account of Anne’s sexuality, neglecting the Romantic and libertine sexuality that some of her other affairs were modelled upon. Conversely, Whitbread’s work demonstrated the universality of Liddington’s analysis of Anne’s society, which marginalised her homosexuality. Liddington’s psychologising of Anne’s sexual nature could not make visible the strategies that Anne constructed and utilised to create a homosexual agency within her society. Separately or considered together, these representations of ‘Anne Lister’ have not yet produced a complex account of Anne’s sexual and social identity.

THEORIZING ANNE’S SEXUAL AND SOCIAL IDENTITY

The major edited representations of ‘Anne Lister’ available today have conditionally incorporated Anne’s social or sexual identity in specific periods of her life. Each of the secondary sources of Anne’s writings was analytically specific, ranging from the generalist focus of Jill Liddington’s social history to Helena Whitbread’s particularist history of Anne’s sexuality, bridged by Muriel Green’s longitudinal focus on Anne’s adventurous character. That the historical knowledge produced in these accounts was particularist or generalist, social or sexual, does not undercut the importance of this work or the knowledge that was produced from it on Anne’s life and history. These three representations of ‘Anne Lister’ have considerable strengths as biographical or historical accounts of Anne’s sociability or sexuality. However, the critical question is,
how have these representations of Anne’s life constrained or contributed to our knowledge about her homosexual subjectivity? The split between these social and sexual accounts of ‘Anne Lister’ replicated the divide that already exists in lesbian feminist and women’s history regarding women’s writings, sexuality and society. Writ small with Anne’s documents, it was the same theoretical dilemma that has faced women’s historians and lesbian feminist theorists for the past few decades.

It was after lesbian and feminist political actions of the 1970s and 1980s that researchers took up the challenge of analysing Anne’s sexuality. It was Helena Whitbread who first developed a psychosexual theorisation of Anne in *No Priest but Love*. It was in the teen ‘tomboy’ years, Whitbread wrote, that Anne’s youthful same-sex crushes ‘quickly acquired sexual overtones’ (Whitbread 1992, 2). Lillian Faderman developed this line of thinking to its extreme. The journal entries were excerpted in Faderman’s historical anthology of lesbian literature, *Chloe plus Olivia*, as ‘Women’s Writing on a Man Trapped in a Woman’s Body’ (Faderman 1994, xx). Anne’s identity, as Faderman categorised it, was a modern one. The sexologists, ‘who did not begin their observations until thirty years after Lister’s death’, Faderman noted,

> formulated a category of ‘sexual inversion’ in which Lister would have recognized herself and hence understood herself to be not the unique individual she describes in her journal. Her masculine appearance and behaviour were much like what the sexologists posited as being most characteristic of the female congenital invert. (Faderman 1994, 198)

Yet, Anne’s passionate love for her own sex was congruent with the contemporaneous model of romantic friendship proposed by Faderman in *Surpassing the Love of Men* (Faderman 1981). However, Anne’s masculine gender identification and active sexuality were not features of romantic friendships according to Faderman. In Faderman’s analysis, the incompatibility with the typology of romantic friends cast Anne’s sexual identity outside of her historical context.

Anne’s representations of her own sexuality and gender were, like the figure of the congenital invert or romantic friends, historical constructions. Lillian Faderman’s early work on the congenital invert had claimed that it was the sexologists who morbidified love between women (Faderman 1978). This dated the inception of this particular identity to the late nineteenth century (Faderman 1978, 76–82). Esther Newton’s historical analysis on the ‘mythic’ figure of the mannish lesbian contradicted Faderman’s claim (Newton 1984). From her research on the sexologists, second wave
feminists and Radclyffe Hall’s books *The Unlit Lamp* and *The Well of Loneliness*, Newton concluded that the figure of the mannish lesbian, or the congenital invert, was a real gender category not invented by the sexologists (Newton 1984, 574). Anne’s gender representation suggested a parallel between her understanding and later modern identities. However, as Jeffrey Weeks has described in *Sex, Politics and Society*, the identities of the mannish lesbian and congenital invert were also bound up with modern concepts of class, deviance, criminality, repression, medicalisation and subjectivity (Weeks 1981, 96–117). None of these applied to Anne’s history or identity. Indeed, Anne understood her own desires, sexuality and gender to have been natural. On 17 September 1823, she had ‘observed upon my conduct and feelings being surely natural to me inasmuch as they were not taught, not fictitious, but instinctive’ (Whitbread 1988, 297). Analysing Anne as a subject external to her own historical moment overwrote the subtle and complex ways in which she understood herself.

Transhistorically categorising the typology of Anne’s sexuality and gender has been the dominant theoretical trend amongst queer theorists. Lisa DeBoer has argued that the theorisation of a historical homosexuality which required the proof of self-identification positioned Anne as the only lesbian within her various relationships (DeBoer 1995, 3). Such a strategy, DeBoer concluded, singularised Anne’s sexual identity even within her own writings (DeBoer 1995, 3). However, in the search for other female gentlemen and lesbian ladies in the edited journal entries, DeBoer structured Anne’s relationships on a modern butch and femme dynamic (DeBoer 1995, 53–97). Similarly, Jennifer Frangos’ work closely modelled Anne’s lesbianism upon the modern gender and sexual identity of the butch (Frangos 1994, 41, 43, 48; 1997, 52, 57, 60). Employing a twentieth century understanding of sexual and gender deviance, repression and masculinity, Frangos examined Anne’s acquaintance with Miss Pickford, a lesbian like Anne with a ‘masculine persona’ (Frangos 1994, 42; 1997, 52). In their standoff confrontations over sexual knowledge, Anne felt compelled to retain a superior and controlling position over the disclosure of her closeted identity (Frangos 1994, 44; 1997, 54). Anne’s relationship with Miss Pickford, as Frangos depicted it, more closely resembled the tough bar lesbian culture of 1950s America detailed in Elizabeth Kennedy and Madeline Davis’ lesbian historical analysis, *Boots of Leather, Slippers of Gold* (Kennedy and Davis 1993). A decontextualised self, removed from specific social, textual and historical meanings, could only be explained in modern definitive types that had the potential to overwrite Anne’s own historical sexual or gender identifications.
All of these analyses have transhistorically privileged the visibility of Anne’s behaviour or appearance. Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick was also analytically challenged by Anne’s life and history. In her book *Tendencies*, Sedgwick presented the most clinical analysis of Anne’s identity and sexuality with an itemisation of Anne’s behaviour (Sedgwick 1994). Anne constructed, Sedgwick wrote, ‘her sense of self around the pursuit and enjoyment of genital contact and short- and long-term intimacies with other women of various classes’ (Sedgwick 1994, 114). Sedgwick’s focus on describing behavioural practices illustrated the common difficulty with theorising Anne’s historical identity. The emphasis on exterior visibility extended from Anne’s ‘closeted’ crypt, ‘masculine’ dress or ‘butch’ behaviour, to Sedgwick’s addition of ‘genital contact’ with women of assorted classes for a range of periods. However, in her experiential analysis of 1950s America, Joan Nestle considered the ‘erotic heritage’ of butch and femme relationships went beyond such visibility of gestures and role-playing (Nestle 1987, 108). Reducing our historical understanding of identities like the butch or femme to observable characteristics across time, Nestle maintained in *A Restricted Country*, has been at the loss of a rich appreciation of these desires (Nestle 1987, 103). Whether the sexual and gender identity of a lesbian was a butch or femme, mannish lesbian, congenital invert, romantic friend or like Anne’s masculine gender identification, characterising these identities based on their visible characteristics was at the expense of a rich and complex understanding of how Anne’s historical identity was experienced.

Methods like taxonomisation and effects like transhistoricisation have devolved from the conceptual framework of invisibility that has driven the search for historical roots of modern homosexual identities. In the struggle for civil rights, there was a critical need for our own history. The perception that historical representations were absent originated in contradistinction to the presence of modern homosexual cultures and communities. Terry Castle termed this binary of present visibility and past invisibility, a ‘scarcity’ mentality (Castle 1993, 18). Thus, the notion of visible subcultures, identities, behaviours, genders and sexualities – so crucial to the survival of modern homosexualities – was a critical analytic for locating the invisible homosexualities in history. In one case, it was the means to extend an essentialised present into the past. Rictor Norton argued in *The Myth of the Modern Homosexual* that the evidence from the journal entries pushed the ‘lesbian moment’ of the late nineteenth century back to the start of the century (Norton 1997, 202). Anne, Norton wrote, ‘possessed a fully formed lesbian personality whose characteristics (except for the absence of a political
consciousness) are easily recognizable\textit{sic} to modern lesbians’ (Norton 1997, 196). However, Martha Vicinus rightfully cautioned against making too much of Anne’s history, for ‘we may fall into the trap of the same literalism that has characterized\textit{sic} our search for the visible markers of lesbian sexuality’ (Vicinus 1994, 66). Such generalising would always situate Anne’s sexuality and gender as ‘other’ from her early nineteenth century historical context. An account of Anne’s sexuality needs to be a valid, conditional and specific history to be productive lesbian history.

Whatever terminology Anne, or others in her society, utilised to characterise herself, her subjectivity was historical. As Liz Stanley has contended, Anne’s life and loves were not necessarily similar to our modern understanding of ‘lesbian’, nor yet necessarily dissimilar to an understanding of ‘lesbian’ to which we may not have access (Stanley 1992c, 197). Many theorists have thought Anne would readily fit into a novel by Jane Austen (1775–1817).\textsuperscript{15} Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick thought Anne was ‘an almost archetypal Jane Austen heroine’, in \textit{Tendencies} (Sedgwick 1994, 114). In \textit{The Apparitional Lesbian}, Terry Castle found Anne to be a ‘terrific snob’ reminiscent of Emma Woodhouse (Castle 1993, 96). Susan Korba, for instance, has examined Emma’s erotic interest particularly in Jane Fairfax in her lesbian textual analysis of \textit{Emma} (1815) (Korba 1997). Tiffany Potter has argued Anne’s relationship with the lower classed Miss Browne paralleled the lesbian subtext of Emma’s homosexual attractions to Harriet Smith and Jane Fairfax (Potter 1994). Several dramatic productions have also located Anne within her historical, sexual, gender or emotional context. The television series investigating the ‘Georgian Underworld’ situated Anne within the sexual history of deviance and desire of the long eighteenth century (Crombie 2003). An episode of the earlier televised series, ‘A Skirt through History’, considered Anne’s lesbian negotiations with early nineteenth century discourses on marriage (Lowthorpe 1994). The radio play \textit{Such Sweet Possession} and the dramatic work ‘I Know My Own Heart’ both presented Anne within the emotional context of her lifelong love for women (Cooper 2002; Donoghue 2001). Anne was not separate from the literary, sexual, discursive or emotional mentalities of her society.

How would Anne have understood her homosexuality? For theorists locked into modern conceptualisations of subjectivities and subcultures, and eroticised difference and desire, Anne’s textual negotiations of early nineteenth century discourses of gender and sexuality were incomprehensible. Of those theorists that did situate Anne within her
historical context, some have found it difficult to conceive of an appropriate category for her. Recognised for her work on platonic friendships, Elizabeth Mavor, like Lillian Faderman, found Anne beyond the scope of the research she carried out on Lady Eleanor Butler and Sarah Ponsonby in *The Ladies of Llangollen* (Mavor 1971). Mavor found Anne’s active sexual relationships with women indicative of the scandalous popularity of the ‘cult’ of Sapphism in regional areas of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries in northern Britain (Mavor 1988, 19). Randolph Trumbach agreed that Anne’s journal volumes provided evidence of the existence of a Sapphic identity available to women born after the mid seventeenth century (Trumbach 1994, 294). In an earlier analysis of the origins of a Sapphic identity in Britain, Trumbach researched the circumstantial evidence from the pamphlet satirising the same-sex loves of Mrs. Anne Damer (1748–1828) in 1782, and the anecdotal evidence in the diaries of Mrs. Hester Lynch Thrale (later Piozzi) (1741–1821) in 1795, concerning Marie Antoinette (1755–93), the late Queen of France (Trumbach 1991, 130–32). The historical evidence and theoretical research showed that Sapphism was an identity contemporary to Anne’s life. It was one of the cultural representations available for Anne’s own homosexual identity.

Anne displayed many of the characteristics considered part of a Sapphic identity. Randolph Trumbach suggested that Sapphists were exclusively attracted to women, had certain masculine traits and had acquired their identity through learning (Trumbach 1994, 288–89). On 13 November, when Anne discussed ‘the subject of Saffic[sic] regard’ with Mrs. Barlow, she distinguished her love for women from that of Sapphism (Whitbread 1992, 49). There was, Anne said, ‘artifice in it. It was very different from mine’ (Whitbread 1992, 49). The difference was that Anne’s love for women did not employ the ‘use of a —’ (Whitbread 1992, 49). According to Helena Whitbread’s editing, there was no word entered in the journal entry, but there was a word written in Anne’s manuscripts (Whitbread 1992, 49). It was the word ‘olisbos’, the Greek word for what was later known as a dildo (143) [Appendix 1]17. Anne classified the artifice of Sapphism to be the involvement of mechanical means. Such an understanding was confirmed the following day, when the ‘artifice’ of Sapphism was discussed again. On 14 November, Anne mentioned ‘the girl at a school in Dublin that had been obliged to have surgical aid to extract the thing’ (Whitbread 1992, 50). Anne’s love for women was distinct from this practice. ‘I liked to have those I loved near me as possible, etc’, Anne explained (Whitbread 1992, 49). Anne considered her homosexual love for women to be unlike Sapphism, and instead as intimate and natural, without artifice. The
journal entries revealed these conceptualisations of Sapphism were similar in all but one respect. It was an identity that Anne rejected.

Anne’s diligent self-education was suggestive of another historic identity of the early nineteenth century. The representation of the Bluestockings could have been a source for Anne’s sexual and gender identifications. For some theorists, highlighting the intellectual and political aspects of Anne’s history was a way to categorise the agency she exercised in her life. When analysing the account of her final trip to Georgia in 1840, David Lang characterised Anne as an ‘exceptionally gifted, intelligent, but eccentric and morally unprincipled lady’ (Lang 1989, 47). Lang continued, she was ‘an unconscious forerunner of “Women’s Lib”’ (Lang 1989, 47). Dorothy Thompson was perhaps the first after Anne’s heir John Lister, to consider seriously Anne’s political commitments and values (Thompson 1987). In her analysis of women and electoral politics in the nineteenth century, Thompson argued that a private system of power and patronage existed that enabled women to exercise some authority over voting (Thompson 1987, 58). Like many women canvassers of the period, Anne used a range of strategies to obligate voters to her own political dictates. Cat Euler examined some of these strategies, like Anne’s allocation of tenancies on Shibden Hall property in exchange for promises to vote for the local Tory member (Euler 1995, 231–87). Before enfranchisement of British women in the early twentieth century, Anne had a limited political authority within her local economy to campaign for votes.

As the conservative cast of Anne’s electioneering demonstrated, her intellectual and political agency did not necessarily translate into beliefs congruent with Bluestocking discourse. The complex arguments the Bluestockings made were for the reform, rather than the revolution, of the cult of femininity, Susan Yadlon found (Yadlon 1993, 113–15). Within a popular understanding, Anne’s erudition qualified her as a Bluestocking in the Halifax community. In the journal entry for 30 November 1819, Anne recorded how she had been compared to the ‘bas bleu’ Miss Pickford (Whitbread 1988, 106). However, the philosophical discourse of the Bluestockings did not interest Anne. A few years later, upon her reacquaintance with Miss Pickford, Anne wrote on 28 February 1823, ‘I am not an admirer of learned ladies’ (Whitbread 1988, 237). On the education of women, Anne told Mrs. Barlow in Paris on 20 September, ‘I spoke against a classical education for ladies in general. It did no good if not pursued and if [it was], undrew a curtain better for them not to peep behind’ (Whitbread 1992, 20). Nor was Anne
interested in the rights of women to vote. On 6 December 1819, Anne read the radical paper *Manchester Observer* and was incensed with its call for vote reform to include the ‘Rights of Women’ (Whitbread 1988, 108). ‘What will not these demagogues advance,’ she wrote, ‘careless what absurdity or ruin they commit!’ (Whitbread 1988, 108). The Bluestockings were a model that Anne could have fashioned her own gender or sexual identification upon, but it was not an identity that she claimed.

Taking Anne’s view of women as a product of class status, her conservatism could be seen as central to the reworking of the romantic friendship model. In her work on the long eighteenth century, Susan Lanser expanded the theorisation of female intimacies to include the class interests of a ‘gentry hegemony and feminist agency’ these attachments served (Lanser 1998–99, 180). Anne controlled the public perception of her female relationships, Lanser argued, through the deployment of a ‘compensatory conservatism’ (Lanser 1998–99, 189). Through the utilisation of indicators of gentry class like the development of land, Lanser demonstrated how Anne compensated for the risk of her gender and sexual transgressions (Lanser 1998–99, 189). With her analysis, Lanser brought the sexualised concept of the female homosexual into relation with the socialised notion of the female friend. Lanser’s formulation allowed for the re-examination of other historical examples of female relations, like the romantic friendship of the Ladies of Llangollen. Thus, the Ladies’ espousal of a pastoral ideal was a strategy for portraying their female intimacy as sexually and politically innocent (Lanser 1998–99, 193). Lanser’s work made visible the cultural and historical similarities between Anne’s homosexual relations and the Ladies of Llangollen’s ‘befriended’ relationship (Lanser 1998–99, 187). When not isolated from her social or class context, Lanser’s analysis showed that Anne’s sexual relations within her society could illuminate other historical women’s sexuality.

Many were familiar with the public representation of the idealised friendship of Eleanor Butler and Sarah Ponsonby. Yet, even Anne had speculated about the nature of their romantic friendship. In July 1822, Anne and Aunt Anne had visited the Ladies of Llangollen on their tour of North Wales (Whitbread 1988, 200–05). Anne told the gardener at Plas Newydd on 14 July, ‘I had longed to see the place for the last dozen years’ (Whitbread 1988, 196). Since she had first met and fallen in love with Mariana in 1810, Anne had especially desired to learn about the Ladies (Green 1992, 9). Mariana was greatly interested in Anne’s visit. ‘‘You have at once excited & gratified my
curiosity”, Mariana wrote to her on 3 August (Whitbread 1988, 210). “Tell me”, Mariana continued, “if you think their regard has always been platonic & if you ever believed pure friendship could be so exalted” (Whitbread 1988, 210). Anne pondered the question in her journal entry of 3 August:

I cannot help thinking that surely it was not platonic. Heaven forgive me, but I look within myself & doubt. I feel the infirmity of our nature & hesitate to pronounce such attachments uncremented by something more tender still than friendship. (Whitbread 1988, 210)

The ‘platonic’ definition of the Ladies of Llangollen’s romantic friendship was questioned by Anne. There was a difference, Anne recognised, between her experience of ‘more tender’ relationships, the ‘nature’ of her own homosexual identity and the friendship of the Ladies. Anne did not want her relationships, nor did she qualify her love, to be that of a romantic friend.

Anne’s understanding of romantic friendships altered when she and Miss Pickford became friends in February 1823 (Whitbread 1988, 234). Miss Pickford had a female friend called Miss Threlfall (n.d.) and Anne was intensely curious about the nature of their friendship (Whitbread 1988, 234). Where Anne could only speculate about the Ladies of Llangollen, Miss Pickford could be discreetly questioned. From 16 February to 1 September 1823, Anne implied, intimated and conversed with Miss Pickford about loving women (Whitbread 1988, 234–92). On 15 March, Anne had talked of Miss Pickford’s friend, Miss Threlfall, ‘in such a manner that if there is anything particular between them, Miss Pickford might possibly suppose I had it in mind’ (Whitbread 1988, 241). Miss Pickford hinted on 11 July, ‘Miss Threlfall would, perhaps, be jealous of me’ (Whitbread 1988, 262). However, despite the many veiled discussions with Miss Pickford, Anne had difficulty ascertaining the nature and intimacy of her relationship with her friend Miss Threlfall. As Lanser proposed, what was socially operating to obscure Anne’s certainty were the idealised tropes surrounding romantic friendship in the early nineteenth century. At the same time as social and class investments worked to separate the befriended female relationship from a sexual intimacy between women, the public and private aspects of these relations were actively brought into visibility or suppressed. Thus, Anne’s attempts to determine the nature of Miss Pickford’s friendship with Miss Threlfall were frustrated by powerful forces of cultural concealment.
Anne was to use the same cultural concealment as a strategy to maintain discretion. On 31 July, Miss Pickford confirmed, as much as hinting allowed, that her relationship with Miss Threlfall was what Anne supposed. Anne had told Miss Pickford about ‘what I suspected, apologizing[sic] & wrapping up my surmise very nearly till at last she owned the fact’ (Whitbread 1988, 269). Anne could not confide in Miss Pickford in return, for it was necessary to protect Mariana, whose reputation was vulnerable, as a married gentlewoman. Anne’s extra-marital homosexual relationship with Mariana was subject to different forms of social scrutiny than Miss Pickford’s romantic friendship. To cloak her relationship with Mariana, Anne used the rhetoric of platonic friendships. On 5 August, Anne said to Miss Pickford:

I am very warm in friendship, perhaps few or none more so. My manners might mislead you but I don’t, in reality, go beyond the utmost verge of friendship. Here my feelings stop. If they did not, you see from my whole manner & sentiments, I should not care to own it. (Whitbread 1988, 273)

Anne’s strategy avoided a direct disclosure. However, the claim of ‘warm’ friendship encoded, and perhaps nonetheless communicated, the nature of Anne’s intimate relations with women. It was then that Anne appeared to become aware of how romantic friendships could work in praxis, rather than theory. A few days before on 26 July, Anne had ‘thought to myself, more than ever, what the connection between them must be’ (Whitbread 1988, 268). The relationship between Miss Pickford and Miss Threlfall was a socially plausible relationship where the exclusive and intimate sexuality between the two gentlewomen was cloaked by early nineteenth century ideologies concerning romantic friendships.

The discretionary practices of lesbian history have at times resisted our modern theorisations of a specific history of female homosexuality. Pioneering histories of female friendships could only suppose, like Anne, the possibility of a female homosexuality within these relationships. Carroll Smith-Rosenberg discovered letters rich in romantic, sensual, emotional and physical expression in her study of the homosocial world of American women’s relations in the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries (Smith-Rosenberg 1975, 24). The ambiguity of her findings led Smith-Rosenberg to conclude historical female friendships could move through a ‘spectrum of human emotions between love, sensuality, and sexuality’ (Smith-Rosenberg 1975, 27). It was a concept of relations between women that was later termed a ‘lesbian continuum’ by Adrienne Rich (Rich 1980, 648–49). In Lillian Faderman’s work on
romantic friendships of the same period, *Surpassing the Love of Men*, the possibility of sexuality was discounted (Faderman 1981). Faderman concluded that kissing, fondling, sleeping together and declarations of love were not expressions of a female homosexuality. Romantic friendships, Faderman wrote, ‘were love relationships in every sense except perhaps the genital’ (Faderman 1981, 16). Without the ‘burden of visible proof’, only the representation of romantic friendships as socialised and idealised could be established with certainty (Faderman 1981, 16). Yet, the insistence on the critical seriousness of female friendships opened up the theoretical possibility of these homosocial relationships as a form of homosexual relationship within lesbian history.

The effect of early nineteenth century cultural investments in, and some women’s active management of, a platonic ideology of romantic friendships made it difficult for contemporaries to determine sexual relationships unambiguously. Anne said on 1 August, Miss Pickford ‘was the character I had long wished to meet with, to clear up my doubts whether such a one really existed nowadays’ (Whitbread 1988, 271). At first, Anne had supposed the possibility from her own experience with regards to the Ladies of Llangollen. Later with Miss Pickford, Anne’s questions and doubts became certainty only through the confidences of their companionship. As Anne told Mariana on 17 September, ‘I had met with those who could feel in unison with me’ (Whitbread 1988, 297). In her literary study of the figure of *The Apparitional Lesbian*, Castle traced the ghosting of the sexual lives of women, like Anne, from the eighteenth century onwards (Castle 1993). By contrast, in fleshing out the ‘energetic’ pursuit of women, Castle was one of the first theorists to portray Anne’s passionate homosexuality within the literary context of her Romantic society (Castle 1993, 106). Yet, Anne herself had confronted the ‘spectral’ representation of the lives and loves of historical lesbians, as Terry Castle termed it (Castle 1993, 4). On 5 August, Anne wondered, were ‘there more Miss Pickfords in the world than I have ever before thought of?’ (Whitbread 1988, 273). Historical concealment of women’s sexual relations could occlude the sharing of knowledge for isolated women like Anne.

Despite her isolation from urban, intellectual or artistic communities of like-minded women, Anne was able to construct her own homosexual identity. Anna Clark has examined the factors that assisted Anne in individually acquiring her own lesbian identity (Clark 1996). Anne’s ‘renegade’ temperament did not suit the choices of heterosexual roles of motherhood or marriage, nor did her active desire for women suit
the asexual and homosocial role of romantic friend (Clark 1996, 29–31). Clark illustrated how Anne, with a limited material agency and a strategic use of classical and Romantic representations of sexuality, set to ‘imaginatively’ reworking these heterosexual and homosocial paradigms into a positive lesbian self (Clark 1996, 31, 50).

‘Je sens mon coeur’, Anne quoted from Rousseau – or as it translated into English, ‘I know my own heart’ – in her journal entry on 20 August 1823 (Whitbread 1988, 283). Emma Donoghue briefly noted in Passions between Women, that bowdlerised texts like the Sixth Satyr (AD 100–27) of Juvenal, hostile to lesbianism, were read against the grain by Anne (Donoghue 1993b, 213–14). Anne told Miss Pickford on 27 August 1823, ‘there were few classical works of this sort I had not read’ (Whitbread 1988, 287). Other cultural representations of women’s same-sex love were present in literature and the judicial system of the time, as Lisa Moore has detailed (Moore 1992; 1997). There were characters like Harriot Freke in Belinda in 1801, or the Scottish court case against two female teachers Jane Pirie and Marianne Woods in 1811 (Moore 1992, 503–10, 513–17; 1997, 75–108). In the early nineteenth century, many cultural representations raised or dismissed the possibility of sexual relations between women, and Anne carefully attended to them all in her search for sexual self-knowledge.

Anne used literature as a source of sexual information, to learn about herself. As Lisa Moore analysed in Dangerous Intimacies, Anne ‘uses reading strategically so as to construct her sexuality’ (Moore 1997, 88). Anne researched studies on anatomy for an explanation of her sexual subjectivity. In Paris on 13 November, she recorded how these researches for once had not been successful. ‘Could not find it out. Could not understand myself’, Anne said to Mrs. Barlow (Whitbread 1992, 49). Anne also used the practice of reading to affirm her sexual identity. After Anne and Mariana made their own marriage commitment on 23 July 1821, they agreed to ‘reading something, the same thing & at the same hour every day’ (Whitbread 1988, 159, 165). The two gentlewomen decided to read chapters from the New Testament ‘every morning at 10 ¾’ (Whitbread 1988, 165). Reading could be a marital ritual or an expression of amorous interest. When Anne was wooing Miss Browne on 12 May 1818, she thought of obtaining a copy of Byron’s Childe Harold, so she could ‘offer it for her reading’ (Whitbread 1988, 42). The way that Anne identified through reading was seen in a journal entry from 12 February 1821. Anne was reading the novel Leontine de Blondheim (1809) by August von Kotzebue (1761–1819) and the characters painfully reminded her of the entangled romance with her lover ‘M-’, Mariana, who was married

Some historical scholarship on Anne’s homosexuality has worked with a desexualised conceptualisation of her agency and subjectivity, persistently analysing it as the actions of a male agency. As Denise Riley has argued, the dislocation of historical women from their sex relies on a fixed notion of the category of ‘woman’, as it also fails to question the ‘temporalities’ of the complex subjectivities of ‘women’ in history (Riley 1988, 113–14). For instance, Caroline Eisner has examined the ways that Anne rewrote and reshaped her lesbianism in her journal volumes (Eisner 1998; 2002). Anne repositioned her sexual self in the journal accounts, Eisner wrote, as a ‘womanizer[sic]’ and ‘victimizer[sic]’ who ‘turned herself in her own mind, into a man’ (Eisner 1998, 74; 2002, 31). Jill Liddington briefly characterised Anne’s behaviour as a husband to Ann Walker, as ‘no worse than any other rather caddish man’ (Liddington 1998, 244). The comparisons Liddington made to heterosexual males were unanimously dreadful examples. There was the Halifax husband who took ‘full advantage of his wife’s successive pregnancies’, another who was a ‘violent and alcoholic husband’, or there were the fictional examples of a ‘dissolute husband’ and an ‘aridly selfish husband’ (Liddington 1998, 244). Tamsin Wilton has termed such insistence on gender binaries, ‘heteropolarity’ (Wilton 1996, 127). In a heteropolar framework, Wilton argued, gender must be individually compliant, as well as differentiated between a pair (Wilton 1996, 126–28). Analysing Anne’s actions as a male agency eclipsed the specificity of her own sexual and gender identifications.

Anne was not a man, nor did she cross-dress to obtain a male agency within early nineteenth century society. Hermaphrodism was not an explanation, like the famous French diplomat and spy Chevalier d’Eon (1728–1810). ‘No exterior formation accounted for it’, Anne told Mrs. Barlow on 13 November (Whitbread 1992, 49). Yet, Anne considered a hierarchical biology, such as described by Thomas Laqueur, where women were homologous but lesser to men, might explain her difference (Laqueur 1987). In the same conversation with Mrs. Barlow, Anne hinted at ‘an internal correspondence or likeness of some of the male or female organs of generation’ (Whitbread 1992, 49). What Anne did express was a desire for the accoutrements of
masculinity. As Anne wrote on 20 April 1824, her ‘usual costume’ was a gentleman’s
greatcoat, but she also liked to use gentlemen’s braces and umbrella (Whitbread 1988,
341).27 Anne, like Miss Pickford, had a masculine nickname ‘Fred’ (Whitbread 1988,
89, 129, 284). On occasion, Anne’s gender desire extended to sexual accoutrements. On
7 May 1821, Anne fancied meeting Caroline Greenwood (n.d.) on the moor, ‘myself in
men’s clothes & having a penis, tho’ nothing more’ (Whitbread 1988, 151). Anne’s
gender fashioning was that of a ‘female gentleman’, as Lisa DeBoer recognised
(DeBoer 1995). On 4 October 1820, Anne wrote, ‘my manners are certainly peculiar,
not all masculine but rather softly gentleman-like’ (Whitbread 1988, 136).28 Within her
own class, Anne’s manners, gait, voice, attention and understanding were considered
odd, but were accepted.29 Yet, Anne’s gender identifications, whilst firmly located
within her class, were transgressive of early nineteenth century gender boundaries.

For Anne, wearing some items of gentlemen’s clothing was congruent with her
homosexual desire. ‘It was all the effect of the mind’, she said in explanation to Mrs.
Barlow on 13 November (Whitbread 1992, 49). As Martha Vicinus wrote, Anne’s was a
subjectivity ‘which denied the theatricality of gender and instead inscribes it upon the
body as a permanent identity’ (Vicinus 1992, 480).30 Mrs. Kelly (nee Browne), before
her marriage on 28 September 1820, had once been the focus of Anne’s serious
attentions (Whitbread 1988, 83). On 10 May 1824, Mrs Kelly said she thought Anne’s
‘whole style of dress suited myself & my manners & was consistent & becoming to me’
(Whitbread 1988, 342).31 The closest literary parallel was the mid eighteenth century
literary trope of the virile ‘female husband’, from the pamphlet The Female Husband
(1746), drawn from the life of Mary or Molly Hamilton (b.1721?), as Judith Halberstam
has extensively considered (Fielding 1746; Halberstam 1998, 65–73). Anne and
Mariana certainly called each other ‘husband’ and ‘wife’, but they had not always been
married (Whitbread 1988, 121, 129, 145, 154, 159, 177). A fantasised inflection on the
female gentleman appeared to be the female master. ‘Musing on the subject of being my
own master’, Anne wrote on 3 May 1820, involved going off with a carriage and
servant, ‘an elegant girl of family & fortune’, attentions, affections and a double bed all
night (Whitbread 1988, 123).32 The summit of Anne’s ambitious fantasy, she wrote on
18 July 1823, was to be awarded a barony (Whitbread 1988, 264). Anne’s actualisation
of the female master role was undoubtedly her dealing with trespassers on the estate
with a show of pistols.33 As a female husband, gentleman and master, Anne’s gender
identification was intricately bound up with her sexual notions of romance, and social discourses about marriage and class.

Anne’s fashioning of her sexual self, like her gendered self, was culturally complex. Terry Castle recognised Anne’s modelling of her ‘sexual adventurism’ on Lord Byron’s persona of the ‘arch-romantic’ and ‘notorious womanizer[sic]’ (Castle 1993, 103). The public representation available was, as Castle noted, that of the ‘heterosexual rake’, not our more recent knowledge of his homosexuality (Castle 1993, 103). Clara Tuite examined Anne’s sociable and sexual stylisation of Byron and also her textual identification with her literary hero, Jean-Jacques Rousseau (Tuite 2002). Anne imitated Rousseau’s sincere style of confessional sexual writing, Tuite argued, to display her own Romantic character as a lover (Tuite 2002, 198–200). The social concern with vulgarity was one of Anne’s Byronic performances, as was her embodied representation of the ‘perennial winter story’ by always wearing black (Tuite 2002, 189). One of the ways Anne’s black clothes can be considered is as a transformation of cultural practices of mourning, as I have argued, to signify her homosexual loss over her lover Mariana’s marriage (Orr 2004a, 208–13). Some of Anne’s constructions of her sexual self were drawn from more intimate and direct sources. When she sought medical treatment of her venereal condition in Paris, Anne appropriated Mariana’s marital sexual history wholesale to solicit an effective diagnosis (Orr 2004a, 213–18). These analyses illustrate the personal and cultural significance of Anne’s profound and intense sexual identifications within her early nineteenth century society.

Anne’s interactions with her society were designed to represent a cohesive concept of herself in resistance to early nineteenth century conventions and discourses regarding class, sexuality, gender, race and nation. Jacqueline Parker-Snedker analysed the rhetoric of Englishness that Anne utilised, like visiting practices associated with taking tea, to negotiate the sexual boundary between acceptability and unacceptability within her community and material economy (Parker-Snedker 1994). Anne’s complex gender negotiations within her class, female networks, family, politics and local Halifax society were thoroughly examined in Cat Euler’s analysis (Euler 1995). Anne shifted according to class and gender concerns, Euler showed, between a ‘masculinized[sic] entrepreneurial subjectivity’ with her workers and a ‘feminine gentry subjectivity’ with her friends, family and acquaintances (Euler 1995, 395). The position of Tory landowner was cemented in the local Halifax community, as Anira Rowanchild argued,
through Anne’s family name, relative wealth, acquaintances of note and strategic upgrading of the Shibden Hall estate (Rowanchild 2000c, 150, 156–59). Areas of Shibden Hall were remodelled with Gothic details and the construction of picturesque rustic paths and a moss hut created a landscape that displayed Anne’s wealth, as much as it secluded her affairs from observation (Rowanchild 2000a, 95, 98). Anne’s sexual and gender self informed the ways she related to others within her class and society, but managed and shaped that environment to reflect her own homosexual desires.

Analyses of the construction and context of Anne’s subjectivity have been the most influential in my own study of Anne’s sojourn to Paris. Examining the ways that Anne negotiated her identity within her society, I develop, like these theorists, an understanding of her subjectivity in external action. In Liz Stanley’s terms, it is a theoretical position that focuses upon the exterior agency of ‘women’s made-selves’ (Stanley 2000, 57). From a situated analysis of Anne’s society, it is possible to understand the influences on her subjectivity in internal action. Or, again as Stanley understood it, analysing the context of women’s lives allows for specific insights into the interior agency of the ‘self-made women’ (Stanley 2000, 48). Nonetheless, the theorisation of Anne’s subjectivity has remained specific to particular areas of her writings or aspects of her life. We have a complex understanding of Anne’s sexual subjectivity, not only within her ‘private’ writings, but more recently also within her society. Similarly, we have a detailed understanding of Anne’s social subjectivity within the ‘public’ writings and as enacted within her society. What is missing is an understanding of Anne’s subjectivity not only as it was enacted sexually, but also socially. When gentlewomen were not her lovers, what was the nature of their interaction and relationship with Anne? Anne identified as a lover of the ‘fairer sex’, but how did she interact with other gentlewomen of her society who were not lovers, but acquaintances, friends or companions (Whitbread 1988, 145)? How then was Anne’s sociability and sexuality intertwined? What was the full complexity of intimate relationships that Anne had with other women within her society?

Given the theoretical opposition of the romantic friendship model with historical lesbian sexuality, it is unusual that no theorist has analysed the range of relationships Anne had with other gentlewomen. It is time to examine the rich variety of Anne’s relations with gentlewomen in her own social sphere – her acquaintances, friendships, flirtations, unrequited loves, lovers, mistresses and potential wives. Not every relationship in
Anne’s life was immediately identifiable as a sexual one, nor were friends sacrosanct from the possibility of becoming one of her lovers. Some of Anne’s lovers, like Mariana Belcombe or Isabella Norcliffe, were lifelong friends. Anne and Mariana for instance, at some point, even maybe very briefly when they first met, and later after Ann Walker became Anne’s wife, were dear friends. Helena Whitbread’s account of Anne’s sexuality within the journal entries, whilst focused upon Mariana, indicated that there were many other sexual relationships in Anne’s life: flings, affairs, amours, romances, lust or abiding love. Anne was capable of being loved and attracting love from other women. From Muriel Green’s representation of Anne’s sociability within the correspondence, Anne was a steady friend, developing and maintaining relationships with other women that lasted sometimes throughout her life, as correspondents, lovers or confidantes. How were Anne’s different relationships established and maintained, what were the rituals associated with sociability or sexuality with other women and under what circumstances did a friendship become a sexual relationship?

My thesis on Anne’s sojourn to Paris is not an attempt to correct the various edited representations of ‘Anne Lister’. Rather, I seek to displace some of the constructions of Anne’s sexuality or sociality that have become conventional knowledge. To broaden the particularity of our knowledge of Anne’s sexuality drawn from the journal volumes, I include an analysis of the correspondence from Paris. In *The Life and Death of Emily Wilding Davison*, Liz Stanley and Ann Morley sourced other documents to produce a material counterpoint to the received history of Davison’s political life (Stanley and Morley 1988). To deepen the understanding we have of the travel letters written all through her life, I examine Anne’s epistolary subjectivity in the extant letters from Paris. Liz Stanley drew upon women’s letters sent to Edward Carpenter, to analyse their sexual self-knowledge prior to the development of medical knowledge by the sexologists (Stanley 1992b). To address the marginal understanding we have of Anne’s sexuality as it was bound up with her sociality, I consider all of her interactions, social and sexual, with others in Paris. Liz Stanley argued that examining the ‘webs of friendship’ between early twentieth century feminists countered traditional ‘spotlight’ biographies that psychologised these women’s selves outside of their social, political and contextual production (Stanley 1991, 213–14). A full examination of Anne’s sexuality and sociability within her society for her life is yet to be done. My entry point into this broader undertaking is to extend our understanding of Anne’s subjectivity over the seven month period of her sojourn in Paris. In this way, I hope to move our
theorising of Anne’s sexuality and sociality towards a more complex integration of these different categories of analysis.

**SEXUALITY AND SOCIALITY IN ANNE’S JOURNALS**

Anne’s journal volumes were an integral part of the construction of her identity representations and actuation of her sexual and gender agency within her society. Through the practices of reading and writing, Lisa Moore argued, Anne created a ‘potent construction of herself as a sexual agent’ (Moore 1992, 517). The journal volumes were the writing space where Anne affirmed her sexual subjectivity. ‘I love, & only love, the fairer sex & thus beloved by them in turn, my heart revolts from any other love than theirs’, Anne wrote on 29 January 1821 (Whitbread 1988, 145). Anne’s journal accounts demonstrated, as Moore wrote, that ‘women’s reading and writing could create a homosexual agency for women’ (Moore 1992, 517). Exactly how did Anne use the different forms of her writing to textually represent her subjectivity and create her agency? The characteristics of the journal volumes, letters or other writings, and how Anne employed these materials to constitute her authorial self, have not previously been considered in the edited publications by Muriel Green, Jill Liddington and Helena Whitbread. Yet, much of our theorising of Anne’s sexuality has been based upon unquestioned notions about the crypt handwriting. In this section, I will examine the editorial representations of the crypted and uncrypted handwritings, analysing the implications of these accounts upon our understanding of Anne’s construction of her sexual and social identity within all of her writings.

Questions about the crypt handwriting have not been foregrounded in analyses of Anne’s sexuality, for no editorial distinction was made between specific textual spaces in Helena Whitbread’s publications. As women’s historian Angela John noted, ‘the reader is left feeling rather too dependent on a selection of diaries without sufficient explanation of how and why particular passages have been selected’ (John 1989, 112). Sourced exclusively from the journal volumes, both of Whitbread’s books included material from Anne’s uncrypted and encrypted handwritings (Whitbread 1988, xxvii–xxix; 1992, xvi–xvii). Whitbread stated simply in her first book, that Anne’s journal records were in ‘code whenever Anne wishes to confide her intimate life’, which was clarified to Anne’s ‘bouts of physical lovemaking with Mariana and also with other women’ in the second volume (Whitbread 1988, xxv; 1992, 6–7). According to Whitbread, Anne
also used the crypt ‘in her journal to pour out her feelings in privacy’, when she ‘wished to write about her emotions’ (Whitbread 1988, 7; 1992, 6). Since, it has been commonly assumed that the crypted journal entries not only contained details of Anne’s sentimentality and sexuality, but that the crypted spaces were the sole and originating location of Anne’s sexuality in her writings. The converse presumption was that Anne’s other writings, those that were not sentimental or sexual like her uncrypted journal writing, letters and account books were the textual location of her sociality. Without recourse to a differentiated version of the journal entries, it has been difficult to challenge these assumptions. Thus, the separation of Anne’s handwritings along a public and private divide has become received knowledge of the location of Anne’s sociality and sexuality in her writings.

The crypted handwriting of the journal entries was central to the issue of Anne’s sexuality. However, the production of Anne’s homosexuality within her writings was not exclusive to the crypted handwritten journal entries. Anne noted that she wrote her letters in the crypt handwriting to Mariana in the journal entries of 22 May 1817 and 8 February 1821 (Whitbread 1988, 8, 145). When Anne gave Miss Vallance (n.d.) a copy of the ‘crypt hand alphabet’ on 7 January 1821, it most likely would have been for their correspondence, as Miss Vallance lived in Kent (Whitbread 1988, 136, 142). The amount of encryption in the original correspondence cannot be determined, as not all of Anne’s letters have survived. In 1992 in Miss Lister of Shibden Hall, Muriel Green released a selective edition, focused upon Anne’s travel correspondence, of her 1938 thesis work (Green 1938; 1992). The edited correspondence did not in itself provide proof of Anne’s homosexuality, for the crypt handwriting was not used in these letters. Green concluded in an interview with Jill Liddington, Anne’s lesbianism ‘doesn’t come into the letters’ (Liddington 1994, 57). Yet, the indications were that the letters were part of Anne’s sexual relationships. As Green noted, Anne’s correspondence with her lover, Eliza Raine, was a ‘sentimental exchange’ (Green 1992, 33). In the same interview, Green also mentioned she thought the letters were ‘rather affectionate’ and ‘very flowery’ (Liddington 1994, 57). There was, as Liddington noted, a strong likelihood that Anne used the conventions of romantic letter writing as she used her journal volume (Liddington 1994, 57). Letter writing could also have been a textual space in which Anne created her sexual identity and agency with her lovers and correspondents.
In the editing of her books *Female Fortune* and *Nature’s Domain*, Jill Liddington stated she retained Anne’s proportion of crypt to unencrypted handwriting (Liddington 2003, 107). In *Female Fortune*, about a tenth of the journal entries were presented in the crypt handwriting, whereas in *Nature’s Domain*, approximately a third of the journal entries that Liddington included were in the crypt hand (Liddington 1998, 78; 2003, 107). The emphasis was strongly centred on Anne’s ‘social’ writings as sources, like her account books and correspondence, or as the majority of the content, like the unencrypted journal entries. Through her analysis of the ‘public’ documents, Liddington has been able to examine Anne’s gender agency as an objective social and historical construct, without necessarily having to integrate a substantial account of Anne’s ‘private’ or subjective sexuality located in the marginal spaces of the crypt handwriting. Anne’s sexuality and crypt handwriting were not interconnected to, or informed her actions with, her social sphere. Thus, Liddington concluded, Anne’s ‘identity was still largely defined by class, by landownership, by dynasty, by education’ (Liddington 1998, 251). For Liddington, Anne’s social identity and public documents were not shaped or defined by a homosexuality written in the private and crypted sections of the journal volumes.

Uncontested by the sexual accounts presented by Helena Whitbread, or the social accounts by Muriel Green and Jill Liddington, the segregation of the sexual and social aspects of Anne’s writings can be traced further back. The two distinct modes of theorisation about Anne’s writings, like the representations of her life, have emerged from the bifurcated historiography of the papers. As Michel Foucault argued, the social and sexual were discursively separated in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries (Foucault 1978, 1:115–31). Such a separation was effected by suppression and censorship of Anne’s writings. In the late nineteenth century Anne’s heir, John Lister, first discovered the key to the crypt and worked to repress knowledge of Anne’s sexual identity through the control of her social representation (Liddington 1994, 15). For over a century, only the ‘public’ sections of Anne’s writings were made widely available because of familial suppression of the key to the crypt handwriting, and later official restrictions on publication (Liddington 1994, 17–18). The ‘private’ sections of Anne’s writings were accessed by researchers, according to Liddington, who were provided by the archivist with a key to the crypt (Liddington 1994, 17–19). Consequently, the censored representation emerged of ‘Anne Lister’ as a social agent from her ‘public’ documents, separated from the more recent representation of ‘Anne Lister’ as a sexual individual, drawn from her ‘private’ crypted papers. To see her writings, or merely the
journal volumes, as disassociated spaces of Anne’s sexual and social identity has been the result of a retrospective application of these categories. Anne’s specific reasons for creating and maintaining differentiated spaces within her texts have been obscured.

The disconnection between sections of Anne’s writing has more relevance to modern conceptualisations of sexual and social identity than it does to the historical identity Anne textually produced. Reading across the edited writings, Anne’s authorial voice retained an integrity, or consistency, throughout all of her writing formats. Anne appeared to use her journal volumes and correspondence as simultaneous textual spaces. According to Jill Liddington and Helena Whitbread, the journal entries recorded every detail of Anne’s day including her feelings, intimate relationships, bookkeeping, travels, estate management, family affairs, writing, reading, studying, eating, walking, political commentary, status of her venereal condition, time and weather notations (Liddington 1998, 77; 2003, 107; Whitbread 1988, xxiii; 1992, xvi). The letters also, as seen in Muriel Green’s work, included her ‘sentimental’ letters to Eliza Raine that were ‘full of avowals of friendship’, letters to her brother and letters about Anne ‘secretly having treatment for a virus infection’ in Paris (Green 1992, 33, 35–39, 73 n.3). Anne appeared to have made no distinction between these writing formats: the same social and sexual subjects were evidenced in the journal entries as in the correspondence. The only textual separation within the edited writings was between Anne’s use of the crypt hand and what she termed the ‘plain hand’.

The nature of the crypt handwriting has been the central theoretical focus in the study of Anne’s sexuality. The crypt handwriting was deployed, according to Helena Whitbread, not only to record her intimate life and private feelings, but when she wished to record ‘secretive’ matters (Whitbread 1988, 14). Such matters included, besides her sexuality or sensibility, Anne’s ‘secretive attitude towards discussing or writing about her clothes’ (Whitbread 1988, 14). Anne, Whitbread considered,

obviously felt reticent about her dress and appearance and was constantly the subject of criticism from her friends for her shabby and unfashionable wardrobe. She always used her cryptic code in her journals when referring to her clothes. (Whitbread 1988, 14)

For Whitbread, the crypt handwriting was characterised by secrecy and surreptitiousness. Similarly, in Caroline Eisner’s analysis, Anne’s writing in crypt about her sexuality was an attempt to displace, and thus repress, her ‘shameful self’ (Eisner
Ultimately, the lifelong encryption of Anne’s sexuality was, Eisner concluded, a record of ‘denial of her own true identity’ (Eisner 1998, 117; 2002, 40). The crypt performed, in Jennifer Frangos’ application of Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick’s *Epistemology of the Closet*, as a ‘closet’ for her homosexuality (Frangos 1994, 34; 1997, 47, 59–60; Sedgwick 1990). Anne was so invested in her closeted and crypted sexuality that, according to Frangos, upon confrontation by Miss Pickford, Anne “disavows the very identity she has so carefully constructed for herself” (Frangos 1994, 44; 1997, 54). Thus, the correlation of the crypted textual space with secrecy, shame and disavowal will always represent Anne’s sexual identity as profoundly compromised.

Anne’s differentiation of her textual spaces, of the plain and crypt handwriting in her journal volumes and correspondence, were arguably not an effect of a repressed identity. Anne did not ‘assume a stigma’, according to Anna Clark, with the representation of her own homosexual identity (Clark 1996, 50). The crypt handwriting in the journal entries bore witness to Anne’s sexual identity. ‘What a comfort is this journal’, she wrote on 31 May 1824, ‘I tell myself to myself & throw the burden on my book & feel relieved’ (Whitbread 1988, 345). Anne Choma has analysed the ‘enigmatic’ textual selfhoods that were produced in the journal accounts (Choma 1994, 43). Anne’s beliefs about feminine gender were, Choma considered, congruent with the ideologies promulgated by conduct manuals of the early nineteenth century (Choma 1994, 21). However, Anne did not observe nor did she contravene these discourses in designated spaces, but rather she manipulated these ideologies across the plain and crypt handwritings (Choma 1994, 36). Anne’s ability to negotiate a masculine gender resistance in the plain hand and promote a desexualised femininity in the crypt hand, suggested to Choma that the crypt handwriting provided an emancipatory space where Anne could eulogise her sexual identity (Choma 1994, 43–46). Such an understanding of the crypted space of Anne’s writings rejects the modern notion of a stigmatised sexuality, instead conceptualising the crypt handwriting as the textual exploration of sexual passion. It was an analysis of Anne’s writing project that was congruent with her emulation of Romantic mentalities prevalent in early nineteenth century society.

Anne’s sexuality was not relegated by her to one textual location within the journal entries, nor was it excluded from the ways that she also produced her sociability within her writings. Compare for instance, two versions of the most famous of Anne’s passages, the journal entry for 29 January 1821, which has most frequently been used to
show her identification as a lesbian. In Helena Whitbread’s edition of the journal entries, the passage read:

Arranging & putting away my last year’s letters. Looked over & burnt several very old ones from indifferent people… Burnt… Mr. Montagu’s farewell verses that no trace of any man’s admiration may remain. It is not meet[sic] for me. I love, & only love, the fairer sex & thus beloved by them in turn, my heart revolts from any other love than theirs. (Whitbread 1988, 145)

In unexpurgated form, in the journal entry, Anne’s passage read:

Arranging & putting away my last year’s letters looked over & burnt several very old ones from indifferent people notes &c. & ‘some’ copies of my own letters written to Miss M- & Mrs. Duffin 10 & 12 years ago – sad stuff they seem to me now – i.e. too much palaver – & if I still felt twice as much (for I well know I never wrote what I did not think & feel at the time), half as much said would be more than enough to please me now – Tho’ the heart teem with feeling, let it speak briefly [“]Concise your diction, let your sense be clear, Nor with a weight of words fatigue ye ear” – 10 or 12 years ago, I could write in frank & easy carelessness “my heart is open as the day – if it esteems it loves, & if it loves adores” – o day of youth! how are the clouds of caution gathered round – how art thou darkened, & set amid the glimmerings of the past! – burnt all Caroline Greenwood’s foolish notes &c. & Mr. Montagu’s farewell verses that no trace of any man’s admiration may remain it is not meet[sic] for me I love & only love the fairer sex & thus beloved by them in turn my heart revolts from any other love than theirs. (SH:7/ML/E/4, 240)

In both passages, Anne’s statements of heterosexual rejection and homosexual identification were strongly, but concisely expressed. However, the comparison revealed Anne’s particular detailing, in both the plain and crypt handwriting, of the letters that she kept or discarded from her women acquaintances and amours. In the unexpurgated journal entry, the complex intertwining of Anne’s sexuality and sociability in the plain and crypt handwritings was visible.

Analyses of the crypt handwriting have customarily supposed it to be the intricate element of Anne’s textual practices. However, as Jill Liddington has noted, the plain handwriting could also form an ‘impenetrable thicket of handwritten words’ (Liddington 1998, xx). The focus on the sophistication of the crypt has elided the complex representational issues with the other handwriting Anne used, the plain hand. Like the crypted journal text, the plain handwriting was dense, as it was a heavily abbreviated form of writing. Helena Whitbread found the plain handwriting ‘almost as difficult to decipher as the code had been’, especially when Anne wrote in a little or cramped hand to economise on paper (Whitbread 1988, xxviii; 1992, xvi–xvii). The
plain hand acted in a similar fashion to the crypt handwriting, for it also obscured or frustrated access to her journal writings, except to the most dedicated reader. On 12 December in Paris for instance, Anne discovered Mrs. Barlow secretly reading her journal volume. ‘I have no objection’, she told Mrs. Barlow, ‘make out what you can’ (187). The effect was exacerbated for the modern reader, for Anne’s employment of early nineteenth century terminology, foreign languages or a rare or singular instance of a word, could make it difficult to determine the unabbreviated meaning. Anne’s writings were protected to different degrees by both types of handwriting. The abbreviated plain hand and indecipherable crypt hand were both forms of Anne’s textual codification.

Anne’s textual practices with the crypt handwriting were dynamic. The development of the crypt handwriting suggested that its nature and purpose changed over time. Initially, in 1806, Anne had translated text, using a Greek script, according to Jill Liddington, to record the date and times (Liddington 1994, 27). It was not until Anne and her first love Eliza Raine developed the crypt alphabet together in 1808, that the practice of substituting text could be considered encryption (Liddington 1994, 27–28). The crypt was used in a limited fashion by Anne and Eliza, to note repeatedly the Latin word ‘felix’, or ‘happy’ (Liddington 1994, 70 n.64). The journal notebook that recorded Anne’s notations of ‘felix’ had been started two years before in 1806 after she left the Manor School where she and Eliza had fallen in love (Green 1992, 19, 33). Eliza had commenced the same journal task in 1807, after she also left the Manor School (Green 1992, 33). The synchronicity of inception with the crypt handwriting and journal keeping demonstrated their interrelation. The crypt handwriting was initially designed by Anne and Eliza as the simplest of expressions, to record their mutual felicity or happiness. The journal notebooks were the textual and material repository of Eliza and Anne’s love when they were separated. In both instances, Anne’s relationship with Eliza was the principal motivation for these textual, material and crypted constructions.

Eliza was not to remain the principal or exclusive focus of the crypt handwriting or journal keeping. Anne’s first journal notebook ceased in 1810, the year Anne met Mariana Belcombe (Green 1992, 9). Beginning a new journal volume may have been Anne’s way to create a dedicated material and textual record of her developing relationship with Mariana. By 1814, Mariana was the subject of at least one of the journal volumes. In an inventory of her papers Anne made in 1822, she noted that she had retained ‘my journal of our acquaintance’ from her 1814–15 papers regarding
‘MPB’, Mariana Percy Belcombe (Liddington 1994, 59). The crypt also became utilised in a more complex fashion with Mariana, who was allocated a symbol. Mariana was the mathematical constant, pi or ‘Π’ in the crypt handwriting. Anne’s relationships with Eliza and Isabella Norcliffe had commenced prior to the acquaintance with Mariana, but their names were crypted by a letter for letter replacement system in the 1824–25 journal volume.37 Eliza and Isabella were Anne’s first serious relationships, when the crypt handwriting and journal keeping practices were nascent. By 1814, the journal volumes and crypt had incorporated Anne’s sexual relations with two successive women, no longer existing as the record of a single originating relationship. The crypt handwriting and journal keeping were, by the time Anne met Mariana, developed textual processes. The writing practices that were initially a testament of Anne’s relationship with Eliza were being adapted in complex ways to document the wider history and practices of her sexuality.

From the early stages of Anne’s writing, there were hints of other complex textual practices that were intertwined with her sexuality. Anne had a journal volume from 1814 that was focused upon recording her relationship with Mariana. On 29 January 1821, Anne burnt the poetry of Mr. Montagu (n.d.) as a material statement of her love for the ‘fairer sex’ (Whitbread 1988, 145). The repetition of the word ‘felix’ created a shared understanding between Anne and Eliza. Later, there was evidence of an encoded language Anne employed for sex. On 14 September 1823 for instance, Anne and Mariana ‘made love & had one of the most delightfully long, tender kisses we have ever had’ (Whitbread 1988, 293).38 Anne’s original crypted textual space was concerned with recording her state of being, or felicity, in her relationship with Eliza. After Mariana’s marriage, the crypt journal entries frequently recorded Anne’s angry and unhappy state of being with Mariana. As Anne noted on 18 June 1824, when she reread her journal volumes, ‘I could trace much inconsistency & selfishness noted down against M-‘ (Whitbread 1988, 346). When Anne attributed a symbol to Mariana, she created another form of encoding within the crypt. In the 1830s, Anne used a cross to mark when she ‘incurred a cross’, or masturbated, in the journal margins (Liddington 1998, 62, 264). Anne’s homosexuality was fundamentally bound up with the material and textual creation of her writings and crypt handwriting. Yet, Anne’s sexual subjectivity was also substantiated through the recording of her state of being, and signified through the creation of an encoded language, symbols and marks.
The crypt handwriting constructed Anne’s homosexuality socially. The journal entries were, as Anira Rowanchild argued, one of the most significant locations for the production of Anne’s sexual identity, but the material record of her homosexuality was not the only way she constructed her sexual identity (Rowanchild 2000b, 205). Focusing upon the gentlewomen who were given the crypt, Rowanchild showed how Anne’s sexuality was articulated socially amongst a small network of gentlewomen (Rowanchild 2000b, 202). Rowanchild considered that the crypted text allowed for a ‘clandestine’ privileged readership of other women with same-sex desire, inviting intimate access ‘to those in the know’ (Rowanchild 2000b, 202, 205). The crypt handwriting could be understood, I suggested in my analysis of Anne’s homosexual agency, as a discretionary strategy that she used to manage the disclosure of her female homosexuality (Orr 2004a, 207). Sally Newman considered a similar case in the papers of twentieth century Australian woman Aileen Palmer (1915–88) (Newman 2000). Palmer’s diary recorded in encoded language the same-sex relationships between a group of university women, the ‘mob’ (Newman 2000, 12). Newman found that the shared knowledge of their code was one of the fundamental rituals of acceptance into the ‘mob’ culture (Newman 2000, 17, 22). The crypt handwriting affirmed Anne’s sexuality, at the same time as it enabled a social interaction between interested gentlewomen for the expression of a same-sex desire. It is the textual expression of Anne’s sexuality and sociability, in the crypt and plain handwritings, in the journal volumes and letters, that is the subject of study in my project on her sojourn in Paris.

**REPRESENTING ANNE IN PARIS 1824–25**

A sense of the scope of Anne’s writings in Paris was not easy to achieve from the edited sources. Anne wrote two hundred pages of journal entries during her sojourn to Paris. Less than one sixth of the journal writings for the Paris period were published by Helena Whitbread in *No Priest but Love* (Whitbread 1992, 9–90). Whitbread’s editing indicated there was more to be examined in the journal writing of her sexual relationship with Mrs. Barlow than had previously been published. Muriel Green had highlighted the letters as an equally rewarding source of biographical information about Anne’s character and writing style. Anne wrote thirty letters to friends and family from Paris, of which about two thirds have survived in the papers. For this period of Anne’s life, Green’s 1938 thesis was more comprehensive, as it included seventeen of the extant letters, many of which were transcribed almost in their entirety. However, as
Jill Liddington has maintained, a critical study of Anne’s history needs to be situated within the context of all of the papers (Liddington 1994, 9). In Liddington’s terms, a critical reading of the materials began with their transcription, a challenging task I undertook in my project on Anne’s sojourn in Paris (Liddington 1994, 9). Only reading and re-reading the extant archival materials – the journal volumes, letters and account books – through and across the ‘caches of documents’, Liddington wrote, ‘brings us as close as we can get to the complete Anne Lister’ (Liddington 1998, xx). Representing Anne’s sexuality and sociality during her Paris sojourn required, then, a transcription of all the materials written there, to locate Anne within the context of her writings and history. While the sojourn in Paris was not the central focus of other representations of ‘Anne Lister’, all three editors opened up different possibilities for examining the relationship with Mrs. Barlow in Paris in more textual detail.

The primary sources for Anne’s sojourn in Paris in 1824–25 were the journal volume and correspondence she wrote there. The seven months were contained within one journal volume SH:7/ML/E/8 [Appendix 1]. The journal account, from Anne’s arrival in Paris on 1 September 1824 until her departure on 31 March 1825, totalled two hundred pages of journal entries (67–267[sic]). By my word count, Anne wrote approximately 172 000 words, which I transcribed and decrypted. Overall, approximately a third of the journal entries written in Paris were in the crypt handwriting. However, the rate fluctuated over the entire stay. At the beginning and end of the sojourn, the crypt handwriting was not much in evidence, but from mid October until the end of February half of the journal entries were written in the crypt hand.40 In the papers, there were eighteen extant letters written by Anne in Paris [Appendix 1, fig. 1]. The letters that have survived were mostly written to Aunt Anne, beginning from 8 September, a week after Anne arrived in Paris, and continuing until 14 March, two weeks before she departed (ML/146; ML/164) [Appendix 1]. The correspondence totalled seventy three pages, all of it written in plain handwriting. The legibility of the letters meant that it was only necessary for me to transcribe selections from the correspondence. Altogether, the two hundred pages of journal entries and eighteen letters took me two years to transcribe and decrypt. It was this work that comprised the basis for my project on Anne’s sojourn in Paris in 1824–25.

My project was guided by my concern with the events Anne experienced and relationships she had in Paris. I have used the Paris dates, 1 September 1824 to 31
March 1825, to structure the start and terminus points of my research [Appendix 2]. A detailed analysis of Anne’s stay in London prior to, or following her Paris trip, was not essential to my focus, nor did I have the space to examine in depth the consequences or outcomes from the Paris journey in the later years of her life. However, a journey such as this had an impact upon Anne’s life that was felt beyond the dates of the trip, informed by the past, and continued to have an impact into her future. I have included one incident and one letter that were beyond the scope of the Paris period, for they contributed to a deeper understanding of the significance of the Paris sojourn in Anne’s life. The incident was the ‘treadmill business’ which occurred in London the week before Anne arrived, and it was a subject of some discussion in her journal entries in Paris. The letter was a copy of the first letter Anne wrote to Mrs. Barlow after Paris, which I have also analysed. The exceptions both impacted upon Anne’s life in, or immediately after Paris. The incident in London affected Anne’s reputation amongst the other guests in Paris. The letter copy Anne made indicated her emotional state regarding Mrs. Barlow as she left Paris. The social impact of the ‘treadmill business’ and the sexual information in the letter copy warranted their incorporation into my analysis of Anne’s sociability and sexuality in Paris.

There have been some necessary exclusions from my consideration of the sojourn in Paris. On textual matters, I have only briefly considered Anne’s lifelong material practices with the journal volumes [Appendix 3]. Jill Liddington utilised the account books as a resource for Anne’s history, so I have also investigated the three different ledgers where Anne recorded her Paris finances [Appendix 4]. On sociable matters, Anne’s nine day flirtation with Miss Pope (n.d.) was not consequential enough to be included. Miss Pope’s main attraction were her ‘smiling eyes’, reminiscent of Anne’s first love Eliza Raine, as she told Aunt Anne in the letter she began on 8 September (81; ML/146, 2). Anne’s inebriated attentions to Miss Pope on the evening of 26 September, when she ‘talked away to Miss Pope rather flirtingly’, marked the cessation of the fleeting interest in Miss Pope (87). Anne’s friendship with her language teacher in Paris, Madame Galvani (b.1878?), was more serious.41 These two intelligent and knowledgeable gentlewomen developed a companionable and confidential relationship, full of indecorous and improper conversations. However, Mme. Galvani was not a resident of the Place Vendôme household and although intriguing, the friendship with Mme. Galvani was not part of Anne’s immediate circle of relations in Paris. Thus, it was outside the scope of my project to elucidate Anne’s sociability within an intimate
network of her women friends and lovers at the Place Vendôme. Anne’s lifelong material practices with the journal volumes and account books, or her pedagogical relationships with various teachers would be fruitful topics for further investigation.

My thesis on Anne’s sojourn in Paris is concerned with how we treat sources like journal volumes and letters to produce women’s history. Diaries were traditionally written by women, but, as feminist literary theorist Dale Spender noted, defined by their nature as a repository of emotion, women’s diaries were considered non-traditional in a canonical literature defined by its rationality (Spender 1987, 1). Canonical literature of course includes not only forms of writing of the rational self such as autobiography and biography, but also forms of factual writing such as history, chronicles and annals. As feminist literary theorist Sidonie Smith has analysed, the canon of Western autobiography was a master narrative tradition that has worked to suppress women’s subjectivity (Smith 1992, 83–84). The challenges raised by feminist literary theorists about what texts constituted canonical autobiography or biography have stimulated an extremely significant discussion for women’s historians. Feminist literary investigations into what comprises the writing of the self, and what discourses have structured this analytic, have interested women’s historians who want to analyse women’s periodical writings as an autobiographical and historical source. Women’s history today has continued to rely upon the abundant sources of women’s writings from the past – like published and unpublished journals, diaries and letters. The dilemma has continued to be critical – we need to be able to attend to the particularities of women’s daily writings to produce rich and valid accounts of a woman’s authorial subjectivity in the past.

Anne’s journal volumes, letters and even account books can be considered autobiographical within feminist literary theory. In her groundbreaking study of English autobiographies of the eighteenth century *The Autobiographical Subject*, women’s historian Felicity Nussbaum analysed some of the diaries of women contemporary to Anne, like Hester Lynch Thrale (later Piozzi) (Nussbaum 1989, 201–24). Women’s autobiographical writings, Nussbaum argued, were not politically neutral articulations of the self, but were subject to the structuring of ideological discourse (Nussbaum 1989, xix, xxi). Anne’s writings were not a pre-linguistic écriture of the feminine, but were discursively and linguistically mediated. When Anne sat down to put pen to paper, her textual spaces were already self-mediated, or were in the course of being mediated. Anne was engaged in her writing as an author and agent of her own subjectivity, at the
same time as she was engaged in her writing as an editor and subject of discursive
construction. The authorial self was active, editing the production of a textual record of
a subjectivity located in a particular time and place. Anne’s journal volumes and
correspondence constituted, at their most fundamental level, what we understand as
autobiography: as the self, ‘auto’, compelling the relation of the story of that self,
‘biography’. As Anne’s self was mediated by and within her society, so her writings
were themselves mediations of that self within a text. Anne’s writings were the literary
site or the textual location of the compulsion of that self to be written.

As a type of autobiography, Anne’s journal volumes and letters were similar to other
women’s daily writings, but they remained distinctly different from the more familiar
forms of literary narratives of the self, such as published autobiographies, biographies,
memos and chronicles. To make sense of Anne’s periodic writings as a narrative
required a laborious and conscious shift by the reader to enact ways of interpreting her
writings (choices over methods), that allowed for feminist and reflexive processes of
engagement with her materials (methodological choices). The representation of the
sexual and sociable history of ‘Anne Lister’ in Paris I have produced is not a deduction
of an essential truth about Anne. Rather, it is an analytic production, the result of what
feminist sociologist Liz Stanley has termed ‘reverse archaeology’ (Stanley 1987, 30).
Reverse archaeology is, Stanley wrote, ‘constituted by the accumulation of layers of
knowledge and complexity, not the stripping away of these as debris preventing us from
seeing ‘the real X or Y’ beneath’ (Stanley 1987, 30). The representation of Anne’s life
and loves in Paris in this thesis was the end result of an accumulation of knowledge and
understandings that I have constructed about ‘Anne Lister’. It is an account that I hope
enriches our knowledge about Anne’s writings, history, sexuality and sociability, and
yet it might also displace some of the other representations we have of ‘Anne Lister’.

Anne’s autobiographical project, her journal and letter writing, was a process that
involved the writer’s identity, writings and writing act. Liz Stanley argued in The
Auto/Biographical I, that in the Western tradition of bourgeois male autobiography
these autobiographical positions are conceived as already achieved (Stanley 1992a,
133). Problematising these autobiographical relations was one of Stanley’s central
concerns in the conceptualisation of her feminist methodology: ‘feminist
auto/biography’ (Stanley 1992a). Viewed as an autobiographical process rather than as a
realised product, Anne’s self was visible for analysis, whether her subject position was
as a journalist or correspondent, within the textual location of the journal volumes or letters, in the process of being journalled or epistolised. However, Anne’s writings were constituted of textual, as well as temporal processes. Margo Culley has termed the constitution of women’s autobiographical writing over time, the ‘periodicity’ of diary writing (Culley 1985, 20–21). Such a formulation could account for the recurrent nature of Anne’s authorial act and shifts in her subjectivity at different times in her writing life.

As Suzanne Bunkers has written, historical women’s writings were ‘a commentary on life as it was lived, that is, on life in process rather than as product’ (Bunkers 1987, 9). Thus, Anne’s writings could be seen as a series of productions of the self in each of her texts at different points in time. It was these understandings of her writings that I employed as a methodology to construct my representation of ‘Anne Lister’ from the journal volume and letters in Paris.

Anne’s texts were not a finished piece of writing, seamlessly produced narratively or chronologically. Working with turn of the century American women’s writings required a ‘special inventive patience’, Elizabeth Hampsten considered in Read This Only to Yourself (Hampsten 1982, 4). “Nothing happened” written in a journal entry, Hampsten considered, ‘asks that we wonder what, in the context of a particular woman’s stream of days, she means by something happening’ (Hampsten 1982, 4). With Anne’s autobiographical writings that ‘special inventive patience’ involved tracking the written and unwritten; or, the presence and absence of hints and coding, gaps, rituals, patterns, editing, strikethroughs, punctuation, grammar, marginalia, insertions, symbols, markers, intrusions, interruptions, excisions, reproductions, omissions, repetitions, temporality, anniversaries, events, subject matter, constant or recurring themes, length of journal entries or letters, amount of crypting, foreign language, coded terms, created phrases and language style. As a reader, I moved through Anne’s writings back and forth across materials (journal volumes, letters) and chronologies (days, months), inwards and outwards from depth to perspective (journal entries, indices), across formats (crypt hand, plain hand, symbols, marks, encoded language) and temporalities (episodes, cycles). My reading method was a strategy developed to address Judith Butler’s challenge in Gender Trouble to ‘shift from an epistemological account of identity to one which locates the problematic within practices of signification’ (Butler 1990, 144; author’s italics). Using this method of reading Anne’s significations, I have pieced together the sexual experience and sociable interactions of ‘Anne Lister’ from her writings in Paris.
Making sense of Anne’s writings necessitated an interpretive leap by myself, as the researcher of her history. Within a feminist framework, the explication of my process of constructing knowledge about Anne’s history and writings was as important as accounting for the ways that she wrote herself through her writings. The reflexive engagement of the modern researcher with the embedded knowledge within their textual production was one of the most important requirements in Liz Stanley’s ongoing conceptualisation of ‘feminist auto/biography’ (Stanley 1991, 214–16; 1992a, 253; 1993, 44–45; 1999, 17–19; Stanley and Morley 1988, 69). The reading and theorising of Anne’s writings in the present, critically engaged me not only as the historical researcher, but as an interpreter, and later an editor, of the self Anne wrote in her texts. A reflexive feminist methodology necessarily encompassed all research processes and theoretical products – analytical, autobiographical, biographical, editorial, epistemological, historical and methodological. Such a methodology also included the critical study of the various editors of Anne’s writings, Muriel Green, Jill Liddington, Helena Whitbread. As women’s historian Joan Scott has stated, ‘a reflexive, self-critical approach makes apparent the particularistic status of any historical knowledge and the historian’s active role as a producer of knowledge’ (Scott 1988, 7). Thus, all of the editorial accounts of Anne’s life were a place to start the theorisation of her history contained in her autobiographical writings.

In working on Anne’s writings, I have been conscious of the representation of ‘Anne Lister’ I was producing. Bonnie Zimmerman has argued that the modern lesbian feminist critic has the job of exploring lesbian literature and expanding the theoretical possibilities for women, whilst being careful not to create or reinforce the stereotypes of lesbian lives in the past, or present, in our culture (Zimmerman 1985, 203). Thus, the most crucial consideration in my work has been to attend to Anne’s words. Anne’s sexual history was part of our lesbian history, but her own stated sexual orientation was as a lover of the ‘fairer sex’ (Whitbread 1988, 145). Anne did not name this sexual identity; rather, she used terms that expressed her sexual desire. To let Anne’s writings speak to her understanding, I have employed generic terms like ‘homosexuality’ or ‘same-sex’ that describe, not define, her sexual practices in Paris. Regarding her writing practices, Anne utilised a specific terminology, which I have retained. In the journal entry for 16 August 1819, Anne even troubled to correct her lover Isabella Norcliffe. Isabella, ‘much to my annoyance,’ Anne noted, ‘mentioned my keeping a journal, & setting down everyone’s conversation in my peculiar hand-writing (what I call crypt
hand)’ (Whitbread 1988, 96). Terms like ‘diary’ or ‘code’ were not used by Anne, as Jill Liddington and Helena Whitbread have extensively done. In presenting my account of the sojourn in Paris, I have tried to be directed by Anne’s representation of her history, self, sexuality and writings.

Presenting Anne’s writings in the thesis raised a series of editorial issues about the treatment and representation of the texts. The guiding concern was to enable a textual space where Anne’s words could be presented with minimal editorial interference. Preserving the authenticity and historicity of Anne’s abbreviated plain or crypt handwriting would have been at the expense of the communicability of her writing. My intention was for the reader to be able to access my representation of Anne’s writings in a manner that allowed for a diversity of readings of the sojourn in Paris. The strategy of decentring an authoritative editorial interpretation could make possible a multiplicity of contingent analyses in dialogue with Anne’s writings. However, there was no one way of adequately representing the plain and crypted handwritings that did not effect some difficulty of access or induce some measure of stabilisation. The alternative was to account for my editorial processes, to be reflexive as to what choices I made and how they structured my representation of the writings of ‘Anne Lister’ in Paris. It was a choice to increase the level of any reader’s engagement with the materials, without sacrificing too much of the accuracy, originality or authenticity of Anne’s authorial voice in her writings. Highlighting my engagement with the writings and making the reader’s access to the text possible were measures intended to open up, rather than foreclose, the space for alternative understandings of Anne’s meanings.

The most critical issue with Anne’s writings is how to represent the two forms of her handwriting. Jill Liddington and Helena Whitbread have both lengthened Anne’s abbreviations in the plain handwriting (Whitbread 1988, xxviii; Liddington 1998, 78). In line with both editors’ work, I have also lengthened Anne’s abbreviated plain handwriting. However, using this editing practice has meant expanding the historically specific abbreviations Anne used. For instance, the most common abbreviation was for ‘th’ words, which Anne shortened with ‘y’ contractions, so that ‘ye’ was for ‘the’, or ‘yt’ for ‘that’ and so on. To illustrate the effect of the lengthening process, an example has been selected from the journal entry of 20 November. It concerned the order Anne placed with the bookseller Jeannin, for binding Lord Byron’s works as a gift for Mrs. Barlow. The abbreviated plain handwritten comment appeared in the journal entry as:
seeing an edition in the shop window "of Jeannin" (no. 8) went in, & finding that he would allow some diminution of from 101 francs to 88, bought the work (16 volumes) & ordered them to be bound at 2 ½ francs per volume – they are to be done in 10 days – said I bought "a great many books – these for a lady. (153)

In this thesis, in lengthened format, the journal note regarding Anne’s gift of Byron’s oeuvre will be presented as:

Mrs. B- lay down by me & we both slept Jane sitting by us cutting open Lord Byron’s works which I have given Mrs. B- she had her right hand in bed on my queer all the while. (227–28)

Presenting the crypted passages already decrypted for readability was at the expense of some of the complexities, fluidities and instabilities that existed in the crypt handwriting. My point in highlighting the decryption work is that even at an apparently rudimentary level editorial choices were made about Anne’s handwritings. When the
writing was less legible, the intuitive leap to understanding was an engagement with Anne’s texts, an editorial interpretation of her meaning.

The crypt handwriting was a complex code dissimilar to a regular alphabet. The crypt handwriting had no possessives and there were no inflections with Anne’s use of French. The crypt alphabet did not evidence any distinguishable system for capitals, or, alternatively, perhaps it was all capitalised. There was no perceptible size difference in the use of crypt alphabet symbols, or the assignation of different symbols for capitals. Anne did not use spacing to mark out words in the crypt handwriting and, in the journal entries, the crypt handwriting looked like a continuous sequence, with the decrypted writing forming long strings of letters. Regarding the Byron works that Anne gave to Mrs. Barlow, the missing middle step in the decryption process would have rendered the crypted journal text to look like, ‘mrsblaydownbyme&webothslept janesittingbyus cuttingopenlordbyronsworkswchihavegivenmrsbshadherrighthandinbedonmyqueer allthewhile’ (227–28). To make the crypt handwriting more accessible, I inserted possessives, inflections, capitals and word spacing, drawing upon the plain handwriting as the guide. Anne used all of these elements in the plain handwritten journal entries, but she only capitalised personal pronouns, people’s names and places. Keeping the grammar of the decryptions consistent with the plain hand could be imposing a coherency that Anne did not have across these two types of handwriting, but these editorial practices already existed within Anne’s journal writings.

Where I have differed from other edited representations of Anne’s writings was over introducing corrective editorial elements into the plain and crypt handwritings. Anne’s punctuation, as both Jill Liddington and Helena Whitbread have noted, consisted mainly of dashes rather than full stops (Liddington 1998, 78; 2003, 107; Whitbread 1988, xxviii). Spacing sometimes acted as punctuation in the crypt handwriting, with breaks for clauses or between subject matters. These patterns which Anne used to pace her writings have been retained. Anne was an editor of the journal volume and letters and her corrections and elaborations revealed a need for accuracy with her writings. Anne occasionally excised her own writing when she copied it, with an ellipsis, ‘…’. When she made a mistake, Anne struck through the incorrect text and inserted the correction in superscript above her commentary. Elaborations were inserted in the same manner, marked with a caret, ‘ˆ’. However, to signal the conclusion of the superscripting, I have added a closing caret, ‘ˇ’. Anne used a variety of forms and abbreviations for people’s
names which I have kept, for these nominations indicated the sociable relations Anne had with her acquaintances and friends. Likewise, the historical specificities, inconsistencies and errors with Anne’s spelling and language have not been modernised, systematised or corrected, although I have noted their occurrence. The editorial practice of preserving punctuation, editing, historicity and naming allowed me to retain many specificities of Anne’s writing practices within her own texts.

In rare instances, Anne’s writings were illegible. Square brackets marked those words or letters that were less clear or ambiguous. The indices were an extremely valuable tool when the journal entries were damaged or unreadable. Extreme damage was very rare in the Paris period, but there were instances. Infrequently, even magnifying the microfilm images of Anne’s writings did not assist in determining what she had written. One instance was the journal entry for 19 January 1825, when the first half, mostly in crypt handwriting, was so faded it was difficult to decrypt (223). The journal entries from 15 March until her departure on 31 March were more difficult to read than any other during her sojourn in Paris (259–67[sic]). In many of these journal entries, the plain and crypt handwritings were scribbled and cramped. The journal entries for some of these dates, like those of 15, 16 and 19 March, were faded enough to be substantially illegible (259, 261). Especially in the last two weeks of the sojourn, only the index notations could reveal the journal entry content. The indices for the journal entries were a critical starting point for problems with Anne’s handwriting, for they were more clearly written. Difficulties with the letters were also very few, as the correspondence was well spaced and clearly written. The legibility of the indices and correspondence made them both good places to begin the familiarisation process, before tackling the density of the plain and crypt handwritings in the journal entries.

The three most central questions of my project with Anne’s writings in Paris were textual issues, social context and sexual practices. These concerns arose from the approaches of the prior three principal editors of Anne’s writings. Each of my chapters addresses one of these areas of investigation. Firstly, from Muriel Green, there was the fleshing out of her lifelong representation of ‘Anne Lister’ through the careful analysis of the letters. Chapter One ‘Anne’s Texts – Writing the Paris Sojourn 1824–25’ focuses on the issue of textuality within Anne’s writings for the period in Paris. In this chapter, I analyse the source materials for this time in Anne’s life: the journal volume that she kept for the seven months in Paris, the letters that she wrote to friends and family whilst
she was resident there and the space in the text where both formats intersected. Secondly, Jill Liddington’s analyses have detailed Anne’s social history and agency in her representation of ‘Anne Lister’ in the later years. In Chapter Two ‘Anne’s Society – Sociability in Paris 1824–25’ I consider Anne’s social interactions with the other residents and guests at the Place Vendôme household. Anne formed a number of relationships in Paris that ranged from affectionate homosociality with other English gentlewomen, to the domestic difficulties with social gatekeepers like the owner of the guesthouse. Thirdly, the representation of ‘Anne Lister’ in Helena Whitbread’s work has contributed to an understanding of Anne’s homosexuality. The last chapter, Chapter Three ‘Anne’s Sexuality – Sex in Paris 1824–25’, deals with Anne’s daily experience of her sexuality in Paris. In this chapter, I examine Anne’s sexual practices in the writings from Paris, the narrative of her sexual history that she told to Mrs. Barlow and the development and intensification of their sexual relationship.

Anne’s case has become a cause célèbre in the rich history of homosexuality. Frequently referenced in discussion and analyses of female homosexualities, Anne has been the focus of increasing debate about our theorising of lesbian sexual identities in history. Since Helena Whitbread’s first public disclosure of Anne’s sexuality, the revelations contained in the journal accounts have fundamentally contested some of the predominant models and concepts regarding historical women’s sexualities. Anne’s writing displayed a dynamic cultural negotiation that has raised critical challenges to the theorisation of contemporaneous ideologies of gender and sexuality as homogeneous, oppressive or rigid. The content of the journal entries documented that some nineteenth century women’s sexuality was readily active, disputing our understanding of the passivity of early nineteenth century women. As well, the evidence that other women participated in sexual relationships with Anne radically contested the nominal heterosexuality bestowed on single, married or widowed women in our theorising of women’s sexualities of the past. Anne’s accounts of her intimate relationships with gentlewomen also questioned the sociality and supposed asexuality of the ‘romantic friendship’ model of lesbian feminist history. Anne’s case has thrown up many questions about our modern theorising, not only because of the evidentiary breadth and frankness of her journal volumes, but also because of the historical implications of her writing, homosexuality, sexual and social relationships. It is time to take up the rethinking of Anne’s sexual and social relations, beginning with her writings in Paris.
ENDNOTES

1 In British Women’s Diaries, a bibliographic analysis of fifty nine nineteenth century diaries, Cynthia Huff found one woman who selectively wrote in code, Miss Helen Russell (b.1835?) (Huff 1985, 36–38).

2 Jill Liddington calculated that Helena Whitbread published three per cent of the total journal entries in I Know My Own Heart; Muriel Green published approximately five per cent of the correspondence in Miss Lister of Shibden Hall and Liddington herself published one per cent of the total journal entries in Female Fortune and half a per cent in Nature’s Domain (Liddington 1994, 23, 49, 53; 1998, 77, 266 n.1; 2003, 107). Liddington did not include Whitbread’s second volume No Priest but Love in her estimates.

3 For Miss Browne’s age, see the journal entry of 18 February 1819, where Anne noted Miss Browne had turned twenty five a fortnight before (Whitbread 1988, 80).

4 The spelling was ‘Mariana’ according to the bond of 6 March 1816, which secured an annuity between her soon to be husband, Charles Lawton, and father, Dr. Belcombe (1757–1828) (SH:7/ML/72).

5 For Colonel Barlow’s age, see the journal entry of 3 November, where Mrs. Barlow told Anne Colonel Barlow was thirty eight when they married in 1808 (129).

6 For Jane Barlow’s age, see the journal entry of 9 November, where Anne noted she turned fourteen (137). Helena Whitbread published Jane’s year of birth as 1811 (Whitbread 1992, xx).

7 Such censorship perhaps would not have been applied to unpublished academic work. Apparently Vivien Ingham was to include a section in her doctoral thesis on Anne’s lesbianism, a subject which her supervisor Olive Anderson reported there was ‘no question of excluding’ (Anderson 1995, 191). Unfortunately, Ingham died before her thesis was completed. It was the contention of her supervisor, that Ingham’s papers on Anne Lister were collected into the papers, and misattributed to her colleague Phyllis Ramsden (Anderson 1995). Similarly, Muriel Green’s 1938 thesis, ‘A Spirited Yorkshirewoman’, included more of the letters that were of a sensitive or intimate nature, than her 1992 publication based on the earlier work. Of nineteen letters from the Paris sojourn, Green included seventeen in her thesis and only three in her later publication [Appendix 6].

8 More recently, Helena Whitbread has published an article on the historiography of Anne’s papers (Whitbread 2004). The article does not include any substantial transcriptions from Anne’s writings, nor does it add to, or alter, the standard portrait of ‘Anne Lister’ seen in Whitbread’s previous works.

9 Ninety two days, or three months, of the journal entries from the seven month sojourn in Paris were completely excised by Helena Whitbread from publication in No Priest but Love. However, this only accounted for total expurgation of a journal entry, not for Whitbread’s editing within individual journal entries. In fact, Whitbread’s editing was more substantial, as indicated by the word count.

10 For the months covering the development of Anne and Mrs. Barlow’s courtship, Helena Whitbread excised a third of the journal entries for each month of September (ten days), October (ten days) and November 1824 (nine days). For the later months covering Anne and Mrs. Barlow’s intimate relationship,
half of the journal entries for the months of December 1824 (thirteen days) and January 1825 (fifteen
days) were excised by Whitbread. The month of February 1825 (twenty three days) was the most heavily
edited for the Paris sojourn, with two thirds of the journal entries for the month excised. The final month
in Paris was not as heavily edited, but March 1825 (twelve days) nonetheless had half of the journal
entries excised by Whitbread from publication.

Unfortunately, whilst Jill Liddington has resourced other materials like the account books, she has not
included excerpts in her two publications of Anne’s writings, Female Fortune and Nature’s Domain
(Liddington 1998, xx; 2003, 118). These two books predominantly contained the journal entries with
excerpts from some of the letters.

More purple prose than historical fiction, Maureen Peter’s novel Child of Earth about Emily Brontë
included a meeting with Anne Lister that was wildly suggestive (Peters 1991, 137–44). Jill Liddington’s
analysis of the claim found a meeting extremely unlikely (Liddington 2001, 63). However, Liddington
considered that the familial and legal sagas involving Anne and her partner Ann Walker could have
informed the relationships of the novel (Liddington 2001, 64). The meticulous journal notations Anne
made about the weather in that stormy winter, Liddington wrote, ‘put the “wuther” back into Wuthering
Heights’ (Liddington 2001, 64). Cat Euler has also explored the similarity between the portrait of Shirley
Keeldar Esquire and Anne in the novel Shirley (1849) by Charlotte Brontë (1816–55) (Euler 1995, 400–
02). The works of the Brontë women could have been informed by more personal knowledge of female
relationships. For theoretical revisions of the heterosexual normalisation in Brontë biographies of
Charlotte Brontë’s love of Ellen Nussey (1817–97), see Elaine Miller’s article on their correspondence
(Miller 1989); and for the ambivalence Emily Brontë displayed about her own sexual identity, see Jean
Kennard’s analysis of Wuthering Heights (Kennard 1996).

For Eliza’s letters, see the chapter dedicated to ‘Eliza Raine’s Letters. 1806–1814’ (Green 1938, 79–
concentrated on travel letters (Green 1938, 10–11).

In Miss Lister of Shibden Hall, Muriel Green had eighteen topic chapters, eleven focused on travel
correspondence (Green 1992, 5).

There has been some theoretical work on the homoeroticism and homosexuality of Jane Austen and her
novels. For the homoerotic relationship between Jane Austen and her sister Cassandra (1773–1845), see
Terry Castle’s analysis of their correspondence (Castle 2002).

In the journal entry of 13 November, the term ‘Saffic[sic]’ was not spelt with the crypt for ‘ff’, ‘Ψ’; but
the combination symbol for ‘ph’, ‘ϕ’, thus ‘Saphic’ (143). According to the Oxford English Dictionary,
1989 second edition, s.v. ‘Sapphic’ or ‘Saphic’ pertaining to Sappho, the Greek poet from Lesbos (c. 600
BC), first came into usage in the sixteenth century. However, Anne’s use showed that there was a more
sexually specific understanding in the nineteenth century for the term.

www.dictionary.oed.com/ (accessed 24 May 2006), meaning dildo, first came into usage from Greek in
the late nineteenth century. However, Anne’s use suggested the term was known earlier in the nineteenth
century. Anne was familiar with the concept of an olisbos from classical writers like Juvenal (c. AD 60–
65 – c. 127), Martial (c. AD 40 – c. 104) and Suetonius (c. AD 70 – c. 130).

18 David Lang revised his representation of Anne in his 1990 version of the same paper to an
‘exceptionally gifted, intelligent, but eccentric and highly emotional lady’ (Lang 1990, 116). According to
the introductory comment in the 1989 paper, the analysis that Lang presented to the Transactions of the
Halifax Antiquarian Society was an ‘abbreviated version’ of the 1990 paper (Lang 1989, 47).

19 Anne and Miss Pickford had first met in Bath in 1813, but their acquaintance was not re-established
until ten years later (Whitbread 1988, 235).

20 For Anne’s intimate knowledge of Juvenal, see 29 November (167); for Martial, see 25 November
(161); and for Suetonius, noted in the journal entries, see 9 October (Whitbread 1992, 25; 98), and noted
in the literary index, see page 98 (index 3). Anne was determined to purchase a copy of Martial in Paris;
for her enquiries, noted in the journal entries, see 11 and 28 October, 11 November, 25 December and 24
March (100, 119, 141, 198, 264), and noted in the literary index, see page 141 (index 3). On 25
December, Anne went so far as to ask Mme. Galvani about a particularly rare edition of Martial she was
interested in. Anne wrote in her journal entry, the edition ‘can only be got by stealth for me from the
King’s library & which will therefore be too dear’ (198). Eventually, Anne purchased a copy in London,
as she mentioned in her journal entry, see 4 April (271), literary index, see page 272 (index 5), and in the
index, see 4 April (index 18). For how the English read and translated Juvenal, see Dror Wahrman’s
history of sexuality analysis of the mid seventeenth to early nineteenth centuries (Wahrman 1999).

21 Anne was probably referring to the fourth canto of Childe Harold published in 1818.

22 There was a separate problem with Caroline Eisner’s work – many of her dates and facts sourced from
Jill Liddington and Helena Whitbread concerning Anne’s life were erroneous. The error pertinent to
Paris, for example, was Eisner’s assumption that ‘Lister met Maria Barlow and continued an affair with
her until 1834, when she met and eventually settled down with Anne[sic] Walker’ (Eisner 2002, 29).
According to Whitbread, Anne’s relationship with Mrs. Barlow finished in 1827, not 1834 (Whitbread
1992, 204). The next relationship after Mrs. Barlow was not with Ann Walker, Whitbread noted, but with
Mme. de Rosny (n.d.) in the late 1820s (Whitbread 1992, 204). Anne met Ann Walker, according to both

23 Anne’s homosexuality was discussed in Female Fortune only as preliminary and concluding material,
and was not analysed at all in Nature’s Domain (Liddington 1998, xiii–xxi, 242–51; 2003).

24 For an elaboration of the tradition of cross-dressing in Europe, see the work of Rudolf Dekker and
Lotte van de Pol, who analysed one hundred and nineteen court cases in their study, The Tradition of
Female Transvestism in Early Modern Europe (Dekker and van de Pol 1989, 3). For eighteenth century
transvestite traditions, such as the theatrical cross-dressing, like Charlotte Charke (1713–60), see Pat
Rogers’ examination of the ‘breeches part’ on stage from the Restoration onwards (Rogers 1982); for
Charlotte Charke, see Jones DeRitter’s analysis of Charke’s dramaturgic self-representations (DeRitter
1994); and Kristina Straub’s analysis of Charke’s biographical resistance to normalisation of her sexuality and cross-dressing (Straub 1991). For the warrior woman of balladry or the historical counterpart, the military maid, who dressed as men, joined the army or navy, to experience a life of adventure or to join the object of their affection, see Dianne Dugaw’s authoritative analysis of Anglo-American ballads of the seventeenth to nineteenth centuries, in *Warrior Women and Popular Balladry* (Dugaw 1989); and for the lives of Western and European women from the eighteenth century onwards, see Julie Wheelwright’s book *Amazons and Military Maids* (Wheelwright 1989).

25 For Chevalier d’Eon, see Gary Kates’ historical analysis of the one-sex model in the late eighteenth century (Kates 1991); and for a study of the popular textual representations of the hermaphrodite, see Emma Donoghue’s work on the mid seventeenth to mid eighteenth centuries (Donoghue 1993a).

26 By the late eighteenth century, according to Thomas Laqueur, the ‘anatomy and physiology of incommensurability replaced a metaphysics of hierarchy in the representation of women in relation to men’ (Laqueur 1987, 3). Anne’s strategic application of the older one-sex model of biological explanation to herself suggested it persisted some time later than Laqueur had originally supposed.

27 For Anne’s greatcoat, see 23 August and 2 September 1823, and 20 April 1824 (Whitbread 1988, 285, 292, 341); for braces, see 2 April 1817 (Whitbread 1988, 1); and for the umbrella, see 18 February 1819 (Whitbread 1988, 80).

28 See also the journal note on 11 March 1824, when Anne was ‘conscious of occasionally bordering on a rather gentlemanly sort of style’ (Whitbread 1988, 330).

29 For Anne’s manners, see 27 July 1819, and 1 March and 17 May 1823 (Whitbread 1988, 94, 238, 252); for gait, see 2 July 1821 (Whitbread 1988, 155); for voice, see 22 March 1820 and 2 July 1821 (Whitbread 1988, 118–19, 156); for attention, see 5 April 1820 and 19 May 1823 (Whitbread 1988, 120, 254); and for understanding, see 10 May 1824 (Whitbread 1988, 342).

30 Geraldine Friedman has analysed an intriguing exception, the life of the Scottish woman and writer, Mary Diana Dods (n.d.), an early nineteenth century contemporary of Anne (Friedman 2001). Dods was, Friedman wrote, ‘a woman with multiple names and genders’ who spent her life as a woman, then later wrote under anonymous or male pen names, and who eventually passed as a man in France, where she married (Friedman 2001, 1). The multiplicity of identities and genders has made it difficult to ascertain even Dods’ birth and death dates.

31 When she was Anne’s love interest, Miss Browne (later Kelly) had wished Anne ‘had been a gent’ on 18 February 1819 (Whitbread 1988, 78).

32 See also when Anne, having told Sarah Ponsonby her life story on 23 July 1822, received this wistful advice. ‘“Ah, yes,” said she, “you will soon be the master & there will be an end of romance”’ (Whitbread 1988, 203).

33 For pistol showing, see 23 August 1818, 16 October 1821, 2 July 1822 and 6 February 1824 (Whitbread 1988, 55, 168, 191, 326–27).
There may be extant correspondence in the papers in crypt handwriting, but neither Muriel Green, Jill Liddington nor Helena Whitbread have noted its occurrence.

For the journal reference to her ‘plain hand’, see 12 December (187).

This was Eliza’s journal notebook for 1807–09, SH:7/ML/A/13 (West Yorkshire Archive Service 2005).

For example, Isabella could be written as ‘Tib’, ‘Isabel’ or ‘Isabella’. In Anne’s letter by letter encryption, noted in the journal entries, for ‘Tib’ as ‘~4t’, see 12 and 27 September, 5 October (twice), 28 and 29 November, and 22 December (twice) (75, 88, 95, 164, 167, 195), and noted in the index, see 12 September (index 7); for ‘Isabel’ as ‘4=2(3d’, see 26 February (250); and for ‘Isabella’ as ‘4=2(c:a’, noted in the journal entries, see 1 October, and 4 and 9 December (92, 174, 180), and noted in the index, see 17 November (index 11). Similarly, Eliza’s name was crypted letter by letter in the journal entries and index in Paris, including, on occasion, her surname. For ‘Eliza’ as ‘3d492’, noted in the journal entries, see 29 October, 13 (twice) and 16 November, 15 December (twice), and 22 and 28 January (121, 143, 148, 190, 226, 231), and noted in the index, see 13 November (index 11); and for ‘Eliza Raine’ as ‘3d492p24\3’, noted in the journal entries, see 29 October and 15 December (121, 190), and noted in the index, see 29 October (index 10).

According to the Oxford English Dictionary, 1989 second edition, s.v. ‘make love’ meaning both to pay amorous attention and to copulate, first came into usage in the late sixteenth century.

Muriel Green’s 1938 thesis ‘A Spirited Yorkshirewoman’ summarised one letter ML/158 dated 12 December, whilst another dated from 4 to 8 April, ML/166, was excluded (Green 1938, 229). Only three of the extant letters from Paris were included in Green’s 1992 book Miss Lister of Shibden Hall: The letter to Aunt Anne from 8 to 12 September ML/146, the backdated letter to Aunt Anne from 29 November ML/155, and another letter to Aunt Anne from 7 December ML/157 (Green 1992, 66–75).

From September to mid October, the rate of handwriting was one quarter crypt to three quarters plain hand. For the month of March 1825, the rate was slighter higher at one third crypt to two thirds plain handwriting. However, this was a decrease from the ratio of half crypt handwriting, half plain handwriting seen in the months from mid October to the end of February.

For Mme. Galvani’s age, see the journal entry of 28 September 1824 and 24 March 1825, where Anne noted Mme. Galvani was forty five, but was to turn forty six on 25 March (89, 264).

I have not found that Anne used either of the terms ‘diary’ or code’ for her own writings in Paris, or in the transcriptions from her journal entries in the edited publications by Jill Liddington and Helena Whitbread. Both Liddington and Whitbread drew on the journal entries, yet consistently employed the terms ‘diaries’ in contestation of Anne’s terminology for her writings. For the term ‘diaries’, see particularly the titles of Liddington and Whitbread’s published works (Liddington 1998; Whitbread 1988; 1992). Whitbread’s use of the term ‘diaries’ was exclusive until her most recent article (Whitbread 2004). Ironically subtitled ‘Georgian Diarist Extraordinaire’ Whitbread has shifted within the article, to using the term ‘journals’ for the journal writing, but retained the term ‘code’ for the crypt handwriting (Whitbread
2004, 194–200). For the term ‘code’, see Liddington’s discussion of the creation of the crypt and her editorial practices with it, as well as Whitbread’s discussions of the typical subject matters written in the crypt and her editorial practices (Liddington 1994, 27–28; 1998, 78–79; Whitbread 1988, xxv, 7, 14; 1992, xv–xvii, 6–7). Of all the editors of Anne’s writings, only Muriel Green, who wrote exclusively on the correspondence, used Anne’s terminology for her own writings (Green 1992, 19–21).

43 There was no recorded antecedent for Anne’s use of ‘queer’. According to the Oxford English Dictionary, 1989 second edition, s.v. ‘queer’ meaning strange, odd or peculiar in appearance or character, first came into usage in the sixteenth century. As it related to homosexuality, ‘queer’ was not in usage until the early twentieth century. According to the Dictionary of the Vulgar Tongue 1811, 1981 reprint, s.v. ‘queer’ meant base or roguish, but also odd or uncommon. None of these exactly applied to Anne’s use of ‘queer’, which signified a woman’s genitals. Anne made her meaning specific to Mrs. Barlow on 16 January. Anne wrote that, as she grubbled Mrs. Barlow, she ‘explained to her the different parts of queer. Bade her open & shut herself explained the toast of the Wexford Oyster. That a woman’s queer should be small like that & salt & smelling like it’ (221). The phrase suggested a toast (Anne clearly wrote ‘toast’ or ‘~52~’, not ‘taste’ or ‘~2~3’) made when eating oysters from Wexford, but I have been unable to trace the meaning or more information about it.

44 For example, Anne’s historical use of a Latin ‘f’ has been retained. In the crypt handwriting, Anne used a symbol for a double ss ‘?’ after she used a single s ‘=’. In plain handwriting, she rendered the same process as ‘s f’, which I have copied.
CHAPTER ONE
ANNE’S TEXTS:
WRITING THE PARIS SOJOURN 1824–25

Anne left Shibden Hall for Paris on 24 August 1824, travelling via London. The short stay in London was eventful, since Anne became the focus of some social notoriety. Throughout her life, Anne’s intense intellectual curiosity led her to investigate places that in the early nineteenth century were often seen as unfit for gentlewomen. One of these places in London was Clerkenwell prison, where Anne went to see and test the prison’s treadmill. Anne referred to the event as ‘this treadmill business’ and it was written up in the journal entries from 26 to 28 August (94, 60–64). The ‘treadmill business’ came to figure greatly in Anne’s emotional landscape, troubling her whilst she remained in London and for some months after she settled in to the Place Vendôme house. In Paris, Anne received and responded to several letters from her friends and family about ‘this treadmill business’.\(^1\) Anne was also painfully the subject of some gossip about the incident amongst all the gentlewomen at the Place Vendôme pension.\(^2\)

The ‘business’ came about because Anne wished to tour Cold Bathfields prison at Clerkenwell, in part from her own interest, but also because her dear friend Miss Sibbella Maclean (d.1830) recommended it. The prison had an experimental and controversial disciplinary measure: a treadmill – a wheel that prisoners trod for exercise and labour. Anne’s request to tour the prison and see the treadmill had to be authorised by the sitting magistrates at Hatton Garden. They were reluctant to allow an unaccompanied gentlewoman to see such an unfit sight. They ‘hummed and ahed’, Anne wrote in her journal entry (61). The magistrates unsuccessfully attempted to put her off for several days, much to her frustration, but eventually granted their permission upon several conditions: she must be accompanied, sign several documents and receive a special permit. Anne abided by these conditions, taking her maid Cordingley and her hotelier Mr Webb with her to visit the treadmill on 28 August 1824 (62–64).

The visit to Clerkenwell was apparently so unusual, that some court reporters wrote it up for publication. In the *Times* newspaper for the day, in the Police notices section, the reporter noted, that at:
HATTON GARDEN – A lady, whose address and habiliments bespoke her of foreign extraction, appeared before the Magistrates to prefer a request for an order to view the tread-mill[sic] at Cold Bathfields prison. The singularity of the application, and the no less unique manner of the applicant, made Mr. ROGERS pause before he replied. (Times 28 August 1824, 3)

Anne read the Times report and wrote in her journal entry, ‘I felt mortified & annoyed at the idea of what a quiz it would be against me’ (62). Anne worried that her family would be affected by the attention, or even worse, that the small Halifax community would hear of it. She wrote, ‘if my uncle saw, it was a laugh against me for ever – the truth was I thought first of the Saltmarshes & that it would be in everybody’s mouth at Halifax’ (62–63). The journalistic coverage included the Times and Courier in England and later the Parisian paper for English travellers Galignani’s, although to Anne’s grateful relief John Bull did not report it (62–63, 92, 65). The notoriety of the story extended beyond Anne’s London trip, continuing with other reports in Paris.

Personally, Anne seemed to be most mortified about the aspersion cast upon her manners. The Times reporter considered that Anne’s ‘address and habiliments bespoke her of foreign extraction’ (Times 28 August 1824, 3). Intensely and passionately patriotic, Anne found it difficult even a few weeks later to see the comparison between ‘my own thoroughly English “manners” [appearance] & speech with the foreign appearance & address of the lady in question’ (74). There were other reasons for Anne’s dismay at the public attention and her journal entries in Paris were illuminating. Two separate discussions in Paris regarding ‘this treadmill business’ were recorded by Anne, one with her lover Mrs. Barlow on 17 November, and the other with the pension owner Madame de Boyve (n.d.) the following day on 18 November (150, 151). Both of these journal entries made explicit links between Anne’s sartorial style, the social and gendered meaning others made of it, and ‘this treadmill business’.

The example of ‘this treadmill business’ illustrated the social process that Laura Doan has termed the ‘spectatorial’ in her analysis of the effects of early twentieth century cultural imagery on shaping an English lesbian identity in Fashioning Sapphism (Doan 2001). The ‘spectatorial’ was the process by which those within a culture discursively situated the sartorial play and display of someone like Anne within contemporaneous understandings of gender, sexuality and sociability (Doan 2001, xi–xxiii). Anne’s clothing may be an individual choice that figured within her economy of desire, but it was also profoundly social in expression and cultural signification. The journalistic
representations of Anne and notoriety she received were the results of these social and sartorial engagements with the particular ‘spectatorial’ moment of ‘this treadmill business’. It demonstrated in practice what Marjorie Garber analysed in *Vested Interests*, of sartorial representations, particularly cross-dressing, within Western culture (Garber 1992). Fashioning the self worked on a metaphorical level. In the early nineteenth century, the play and arrangement of clothes and presentation was discursively linked with sociability and the play and arrangement of a person’s character and position. Jane Ashelford noted the significance of the converse in her historical analysis of English costume *The Art of Dress* (Ashelford 1996). Disarrangement, Ashelford remarked, was greatly embarrassing (Ashelford 1996, 164). Within such a historical understanding, Anne’s mortification and annoyance indicated the acute social and spectatorial signification of dishevelment.

Anne’s visit to the Cold Bathfields prison treadmill became laden with these social and sartorial repercussions. The complex accumulation of feelings and consequences – of embarrassment, mortification, social display, sartorial disarrangement, gender difference – coalesced into discursive implications about Anne’s person that could subject her reputation and character to scrutiny within early nineteenth century society. Displays like ‘*this treadmill business*’ trod dangerously close to the ideological boundaries that separated improper and proper behaviour for gentlewomen in this period. Anne was apparently extremely adept at negotiating her own agency within such boundaries. Still, the incident and all the difficulties and discomforts it created became densely embedded in the single phrase Anne employed to discuss the matter in her writings – ‘*this treadmill business*’.

Anne wrote the majority of her journal discussions about the incident during her Paris residence, in crypt handwriting.³ Revealingly, the only occasions Anne employed the plain handwriting was the defence of her actions she wrote to various correspondents concerning the matter, which she then extracted into the journal entries.⁴ The instance of ‘*this treadmill business*’ directly addressed the question over the nature of these textual spaces constructed by the crypt and plain handwritings. In examining just the one incident ‘*this treadmill business*’ through the seven months of journal entries and correspondence Anne wrote in Paris, we can see how compactly and complexly the crypted and plain handwritten journal spaces were entwined with her life, identity and social context. It was in the crypted spaces of her journal entries that Anne gave an
account of how she felt or reacted to the matter (in a letter or in a conversation), and of how her clothes, presentation and person were all ultimately implicated in the way the incident was perceived by others. In the plain handwritten spaces of her journal entries, Anne explained and defended herself, copying extracted passages sometimes verbatim, from her correspondence to her family and intimate friends.

With specific reference to ‘this treadmill business’, the crypted handwritten space enabled Anne to negotiate her emotions and sociability. Anne’s feelings about the sartorial, social and spectatorial display of character were cryptically signified and contained solely within the journal space. Conversely, it was the plain handwritings of the journal entries that dealt with Anne’s mediation of her self-representation. Almost contradictorily, the accessible self-representation recorded in the journal entries was what Anne circulated through the letters within the private sphere of her familial and intimate relationships. Whether crypted or plainly handwritten, Anne formulated a textual account of ‘this treadmill business’ in response to the enquiries she received in the correspondence, as well as a social representation of her actions in response to the scrutiny she received from the other gentlewomen at the Place Vendôme. The clustering of social and textual representations, terminology and emotions were associated specifically with Anne’s deployment of different forms of handwriting.

Considering one event in Anne’s life, within the context of all of the texts, over an extended period already complicates the notion of differentiated spaces within her writings. The crypted handwritten spaces of the journal entries were extremely important to Anne. The crypted spaces remain central to modern scholarship on Anne’s life and sexuality. However, as I have shown with the example of ‘this treadmill business’, the plain handwriting was also complexly entailed within her journal entries, as were any distinctions between these two forms of handwriting. The instance illustrated that more than one text could provide information about Anne. The correspondence and journal volume were resources that provided a contextual understanding of Anne’s choices and experiences in Paris. Both sources considered together, construct a detailed understanding of Anne’s reactions and responses to this incident that occurred prior to, but had an ongoing effect during her stay in Paris. Thus, an analysis of both of the handwritings, and both of the textual sources, promises a detailed understanding of Anne’s life in the early nineteenth century.
The edited writings in print do not easily allow such a reconstruction as ‘this treadmill business’ example of Anne’s process of writing or of her authorial subjectivity. Attention to the material writing practices explores unfamiliar ground, for the textual aspects of Anne’s writings have not been addressed by the previous editors of these papers. This chapter examines in detail the texts written in Paris, taking up the theoretical gap in the scholarship about the materiality of Anne’s writings. Here I specifically address the question of how Anne came to the writing act, examining her writing mechanics and practices. The texts were not removed or separate from the production of that text, nor was the finished writing disconnected from the process of authoring and editing it. Understanding Anne’s writing as constitutive or interlinked with her subjectivity means I can then analyse what functions it served for her sexuality and society. The mechanics of Anne’s writing processes illustrated some of her intentions with her writing space; how Anne used the authorial act can reveal the purposes it performed concerning her subjectivity, sexuality and life.

In the first section ‘Anne’s Journal Volume – ‘Wrote the Above of Today’’, I begin with the text that most readers will be familiar with, her journal volume. In what ways did Anne order and record different types of information in her journal volumes? In this first section, my general concern is to detail the various formats and contents of the journal space. Once I have examined the interiority of the self seen there, I turn to the sociability of the self in the epistolary space in the next section, ‘Anne’s Letters – ‘So Little in the Humour for Epistolizing[sic]’’. This section focuses upon the lesser known texts in the papers, the letters. The letters, like the journal volume, had various formats, but the content of the epistolary space and the purposes it served were driven by exterior imperatives. The interconnection between the journal volume and letters is the subject of the final section, ‘Anne’s Intertextuality – The Letters in the Journal Volume’. In this section, I analyse the connections between the journal space, written for the self as audience, and the epistolary space of the letters, written for others as the audience. The journal volume was not independent of the correspondence – the letters permeated the journal space in complex ways. In linking her journal volume and letters in an interpenetrative way, Anne already brought these texts into relation with each other. To analyse Anne as the author of her writings, we must unravel the intricate ways that she produced and contextualised her subjectivity through all of her writings, and then represented her authorial subjectivity to others within early nineteenth century society.
ANNE’S JOURNAL VOLUME:
‘Wrote the Above of Today’

The extant journal volumes, and particularly the journal entries, continue to be the most prominent source for researchers interested particularly in questions about Anne’s homosexuality and identity. As illustrated by the example of ‘this treadmill business’, the journal space was considerably more complex than the edited publications of the journal entries convey. Considered together, the crypted and plain handwritten sections of the journal entries indicated that Anne negotiated her emotions, representations, spectatorial display and sociability concerning the business all within the amassed and aggregated writing space. The journal volume, I argue, was a performative and comprehensive resource for Anne; it acted as her source of subjectivity construction, from which she extended out her textual sphere to include the correspondence. In the next section, I examine the journal volume for Paris, focusing upon the material practices that were in evidence in her daily writing space. However, Anne, as the author of the journal volume, took for granted her knowledge of the significance of these textual habits. Some material processes were consistently employed, but not explained within the journal volume written in Paris. As I demonstrated with the development of the crypt handwriting in the Introduction, Anne’s textual practices evolved over time. Thus, the journal entries edited by Helena Whitbread, written prior to the sojourn in Paris, are also a source of information about Anne’s material practices with her journal space. Here, I will consider what function these material practices performed concerning Anne’s subjectivity.

During the seven months in Paris, Anne wrote a journal entry for every day and these were contained in the journal volume SH:7/ML/E/8 [Appendix 1]. The sojourn in Paris took up a large proportion of the journal volume. In its entirety, the volume encompassed more than a year of Anne’s life, from 20 June 1824 six weeks before she left for Paris, to 31 July 1825 four months after she returned (1–333). The Paris episode even so, consisted of two hundred pages of journal entries, or about two thirds of the volume (67–267[sic]). As mentioned earlier, it totalled approximately 172 000 words of both crypt and plain handwriting. The journal volume was of unlined cream paper, partly bound with brown leather and with a mottled cover (Pat Sewell, personal communication). It was a sizeable manuscript at twenty four centimetres high by nineteen centimetres wide and three centimetres thick (Pat Sewell, personal
Given its thickness, it was a weighty volume, yet not too long for the portable writing desk that Anne possessed. The journal volume was functional and purposeful; it would have been transportable in spite of its substantial size. Anne probably intended the journal volumes to accompany her everywhere, to record and give due significance to the matters of her everyday life.

The journal volume was what Cynthia Huff has termed a ‘self-determined’ format in her study of nineteenth century British women’s diaries British Women’s Diaries (Huff 1985, xiv). It was a blank book that Anne purchased ready-made from a Halifax stationer, as described in the journal entry for 20 March 1819 (Whitbread 1988, 83). The blank and unlined pages were unformatted, and so Anne’s own authorial impulses determined her writing space, choice of content and representation. Anne’s writing practices were socially structured, but at the same time, the textual choices she made in the journal space illustrated their significance to her. In selecting and structuring the material space in her journal volume, Anne performed her own authorial agency, mediating her lived daily experience into a textual expression. As Joan Scott has persuasively argued, experience itself requires historical analysis, as does Anne’s textual management of that historical experience within the physical space of the journal volume (Scott 1999). Anne constructed the unformatted space of the journal volume, through her own selection of material, topic, crypting, time dedicated to the act of writing and money spent on her writing.

Physical form was only one aspect of the material production of the journal volume. Another consideration is the spatiality of the text itself. An analysis of the journal space includes an examination of the features Anne included in her journal volume, the authorial purpose these features serve and assemblage of the volume itself. Readers of Helena Whitbread and Jill Liddington will only be familiar with two elements of the journal volumes: the journal entries themselves and the crypt. Liddington has further gone to considerable effort to closely reproduce the look of the journal entries in her work Female Fortune, ‘preserving as far as possible the sense of what it sounded like for Anne Lister as she was in the act of writing the page’ (Liddington 1998, 79). Still, for most readers the journal entries and crypt remain as Liddington wrote, the ‘jewel in the Anne Lister crown’, and these elements have been analysed by these editors and other scholars (Liddington 1994, 64). They were however, only constituent parts of the entirety of the journal volume, and they were not the only elements of the journal.
volume for the Paris period. The journal volume Anne kept in Paris included a number of extra components such as a summary of letters list, an index to the journal entries and a literary index to the books she read during that period. Previous studies of Anne’s writings have entirely disregarded these other common features.

The temporal pattern of the journal volume, her assemblage of the physical and literal space into an individualised chronology, was an important feature of Anne's writing. The materiality of the journal volume was not visible in earlier editions; neither Jill Liddington nor Helena Whitbread included a physical description of the volumes, nor of the mechanical process of writing and record keeping Anne employed (Liddington 1994; 1995; 1996; 1998; 2001; 2003; Whitbread 1988; 1992; 2004). It was most likely that both editors did utilise Anne’s meticulous notational features – the indices are extremely useful for researching – but the contribution or importance of the indices to their archival and editorial work was not recognised or acknowledged in their work. Previous publications on Anne’s life editorially structure the conglomeration of the journal contents as a seamless and integral whole. The journal entries were ordered without interruption, as if they occurred in such a formation. Nor were the beginnings or ends of the journal volumes noted. As well, both editors have focused totally on the journal entries to the exclusion of other features Anne incorporated into her journal volumes. Directed by the editorial choices of shaping a narrative thread from the mass of Anne’s writings, the journal entries themselves were well attended to and receive sufficient attention. The result overshadowed the other interesting and intriguing aspects of Anne’s authorial practices within her journal volume.

Yet, the lists and indices were not sealed off in content, function or import from the journal entries. These lists and records were utilitarian and functional, but they were also referential. This was precisely their significance, for these reference systems were textual structures that Anne created to interpret and represent information in a different format. All of these features – the indices of her journal entries and literature, her summary of letters, her collection of memoranda and notes – constructed knowledge and performed the specific function of conveying the knowledge within a signification system – the journal volume itself. As such, even if only by association, the records Anne so assiduously kept were linguistic and discursive elements of her textual constructions. They were also historical elements – a singular ahistorical meaning cannot be drawn from what looks outwardly similar to our contemporary systems of
ordering information. Whilst these practices of keeping records were possibly merely a convenience for Anne, they also constitute the basis of what I mean by materiality, for the systemic categorisation of meaning and knowledge was particular and historical, to what Anne found important and necessary to record. These lists were both a subjective construction of knowledge and a socially intelligible way of ordering sets of data within the historical culture in which Anne lived. What motivated Anne to keep these records, what her reasons were, cannot be assumed; to find out, these materials have to be analysed for their meaning and value to her.

Anne wrote on 22 December 1819 that, at last, ‘I have gained a valuable turn towards a habit of patient reference & correction’ (Whitbread 1988, 111). The journal volume that covered the Paris period was no exception. The 1824–25 journal volume that included Anne’s sojourn contained a summary of letters list in the front pages, followed by the journal entries and finished with the index, which contained the literary index, in the end pages [Appendix 5]. Anne collected no other elements into the volume – there were no travel itineraries, memoranda or flyleaf and end paper notes. Working in the sequence of the journal volume, the summary of letters list appeared first. Summarising the letters Anne sent and received, the list covered the same period as the journal entries in the volume, from 21 June 1824 to 31 July 1825. However, the summary of letters list did start a day later than the journal entries (which were from 20 June 1824), as it was the first day Anne received or posted a letter within the timeframe of the 1824–25 volume. The chronology of the journal volume was determined by the journal entries, rather than other textual formats like the letters or the account books.

The summary list acted as a running account of the correspondence and could have been maintained and regularised by Anne continuously and independently of the textual space of the journal entries. The summary record referred almost entirely to the correspondence, and thus a space that was partly autonomous to the business of the journal volume. The link between the summary record and the matters in the journal entries was Anne’s recording of the letters in her list and the intertextual space of the journal entries where the contents of the letter would be extracted. Although the letters were incorporated into the journal entries, epistolary information was edited out from the index that summarised the journal entry contents. So the summary list and letters penetrated the journal entry text to a certain degree, but were distinguished from the indexation business of the journal volume. Yet, the summary list was still encompassed
within the discursive space of the journal volume. These summary pages were Anne’s first point of entry into the physical volume and its position in the front pages suggested the importance of the correspondence to her. Nonetheless, to Anne, its purpose seems to be self-evident. Unlike any other of her writing processes, mechanical or textual, the summary list was the only procedure Anne did not name or even discuss in her writings.

The next records in the journal volume were the indices located in the end papers of the volume. The indices were a larger element of the journal volume than the summary list. In the 1824–25 volume, there were twenty three pages of index interspersed with one and a half pages of literary index. The amount of textual space devoted to indexing indicates something of the importance of the feature in the journal volume; the indices constituted a more substantial engagement with the matter of the journal entries, and arrangement of its content. Yet, the indices were not mentioned at all by other editors, and I did not know of their existence until I came to work with Anne’s manuscripts on microfilm. The indices are critically important to an analysis of Anne’s textuality – they were an extremely sophisticated mechanism for cataloguing events, places and people. However, their importance extends beyond the capacity of the index to regulate and organise Anne’s records. By the time of the 1824–25 journal volume, the index was a highly developed system with dates and page cross-references. It was the systematisation – of content, of importance, of significant events – that was central to understanding the editorial function of the indices in the journal volume.

The indices are important as a key starting point for the researcher. With them, Anne provided a comprehensive structure for incorporating all of her writings – the letters, journal entries and account books. The meticulous record keeping made an accessible and vital pathway into the journal entries. All editors and readers come to Anne’s writings with their own set of research questions and construct meaning from the journal entries extrinsically to the texts. As a feminist researcher, I wanted to recognise the editorial and meaningful constructions Anne made for herself in the indices, from her own journal entry writings. In some part, I wanted Anne’s editorial work to direct my own, to point to the key and significant experiences in her life and the writing of that life. At the same time, I wanted to be careful in highlighting my own editorial work: my analysis of Anne’s writings (my knowledge construction) was not disengaged from my research work on the indices (my method), nor from the actual index space (the text). Moving back and forth from the journal entries, to the indices, to Helena Whitbread’s
second volume and to my own analysis, I found these all to be related but discrete editorial versions of Anne’s life. What I have analysed and what Whitbread has selected did not in general match up with each other. Although drawn from Anne’s own editorialising of her Paris sojourn, my thesis work is a reader’s interpretation of her meaning, and is thus itself distinct from her understanding of this time in Paris.

Each of the journal volumes was self-contained – the indices did not overlap into the contents or chronology of the other volumes. Both the index and literary index reference only the contents in that particular volume. The period of the journal volume dictated the boundaries of the indices. The indices were like the summary list, in that they were also determined by the chronology of the journal entries. Anne did not seem to assign a separate and dedicated volume to the purposes of indexing, or make her indexing of all of her journal contents concordant under subject headings. On 9 May 1820, Anne toyed with the idea of making ‘a universal index of similes, e.g. strong as Hercules; licentious as Tiberius; modest as Daphne, etc.’ (Whitbread 1988, 124). If the universal index of similes was made, it does not appear to have survived into the papers. The 1824–25 journal volume contained within it the contents, chronology and records that were literally contained and internally referential. It was written in the now of that particular journal volume and constituted a coherent episode of that year, which included the sojourn in Paris. The journal volumes were not a more conventional biographical progression, for Anne did not construct any types of records that represented the span of her life in a developmental or generalised sense. Instead, the journal volumes recounted the story of Anne’s life as she wrote and understood it, constructing her autobiographical project by discrete volume instalments.

An interesting feature of the two indices was the intrinsic capacity of Anne’s arrangement, to accommodate the expansion of the index space. Anne wrote the indices of the 1824–25 journal volume at the very back. To start the writing process, the journal volume must have been turned upside down, and the indices were begun on the recto page following the back flyleaf. From the back of the journal volume, Anne moved inwards with the indexing, maintaining her index notations progressively with the journal entries. If the capacity of the volume was reached these indices would have eventually met up with the journal entries in reverse, although it was not the case in the 1824–25 journal volume. In the index, the columns were divided into two sorts of information – the date and notes Anne wanted to make about the journal entry, with the
The literary index was sorted first by the page reference, which was followed by the title of the reading matter. Anne placed the literary index at the edge of the recto pages. Flicking through the pages of the indices, Anne would have been able to see at a glance the titles of her reading materials, and the cross referenced page number for her reviews. The literary index, unlike the index, was not apparently date dependent, for there was no note of the date of the journal entry that mentioned the reading material.

Although the indices were at the back of the volume, their position does not necessarily imply that they were the last elements written in the journal volume. Both the summary list and journal entries appeared to have been kept continuously. The indices might be similar and maintained progressively but, alternatively, the indices had the potential to be retrospective by nature. On 16 January 1818, Anne wrote:

"I have brought up the time I lost in York & have got right again to my journal as usual. I will never get so behindhand again, I am determined. In fact, I shall write my indices as I go along & shall be upon a better plan, I hope, altogether."

(Whitbread 1988, 36)

The passage suggests a further connection between the journal entries and index: the indices were updated constantly, but in tandem with the journal entries. Anne’s custom with her indices was most likely a combination of all of these temporal practices during her life. Regardless of whether she wrote the indices as she went, or got ‘behindhand’ again, Anne did not desist from keeping these records but maintained her indexation practices meticulously for many years [Appendix 3, fig. 1]. Such dedication demonstrated the significance of the indices in the journal volume and authorial processes. As Anne wrote on 22 December 1819, her indexation practices, ‘should I ever publish, may be of use to me’ (Whitbread 1988, 111). Factors like travelling effected a delay in Anne’s habits, not a redundancy in her indexation practices.

Anne sometimes drafted her index notations before she wrote out the final form. In the journal entry of 20 September, Anne noted she ‘wrote out from 9 to 19 July last’ of the index to this volume, & wrote the rough draft (omitted before) of from 19 to 24 July last’ (80). The information in the journal entry recorded that Anne wrote out in good copy a column of the index from 9 to 19 July, and the rough draft for most of the next column from 19 to 24 July. A few days later, the rough draft was also written out in good copy. As noted in the journal entry, Anne ‘wrote out the index to this volume of
from 19 to 24 July last’ (82). The example with the rough draft was a good time after Anne’s original collation of the index, from July to September, and some distance away, from Shibden to Paris. The only other references to the index in Paris were all made at the turn of the year. For instance, Anne wrote in the journal entry of 13 December, she ‘just finished all this of today, & the last 6½ lines of yesterday & the rough draft of the index at 1 ¼’ (189). The process was repeated on Boxing Day, when Anne also worked up Christmas Day, spending ‘¼ hour writing the rough d[raft] of the index of today & yesterday’ (200). Anne made two more mentions of writing a journal entry and drafting the index – on 10 January of a single day and 23 January of two days at once (217, 228). Whilst she was in Paris, Anne appeared to have generally kept the rough drafting of her indices abreast of her writing up the journal entries.

The indices exhibited plain and crypted handwriting. In the literary index there was only one listing in the crypt handwriting, regarding ‘Madame G.-’s observations on Johannes[sic] secundus’ which was made on journal page 98 (index 3). Anne purchased the book of poetry by Joannes Secundus (1511–36) titled Basia (1535) on 16 October (108). The crypted note in the literary index reflected the sensitive nature of this sixteenth century erotic poetry. About half of the index commentary was written in crypt hand, which was a greater proportion of crypt to plain handwriting than seen in the journal entries themselves during the Paris sojourn. Yet, when Anne wrote up her indices, she tended to keep the plain and crypt handwriting synchronous across the journal entries and indices, mirroring in the index the handwriting of the journal entry. However, there were a few exceptions, like the index for 3 March (index 17). ‘Read aloud my journal’, the index merely stated (index 17). The comment was repeated in the corresponding journal entry, but in crypt handwriting (252). The journal entry Anne read aloud, as she described further on, was 29 October.5 According to her index at the time, it covered the sensitive topic of Mme. de Boyve’s ‘history of the flirtations of Mrs. B.-’ (index 10). Thus, the plain handwritten index on 3 March acknowledged that Anne had read aloud Mme. de Boyve’s history to Mrs. Barlow, but the crypt handwritten comment kept the location of the journal entry to herself.

Indices were Anne’s immediate analysis of the contents of the journal entry, written up every few days as rough draft. On rare occasions in Paris, it was a retrospective practice, performed when she had the leisure to work on the indices. In either scenario, the handwriting format in the index mirrored, or was kept in line with, the journal entries.
The mirroring pattern with the handwriting was probably related to Anne’s corrections in the journal entry text; errors amended perhaps as she collated her index material. Altogether, these sorts of authorial mechanics can really only be indicated by my analysis, for Anne did not discuss them in her 1824–25 journal volume, nor do other editors of Anne’s writings. What Anne did with her literary index was even less clear, as she did not make any notes about these practices at all in the 1824–25 journal volume, or indeed in the journal entries edited by Helena Whitbread. I would assume the two forms of index were treated similarly, but Anne’s textual habits were flexible and she frequently adapted her authorial mechanics to accommodate her purposes. The literary index however, required less information – the list comprised only the page cross-reference and the title of the reading material. The literary index did not demand, as the index did, a secondary level of analysis. It looked like a list and functioned as such, rather than as an intricate index to events, people and emotional states. The literary index would not have required a great deal of time to construct and maintain it. It could easily have been kept, like the summary list, as a running account.

Despite some equivalence between these separate elements of the journal volume, these individual features operated differently in Anne’s authorial processes. The indices in the end pages of the journal volume were, for instance, referentially and mechanically distinct from the summary of letters list in the front pages. Whereas the purpose of the summary list was structurally related to the correspondence, by contrast the indices were functionally reliant upon the contents and dates of the individual journal entries. Anne made an index note for every day that she was in Paris. Within the whole volume, the rate was not as regular. Before and after the Paris trip, Anne sometimes skipped a date in her index, although her index notation remained reasonably constant. Of the twenty four and a half pages of indices, half were relevant to the Paris period. The index notes from September 1824 to March 1825 take up twelve pages (index 6–18), but the literary index had only one column that was applicable, although it was spread over two pages (index 3, index 5). During these seven months, Anne generally annotated about a week to an index column, or approximately a fortnight to a page. The rate fluctuated up to three weeks to a page, such as the period from mid October to early November (index 10, index 16). In the last months, from the end of January to late March, Anne increased the number of index notations to four weeks a page (index 16–17). Or, stated another way, Anne reduced her editorial commentary, to fit a month to a page.
What was significant about the practice was the lack of consonance between these increases in the index increments and the length of the journal entries. Where the rate of index notation increased in October and November, Anne was writing substantially lengthy journal entries about her courtship of Mrs. Barlow. The amount of time Anne could spend writing would clearly be a factor: more time with Mrs. Barlow meant more time spent writing up the minute detail of their conversations in the journal entry, which would consequently mean less time for the index. This explained the discrepancy between the long journal entries but brief attendant index notes. Yet, at the time of the peak rate of a month to a page from late January to March, Anne increasingly wrote shorter journal entries, even sometimes four days to a page. The markedly short journal entries seem to be correlated to a decrease in the commentary in the indices, and consequently she fitted more dates in the index to a page. If Anne did have more leisure time, it did not necessarily mean she increased the time dedicated to writing her journal entries, or making notes on them. However, it was the time when she was preparing to leave Paris, and so the converse can be said. If Anne was busy, it did not automatically translate into a textual desire to explicate and make notes upon her activities at length.

Another explanation for the discrepancy was that the indices functioned as gestures towards the details contained in the journal entries. The index provided a context to the journal entries, drawing out the significant events in Anne’s day, to be noted for future reference in the index. Anne liked to read over her writings. It seemed it was not detail the index needed, but a way into the richness of the content of the journal entries. The process was described in a journal entry from 18 June 1824:

> From 2 to 6, looking over volumes 2, 3, 4, & 5 as far as p.111 of my Journal. Volume three, that part containing the account of my intrigue with Anne Belcombe, I read over attentively, exclaiming to myself, ‘Oh, women, women!’ I thought, too, of Miss Vallance who, by the way, is by no means worse than Anne, who took me on my own terms even more decidedly. The account, too, as merely noted in the index, of Miss Browne, amuses me. I am always taken up with some girl or other. (Whitbread 1988, 346)

A succinct index, ‘merely noted’, was all that was necessary to evoke Anne’s memories of the journal accounts of her passionate feelings for Miss Browne. It would not always be necessary to increase the description of the index note, where the subject matter in the journal entry was extensively detailed. Thus, the brevity of an index compared to the detail of a journal entry was a matter of editing the index notations. Anne required an index to point to important content, not to elaborate it.
Whatever the level of detail in the indexing, in selecting the noteworthy – small or large – events of her days, Anne marked out those happenings that were, or she considered would be, of interest or of importance to her as the future reader of her own journal entries. The editorial coverage ranged from the seemingly insignificant to the extremely momentous. There were observations about for instance, Anne’s haircuts in the index notes. ‘Good coiffeur’, she wrote on 6 January (index 14). It was undoubtedly an improvement on the haircut she received some two months before on 13 November, which made her ‘a terrible grenadier-like looking figure’ (143). What would seem to be a rather lightweight index became comprehensible when considered within the context of the journal remarks about Anne’s unfortunate luck with hairdressers in Paris. If the concept of the sociability of dishevelment were revisited, it explained too why Anne’s ‘terrible grenadier-like looking’ haircut carried such social discomposure that it was worthy of some textual comment. Many events and instances were selected for annotation in the index from the journal entries and, through the process, Anne performed as an author and editor of her journal volume. A modern reader may not have access to the historical or contextual understandings that made meaning in Anne’s writings, but the contents and material she selected were meaningful to her. It is precisely that noteworthiness which becomes visible, when the indices are analysed.

To indicate a level of interest in a subject or journal entry, Anne created more than one way of signalling the significance for her future attention. Anne had an intricate shorthand organisation for her indexation, compacting dense and complex matters into a symbolic system of reference. These symbols marked and differentiated out several layers of edited information, from the index and in the journal entries themselves [Appendix 2, fig. 3]. All of these editorial symbols, whether they occurred in the body of the journal volume or in the index, were placed in the margins. The two symbols that Anne used in the index and journal entry were a plus ‘+’ sign and a section mark ‘§’ sign. First, I will consider the meaning and significance of the plus ‘+’ sign, as it occurred in the journal entries, and then in relation to the index space. The plus ‘+’ sign will be perhaps the only mark out of the dense variety of marks that may be known to readers who have intently studied Jill Liddington’s book, Female Fortune. The analysis of the plus ‘+’ sign will be followed by my examination of the second mark, the ‘§’ section sign. When situated within the overall context of the journal entries and indices, these markers indicated a more complex and sophisticated writing process than a first glance at the journal volume supposes.
In the journal volume for the Paris period, one of the easiest symbols to decipher was the ‘+’, a plus sign. Other editors of Anne’s writings have not analysed her practices of keeping records, but both Jill Liddington and Helena Whitbread have briefly touched upon the usage of a plus ‘+’ sign. The journal note that Anne had ‘incurred a cross’ was coyly explained by Liddington as the descriptive corollary of the margin mark, the plus ‘+’ sign, which indicated ‘erotic thoughts’ (Liddington 1998, 62, 264 n.8).6 (How does one incur an erotic thought?) In the journal entries, the most frequent use of the ‘+’ symbol did represent a sexual meaning: the ‘+’ was used to refer to what Anne described as having ‘incurred a cross’.7 An example from the journal entry for 22 November explicitly stated her meaning. After Mrs. Barlow retired, Anne wrote ‘very soon after she went tonight incurred the cross’ (157). Yet, the plus ‘+’ sign was more nuanced even within a sexual understanding of the sign: the plus ‘+’ sign referred to Anne’s masturbatory practices, as Whitbread also concluded (Helena Whitbread, personal communication). The ‘masturbating girl’ was a historical sexual identity in Anne’s time, Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick argued in Tendencies, where she analysed the evidence of the identity in Jane Austen’s Sense and Sensibility (1811) (Sedgwick 1994, 109–29). Anne’s distinction of her onanistic patterns with the plus ‘+’ sign and specific terminology of ‘incurring a cross’ were practices consistent with a historical understanding of a masturbatory identity.

Originally, the ‘cross’ mark that correlated to the phrase of ‘incurring a cross’ was an ‘x’ mark. It only occurred twice, as the first instances that Anne recorded her masturbation in Paris on 13 and 16 October (101, 108). From the next instance of her masturbatory practices on 11 November until the end of her stay in Paris, the ‘+’ sign marked Anne’s ‘crosses’. The masturbatory mark habitually occurred in one place in the journal margin – at the start of the journal entry.8 In the introductory position, it had a very particular meaning: it linked Anne’s masturbatory practices directly to the time of day. On 20 January 1825 for instance, she marked the ‘+’ sign, operating as the metonymy for the crypted crosses, in the margin against her rising time of ‘+10 ½’ a.m. (224). Anne noted in the text that Mrs. Barlow ‘got up twenty minutes before me during which time I [l]ay & incurred a cross’ (224). On 15 February, Anne even marked two crosses (such dedication to detail). The rising time of ‘+10 10/60’ was marked with a cross, for Anne ‘just before getting up incurred a cross’ (242). Another cross was also marked against her bedtime at ‘+4 ½’ a.m. That night, as she noted later in her journal entry, Anne ‘had my hair curled then a little nap then sitting over the fire incurred a
As a ‘cross’, as an autoerotic marker, Anne’s masturbatory mark was the only marginal symbol that she employed specifically in the introductory position at the start of her journal entry. The plus ‘+’ sign when linked with her ‘cross’ incursion was a signifying textual practice of Anne’s sexuality.

Within the broader scope of the entire journal volume, the ‘+’ sign also referred to Anne’s literary rituals and practices. When the plus ‘+’ sign was not in the position of, or indicated by the text, as a ‘cross’, it was a marker that referred to her literacy. The literary meaning of a plus ‘+’ sign was not limited to the journal entries, as was the ‘cross’ plus ‘+’ sign, for it could also occur in the index. In either location it could refer to diverse but related topics like the poets, essays and books Anne was reading, was recommended to read or was discussing; the sermons she particularly related to; observations she made on scientific things like the Proteus Anguinus, or cave salamander; purchases and gifts of books; and everything related to learning languages like dictionaries, grammar books and proper pronunciation. The literacy plus ‘+’ sign was still connected to the more specifically sexual ‘+’ ‘cross’ sign, for it also referenced literature that might have excited her. Three examples of the literary ‘+’ mark were particularly sexual in slant. The first plus mark referenced Anne’s reading Basia, the volume of erotic poems by Joannes Secundus. On 19 October, she was reading the ‘article Bachanals[sic]’ from a French encyclopaedia to Mrs. Barlow, and ‘shewed[sic] her the word phallus’ (110). The third instance marked in the index against 24 December denoted her learning the vulgar meaning of the French word ‘jean’. It was ‘foutre’, Anne wrote, ‘that is fucker’ (index 10, 197). The general signification of the plus ‘+’ sign was primarily literary, although it may well also have been masturbatory.

The literary matters referred to by the plus ‘+’ sign, whether they occurred in the journal entries or against an index, were generally assembled next into the dedicated literary index. (Unusually, the plus ‘+’ mark itself, whether of sexual or textual connotation, did not occur in the literary index for the Paris period.) Although the usage of the plus ‘+’ sign was economical, there was some resulting overlap between the matters it specified in the journal entries, index and literary index. The reading matters noted in the journal entries and index could be processed into the literary index at the same time, only necessitating the one editorial step indicated by the plus ‘+’ sign. However, there was no discernible writing progression, for the plus ‘+’ mark worked to reference back and forth from the index, to the literary index, to the journal entries. Whilst there were
references to content or pagination across these three textual structures and spaces, there
were also incidences where Anne used the mark as a solitary literary mention,
unreferenced and unrelated to any other textual list or format. It was not either of the
indices, or the journal entries themselves, that were comprehensive in their literary
scope. It was rather the symbol – the plus ‘+’ mark itself – that was comprehensively
and skilfully applied throughout the volume.

The function of the plus ‘+’ sign was not located in any overarching list or record in the
journal volume. Instead, the mark made important symbolic and semantic connections
between the extensive matters the mark was used to reference. In the journal entries and
index, the ‘+’ mark correlated topics like Anne’s reading materials (literary, poetical,
polemical and religious), the acquisition of reading material, the acquisition of linguistic
and sexual knowledge, and the application of acquired sexual or textual knowledge to
her life. The mark made connections between Anne’s daily life, her search for
knowledge, consumption, religious beliefs and reading. However, the specifically
sexual component of the plus ‘+’ signifier also bore upon the literary, or more precisely,
literacy meaning of the mark. In its entirety, the plus ‘+’ sign operated as a ‘cross’
marker for Anne’s ‘erotic thoughts’, as Jill Liddington would have it, specifically
deployed to indicate her timely masturbatory practices, and as well more generally as a
literary and language marker it distinguished Anne’s autodidacticism (Liddington 1998,
62, 264). As an archetypal mark, the plus ‘+’ sign symbolically linked the praxis of
Anne’s sexuality with her textuality. It demonstrated the structural foundation that
reading constituted in Anne’s life, knowledge and sexuality.

The complex interconnection between Anne’s sexuality and textuality was a historical
difference between readers of the early nineteenth century and readers of today. In his
theoretical proposal for developing a history of reading, Robert Darnton suggested from
his own research on eighteenth century France, that readers, particularly of Rousseau,
read with a ‘romantic sensibility’ that no longer exists with our reading (Darnton 1991,
141–42). Darnton considered that the construal of meaning from texts in the early
modern era was very closely related to the act of construing meaning from life (Darnton
1991, 142). Such literal and experiential construction of signification can be seen in
Anne’s broad application of the sexual and textual ‘+’ mark throughout her journal
volume. The employment of the originative mark designated connections and defined
associations across these differently purposed formats of the journal entry, index and
literary index. It gives an insight into the role of Anne’s mechanical and editorial processes which linked her textuality with her sexuality. Early nineteenth century literary and cultural imagery was an extremely important source for Anne’s construction and representation of her homosexual identity. Lisa Moore contended that the journal volumes manifested the ‘potential’ offered by cultural representations of same-sex love, to create through writing a homosexual agency (Moore 1992, 517). The usage of a metasign such as the plus ‘+’ mark suggested the means by which such a process of sexual agency could have been effected textually.

Anne utilised another metasign, the section ‘§’ mark, in her journal volume. In the margins of the journal entries, the section ‘§’ marker specifically referred to her system of indexing. Its appearance indicated that she had made an index note of the associated subject matter. It was not a footnote, as Anne sparingly employed another mark entirely for that particular purpose – a ‘#’, or hash sign. Nor was it a direction to refer to some specific comments, or another page entirely, something Anne did frequently in the index, and for which she used the Latin term ‘vide’, or ‘see’. The real difficulty in understanding the usage of the mark came from the repetition and frequency of the section ‘§’ mark in the journal entries and index. The double or triple instancing of the section ‘§’ mark, and its alternative groupings with other makers like the plus ‘+’ sign, in the journal entries and index puzzled me for a long time. The section ‘§’ mark variation could not be traced to one consistent meaning over the different formats of the journal volume. It occurred too frequently to be a place marker for the finish of Anne’s writing process, as it can indicate in modern editing. The designation of a section ‘§’ mark, I concluded, singled out those subject matters that were important to Anne.

Anne frequently considered several subject matters from one journal entry text important enough to be noted. The insistent repetition of the section ‘§’ mark occurred because she methodically accounted for each mention. The combination of a section ‘§’ mark with other marks like the plus ‘+’ sign further specified the content and purpose of the material – that it was to be indexed and was of a sexual or literary nature. The journal entry and index for 29 November was an example of the process (165–68). The journal entry contained two passages not otherwise connected, except that both were marginally marked with the same combination and order of signs, a plus and two section signs – ‘+§§’. The journal entry detailed Anne’s experiments, motivated by her
doctor’s comments, the ‘he’ of the following passage, with heterosexual penetration. The first passage read:

\[+§§\text{ inserted the middle finger of my right hand as high as I could it gave me no sensation but in trying to what he calls embrace it by pushing myself internally backwards & forwards which is done with little or no external movement in five minutes I had felt probably all the pleasure of coition & my finger told me how to guess the sensation that must be experienced by a penis.}\ (166)

The second marked passage read:

\[+§§\text{ kept my hand there resting as many minutes the[sic] in as many more incurred a cross my own way & think it far the longer & pleasanter of the two that dawdling about more on the surface & keeping nearer to the front gives a keener sensation all pleasure with no trace of anything li’ke’ pain or too great exertion.}\ (167)

The relevant index for the journal entry of 29 November collated the information economically. ‘Vid. the bottom of page 166 & top of 167’, the index stated, where there were ‘curious observations on the different pleasures of coition’ (index 12). Directed by the symbols, the index noted the double instancing of the topic and the sexual content of these journal entry passages.

In the journal entries the section ‘§’ mark functioned as a referential mark, directing the reader to the index where the journal content was annotated. In the daily space of the journal entries, these section ‘§’ symbols signified the mechanical practices of indexing, and this pertained generally through all of the journal entries for the Paris period. When I consulted the index however, there were extra and inexplicable occurrences of the section ‘§’ mark. What was immediately apparent was that the quantities and combinations bore a correlation to the journal entries in no more than about half of the cases. Referring again to the example for 29 November, Anne used in the journal entry the ‘+§§’ to indicate that these sexual subjects were to be indexed, where the index evidenced a divergent section marking, ‘§§’ (index 12). The double section marks seen in the index were not a total of the number of annotations made from the 29 November journal entry – there were twenty eight section ‘§’ markers in the journal entry alone, but the index note had just five section ‘§’ marks. Nor was the sexual content of the journal entry, once transposed to the index, marked out with symbols in the index margins – there were no plus ‘+’ marks at all in the index, although there were two plus ‘+’ marks in the 29 November journal entry.
The employment of the section ‘§’ mark in the index traced a substantially different pattern that was not necessarily referring back to the journal entries. Instead, the section ‘§’ marker in the index appeared to perform within the space as a classificatory rather than referential mark. Three variations of the section ‘§’ mark, that I will elaborate, were used by Anne to sort and indicate the significance, and perhaps the type of information, contained in the index notes. It was in the index space that Anne’s practices with the section ‘§’ marker seemed to become highly symbolic, constructing semantic connections between items in the index. Where the section ‘§’ mark operated in the journal entries to link the subject matter to the index, in the index the section ‘§’ mark linked similar sorts of information. The system, as Anne appeared to employ it, marked out the important events or information in her life as noted within the whole context of the index, rather than in regards to the matters discussed and recorded in the journal entries. Categorisation of information in the index had the potential to be of a different temporality and scope than the journal entries. Unlike the journal entries contained within an immersed and daily chronology, the index could be periodised over a longer interval of time, with weeks or even a month to a page. In the index, using the section ‘§’ marker on a longer temporal scale allowed Anne the possibility of employing the semantic functioning of the sign, to draw out themes and construct narratives longitudinally from the material content of her life.

Anne was able to effect the semantic operation in her index using three variations of the section ‘§’ mark – a single ‘§’ mark, a double ‘§§’ mark or a triple ‘§§§’ mark. With these three variations, she was indicating the importance of the comment or information to her own future reflection. Anne wrote about the process on 24 August 1822, when she spent:

2 ½ hours copying out from 13 July up to today of the index to this volume... The looking over & filling up my journal to my mind always gives me pleasure. I seem to live my life over again. If I have been unhappy, it rejoices me to have escaped it; if happy, it does me good to remember it. (Whitbread 1988, 214)

The repetition of the section ‘§’ marker in the index classified Anne’s notes in gradations. The most common occurrence seen in the index for Paris was the single section ‘§’ mark which denoted the moderate importance of the annotation. This was perhaps the mark she used for ‘filling up’ the journal space. The comparatively more important double section ‘§§’ markers were abundant, but not as regularly seen in the index. The incidence of this mark may have indicated those more vital matters that
Anne wished to note for the future, to enable her ‘to live my life over again’. The rarest and most important variation was the triple section ‘§§§’ markings. In living her life over again, these markers probably denoted the most intense emotional states Anne wanted to vivify – happiness and unhappiness. In ‘looking over’ her journal entries to compile her index, Anne marked out that content which constructed the filling, vital or intensely experiential stories of her life, that she may have wanted to rejoice in or remember in the future.

Particularly with the single ‘§’ marker, the content was of broad scope, covering many general topics of interest to Anne. Anne used the single section ‘§’ mark one hundred and forty seven times in the index in Paris. The coverage included events of social and historical import, like the crowds of people paying their last respects to the deceased King Louis XVIII (1755–1824) on 18 September, or the fact that an aunt of Mrs. Barlow’s was tomahawked by American Indians, noted on 23 December (index 8, index 13). A single marker distinguished Anne’s travel and shopping information, such as arranging a little local girl to practise talking French with on 15 September, or the silk composition of Kashmeer shawls on 28 September (index 8). Anne also marked her medical consultations with her doctor M. Dupuytren on 6 December (index 12). The specific combination marks used to denote the state of her venereal condition ‘EO’ will be discussed in Chapter Three. Other single marked items were emotive, such as when she felt low soon after her arrival in Paris on 3 September (index 6). Most of these single section ‘§’ markers demarcated Anne’s sociability, like her first visit from Mrs. Barlow on 4 September and their tête à tête on 17 October (index 6, index 10). The dedicated marginal marker used for her sociability, ‘V’ and ‘Vc’, will be examined in Chapter Two. Anne also single section ‘§’ marked the index note when Mrs. Barlow’s first impressions of her were revealed on 1 November and when she finally kissed Mrs. Barlow on 7 November (index 10–11). Around the middle of October and on through November, the single markers started tracking more diligently Anne’s courtship of Mrs. Barlow and other topics became less noticed.

The double section ‘§§’ marker was comparatively more significant to Anne and most of the ninety five instances in the Paris period marked out affective and sexual annotations. There were a small number of other unrelated inclusions that clearly still warranted Anne’s keen interest, like the name of good booksellers on 16 September (index 8). However, most of the markings related to subjects of sexual interest and
intrigue to Anne and these indices contained many details that were distinctly salacious. The ribald sexual knowledge that Anne double section ‘§§’ marked included many indirect experiences. An example was the stories Anne actively solicited from her language teacher Mme. Galvani, who appeared to enjoy imparting risqué confidences. One of Mme. Galvani’s tales concerned an acquaintance who killed her lover, her ‘amant’, from sexual exhaustion, noted in the index of 25 December (index 14). However, a great deal more of these double section ‘§§’ markers were related to the proceedings and development, both sexually and emotionally, of the ongoing romance with Mrs. Barlow. The double markers dealt not only with Anne’s direct sexual experience with Mrs. Barlow, but also most of Mrs. Barlow’s sexual experience with her late husband Colonel Barlow. These markers overall outlined a narrative of sexual progress with Mrs. Barlow. The sense of favourable comparison, from the ‘§’ sociability with Mrs. Barlow, to the ‘§§’ active courtship of Mrs. Barlow, was what suggested the graduated nature of the section markings within the index notes.

An index note with a triple section ‘§§§’ mark contained a matter of the most importance to Anne. She used her section mark sparingly, marking only twelve events with Mrs. Barlow that were momentous. The triple mark began on 8 December when Mrs. Barlow was found to be a virtuous woman, and moved to Mrs. Barlow’s having no objection to Anne sleeping with her in the new lodgings on 13 December (index 13). Nearly two weeks later, the next triple marked index noted their sexual intimacy when Mrs. Barlow let Anne ‘grubble’ her on 22 December (index 13). Such petting and fondling was followed by Anne’s insertion of her middle finger for the first time on 28 December (index 14). Only one triple marked index note was written in plain hand, but it was clearly significant. It was against 15 January, when Anne recorded her departure with Mrs. Barlow from 24 Place Vendôme for their new lodging at 15 Quai Voltaire (index 15). On 18 January, Mrs. Barlow’s sexual indulgence of Anne was marked, as was the explanation of the ‘French custom’ of coitus interruptus on 28 January (index 15). Anne marked that Mrs. Barlow did not want Mariana to know of their sexual relationship on 30 January, and Mrs. Barlow’s concerns she was being duped on 3 February (index 16). That Mrs. Barlow could not bear if Anne was another’s was marked on 20 February, but Anne wrote that she had nothing physical to give to Mrs. Barlow on 24 February (index 16). The last triple marked index concerned Mrs. Barlow’s claim that Anne was a virgin on 19 March (index 17). These triple marks in the Paris period traced a path of intense sexual and symbolic significance.
The various gradations of the metasignage constructed a complexly layered story. Consistent themes were described through the system of metasignage, particularly of Anne’s sexual and emotional sociability. The function of the section marking was to edit material further that was already assembled in a form of systematised referencing, the index, to produce from the metasigned mapping another editorialised arrangement. As the level of marker repetition increased, so did the amount of crypt handwriting in the index annotations. Except for the one index note above, all of the triple section ‘§§§’ marked passages were entirely crypted. A greater proportion of the double section ‘§§’ marked indices were also in the crypt handwriting and the single section ‘§’ marked indices were evenly mixed. The correlation of encryption to marking accurately reflected the nature of the comments that were so marked, from the greatly intimate to the reasonably general. The level of signification and level of encryption demonstrated the textual weight Anne gave to these events and items when editorialising her index content. Through the semiotics of the section ‘§’ sign, a predominant autobiographical account was constructed, which I have interpreted as Anne’s sexual adventures in Paris.

The index metasignage showed that Anne’s autobiographical project was also an erotic and sexual history of the self. The closeness between Anne’s life writings and sexual writings demonstrated that the separation between pornography and literature was not as narrowly defined in the past, as Dorelies Kraakman has argued in her analysis of the evolution of pornography in Western European culture from the seventeenth century (Kraakman 1999). With the metasignage, Anne fashioned an autobiographical and erotic narrative of her sojourn in Paris. This assay into Continental sexual liberty, as editorialised through the metasignage in the index, was detailed in daily instalments in the journal entries. Anne would have been dependent on the semantic section marking in the index to find her way back strategically into those episodes in the journal entries that were so vital for her to relive and remember. Whether she marked the index with these metasigns in Paris for the demands of her future self, or whether she retraced the index notations after Paris as that future reader, it was these specific metasigned matters that comprised the history that Anne wished to recall of her sojourn in Paris.

This brings my analysis of the materiality of the journal volume to the content of the journal entries; the last and arguably the most important, certainly the most studied, element of the journal volume. The journal entries formed the major proportion of the 1824–25 journal volume SH:7/ML/E/8. The journal entries for the whole volume
contained Anne’s daily coverage for thirteen months of her life from six weeks before she left for Paris on 20 June 1824, to four months after she returned on 31 July 1825 (1–333). Of the total, the majority of the journal entries were concerned with the Paris period, which covered seven months of her life, or about two thirds of the 1824–25 volume (67–267[ sic]). As discussed earlier, Anne wrote a journal entry for every day she resided in Paris, beginning with her arrival at 24 Place Vendôme on 1 September 1824, until her departure from Mrs. Barlow and 15 Quai Voltaire on 31 March 1825. The journal entries for Paris averaged approximately a journal page for each day of her sojourn. These figures give some idea of the time and effort Anne devoted to her journal writing, for not a single day went unrecorded in some fashion during the entire stay.

Anne’s writing patterns did shift over the time she was in Paris. Such patterns were demonstrated more clearly through a monthly average page count. In October, November and December, Anne wrote more than a page a day on average. During these months, Anne and Mrs. Barlow were emotionally and amorously intimate, and Anne dedicated a greater amount of journal space to detailing the courtship. The months of September and January rated just under a page a day. September was Anne’s first month in Paris and she spent a good part of it sightseeing. She had been to Paris five years before in 1819 with Aunt Anne, and as recently as 1822 with her father and sister Marian. The latest Paris sojourn was the first time Anne was to spend any great time overseas, accompanied only by her maid Cordingley, without her friends or family. Even though Anne was busy when she first arrived, she still wrote a fair amount for September in her journal entries. In January 1825, despite again being busy with the removal to 15 Quai Voltaire, she maintained a regular and lengthy writing practice. It was only in February and March that the journal entries became brief, with sometimes up to four days entered to a page. Compared to the peak writing period in November, these months were reduced to almost one third of that amount. These last months of Anne’s stay seemed to have been recorded almost perfunctorily and habitually compared to her previous capacity to be so articulate and detailed.

The usage of crypt handwriting tended to increase or decrease in line with the journal entry lengths. During the months when Anne’s courtship of Mrs. Barlow intensified, so did the amount of crypted journal passages. From mid October, the amount of crypted text accounted for roughly half of the journal entries and the ratio continued through the start of 1825, right up until the end of February. Although Anne used roughly the same
number of pages for the months of January as September, the difference in crypt text
in the journal entries was noticeable. When Anne first arrived in Paris she wrote some
very long journal entries, a few more than a page, but there was very little incidence of
crypt text. Anne did not use the crypt on a daily basis; the few times she did employ
the crypt for more extended comments in September, it mostly referred to ‘this treadmill
business’. By contrast, the plain handwriting was meticulous, detailing the environment,
people, entertainment and facilities of Place Vendôme, and shopping and sightseeing in
Paris. From late September, Anne began flirting more seriously with Mrs. Barlow and
the level of crypt discussion began to increase, from several lines almost daily, to the
steady rate of half plain and half crypt handwritten text seen from mid October onwards.

Anne maintained the evenly divided handwriting pattern for the next few months,
through a shift in residence, until the last few weeks before she left Paris. As her return
to England became imminent, the journal entries became shorter. Although some
journal entries in March did display a large proportion of the crypt, the daily occurrence
of the crypt handwriting became irregular. As when Anne first arrived in September, the
decrease in crypt seemed to be due to her increased sightseeing as she prepared to leave
Mrs. Barlow and Paris. However, in both February and March there was an overall
decrease in length of journal entries and monthly page count, even given the different
levels of crypt text within these two months. The pattern of decrease in both the journal
entries and crypt text, especially in March, was due to a combination of reasons.
Packing and sightseeing took up more of her time in March. More importantly, Anne
and Mrs. Barlow experienced mounting difficulties in March over the legitimate status
of their relationship, as Mrs. Barlow considered her answer to the marriage proposal
from her previous suitor Mr. Hancock (b.1797?), and Anne once again evaluated her
future relationship with Mariana.22 The indeterminacy of her relationship with Mrs.
Barlow at the time of her departure was most likely also a factor and perhaps directed
Anne’s avoidance of textual reflection during the last few weeks of her Paris sojourn.

Anne was busy indeed during her time in Paris but, whether she wrote a concise or a
detailed journal entry, she never failed to find some time for her journal writing. In
general, the journal entries were written up on a daily basis. Due to the occupations of
the journey from Dover to Paris, Anne was not able to write up the relevant journal
entries until she arrived. At the Place Vendôme, she quickly brought her journal entries
up to date, preparatory for the French journal entries. Anne noted on 3 September that
she ‘wrote the last 5 lines of page 65 & the whole of pages 66, 67, & 68, of my journal’ (69). The journal space was now clear, ready to be written up day by day in concert with her lived experience of Parisian life. It was an important authorial space for Anne, as she explained in a journal entry written a few years before on 19 February 1819:

Wrote in this book the journal of yesterday. I might exclaim with Virgil, ‘In tenui labor!’ But I am resolved not to let my life pass without some private memorial that I may hereafter read, perhaps with a smile, when Time has frozen up the channel of those sentiments which flow so freshly now. (Whitbread 1988, 80) In the future when Anne was the audience for these memorials, she preferred to read her experiences of being in Paris as they were written fresh at the time. For Anne, the immediacy of the life event and the journal writing act were both important to capture.

Anne was a regular and habitual journalist of her own life, but the pattern of daily writing was flexible. Shifts in her habits occurred especially when time constraints put her writing process under pressure. Anne was adept at managing her time and energy; however, she did occasionally get behind. When she was pressed, Anne would combine the writing up of her journal entries of a day or two into concentrated sittings. Late September for instance, she was busy responding to and extracting from several letters, chiefly about ‘this treadmill business’. When not writing letters, Anne was being entertained at the fête at St. Cloud, seeing the new King Charles X (1757–1836) return from Notre Dame and reviewing the troops, going to see the Luxembourg paintings or going to the French Opera in the Rue de Richelieu. Understandably, during the frenetic activity, she had to dedicate extra time to writing up her journal entries. Twice on 27 September, she sat down to write her notes for the previous day, as well as include her current journal entry. Anne noted in her journal entry in the morning, that she ‘wrote the first 46 ½ lines of the journal of yesterday’ (88). Later the same day, before bed, Anne ‘then wrote the last 12 ½ lines of yesterday & all the above of today’ (88). Events were important but the writing up of the journal entry about them was as compelling a practice for Anne. When it was required, Anne resorted to these concerted efforts to bring her journal entries up to date.

Time constraints effected shifts with Anne’s writing patterns. Another factor more dramatically affected the customary pattern of her writing process: the lived experience of desire. It occurred most noticeably when the magnitude of Anne’s sexual and erotic experience strengthened her need to reflect textually these impressions. From mid
October, Anne adapted her writing practices to manage and record the intensification of her romantic and amatory experience with Mrs. Barlow, and peripherally Melle. de Sans (b.1799?), in her journal entries.\textsuperscript{25} A most unusual journal entry for 15 October demonstrated this clearly (106). Anne had been discussing her deeper interest in Mrs. Barlow over her attraction to Melle. de Sans. In the midst of writing up the discussion, she inserted an asterisk ‘*’, before continuing until the end of the topic (106). If she had an appointment with Melle. de Sans, Anne told Mrs. Barlow, but was sitting with Mrs. Barlow, ‘I could not keep the appointment *but if sitting with Melle. de S- I could leave her to go to Mrs. B-’ (106). At the conclusion of the subject, Anne wrote, ‘I had written as far as the star when a rap at my room door & entered Mrs. B- with a book “of poetry” in her hand’ (106). The two gentlewomen had then examined the book of erotic poetry together. The immediacy of her amatory experience with Mrs. Barlow required expression, signified by the special use of the asterisk in the journal entry text. Anne had incorporated the demands of recording the sexual encounter, but could not be swayed from her habitual recording of the particulars of her day.

Just as desire affected Anne’s regular structuring of the journal entries, so too distressing emotions could affect her authorial habits. An example can be seen in a journal entry for 5 December, with the receipt of a disappointing letter from Mariana (175–76). The only kindness in Mariana’s letter was, Anne wrote, ‘in saying she would spend half her time with me if she went to York for three weeks’ (175). In the unusual journal entry, Anne recorded first her reading of the letter and some of its contents, before she noted receiving it. Typically, Anne would begin a journal entry with the margin notes of the date and her rising and retiring times. Once she noted these details, and her autoerotic practices if they occurred, she began writing the body of the journal entry text. The textual account followed Anne’s activities of the day chronologically, describing the sequence of events from breakfast time through to the writing of her journal account at the end of the day. The particular journal entry on 5 December was a rare disruption to the linear daily temporal narrative. Anne read and elaborated on the contents of the letter at 10 p.m., in the middle of the journal entry text (175). It was only at the conclusion of the journal entry, that she noted she received the letter before breakfast (176). Thus, initially, the usual chronology pertained until the evening, only to break away and return to breakfast to track the receipt of the letter, before she recommenced her account. The singular reversal of Anne’s writing pattern with her journal entry suggested the disappointment or upset Mariana’s letter produced.
The material substance of the journal entries in Paris was the courtship of Mrs. Barlow. Anne’s compulsion to write about the amatory developments with Mrs. Barlow meant that other notable events were increasingly disregarded in the journal entries. On 25 October for instance, Anne noted that ‘the King buried to day at St. Denis’, but continued, ‘I was with Mrs. B- & too much interested to get up to see the royal carriages pass’ (116). As the conversations with Mrs. Barlow became more detailed and intimate, Anne took to writing her journal entries several times a day to include all that passed between them. Beginning in late October, Anne started to write her journal entries before breakfast, after lunch, in the afternoon and, as well, she would write, as was her custom, at the end of the day before retiring to bed. The journal entry for 28 October was a good example. In the afternoon she ‘wrote all the above of today which took me till 2 ½ –’, but was interrupted when ‘Mrs. B- then came & brought her work’ (119). Mrs. Barlow was called away, so Anne instantly wrote up their conversation. Anne noted she ‘had just written the last 6 ½ [l]ines at 3 ¼ p.m.’, when ‘Mrs. B- came again at 3 ½ & sat with me (brought her work) till 4 ¾’ (119). Anne did not finish the journal entry until late that night: ‘wrote the last 2 lines of the last page & the whole of this, & had just done at 1 50/60’ (120). Rather than exclusively maintaining her habitual journal writing practices, Anne modified them in Paris to incorporate writing upon demand.

At different times during her Paris sojourn Anne oscillated between writing her journal entries every day or on alternate days. In September, she was busy with tours and entertainments and occasionally she spent her evening writing up two days’ worth of journal entries. As she noted on 30 September, it was just past 2 a.m. ‘at which hour tonight I had just finished writing these journals of yesterday & today’ (91). Anne felt the urge to record the exciting developments with Mrs. Barlow at least once a day for the months of October and November. However, in December, the new plan prescribed for her venereal condition appeared to tax and fatigue her strength. Occasionally, Anne wrote up her journal entries every other day because of the medical program from M. Dupuytren. From early January, Anne and Mrs. Barlow prepared to move into their new lodgings at 15 Quai Voltaire. The journal writing pattern became more irregular, switching repeatedly between daily and alternate sessions. Once the two gentlewomen were more settled in early February, Anne shifted back to a more regular daily writing pattern. For the last time in Paris, she brought the journal entries up to the present on 29 March (267). The following day, Anne’s writing desk was packed away for the
journey back to England (267). The last days of Paris, 30 and 31 March, were written up en bloc later, just as when she first arrived in Paris.30

With the journal volume packed in her desk in her luggage whilst she was travelling, how did Anne keep track of these last days without the assistance of another textual resource? The journal entries were not always written in a direct or daily fashion, from her thoughts instantaneously to the journal page. There was an intermediate step: memoranda. The process of memoranda was recorded in a journal entry two weeks after Anne moved with Mrs. Barlow into 15 Quai Voltaire, when they were busy establishing themselves in the new apartment. In the journal entry for 27 January, Anne noted that she ‘wrote the memoranda of today & yesterday’ (231). Again the next day, she wrote, that she ‘had just done these memoranda of today’ (231). It was not until a few days later on 30 January that she was able to spend more time on her journal entries and write them up fully. Anne noted in her journal entry that evening, she ‘wrote out ([f]rom memoranda) the journals of Tuesday Wednesday Thursday & Friday last’ (233). The task was completed later that night, when she ‘wrote out (from memoranda) the journal of yesterday, and the whole of this of today’ (234). The material of these memoranda constituted the source from which the journal entries were written; the making of memoranda was clearly an integral part of the construction of the journal entry text. Anne’s journal writing pattern was a metonymic and textual process transposed from her memory, to memoranda, to her journal volume as memoir.

Anne’s writing process with memoranda was distinct from her practice of writing out a rough draft of a journal page in pencil. Neither practice of rough drafting nor making memoranda appeared to be employed continually in her journal process. Instead, both were utilised as the situation warranted it. It seemed that Anne wrote rough drafts when accuracy and stylisation were important. This was certainly the case with some of the correspondence, indices and translations for her language lessons which she carefully rough drafted. For instance, Anne spent some time on 28 November writing a rough draft of a letter she would send to Aunt Anne concerning the first consultation with M. Dupuytren (165). Some of the work Anne did on learning French required she rough draft her translation before she wrote it ‘over again’, as she did on 23 October (114). The daily index notations were more commonly, although not frequently, rough drafted.31 The low number of corrections in the journal entries – indicated by the use of caret insertions ‘ˆ’ and strikethroughs – were probably made when Anne read over her
daily account for the material to compose her index. Rough drafting was, from these examples, essentially the writing out of a preliminary text.

There was only a single instance of Anne writing a rough draft of a journal entry in Paris. It was the journal entry for 7 January, a day she spent ill in bed. As Anne recorded, she ‘wrote the rough draft of this journal of today in bed which took me till 3’ (214). The rough drafting of this one journal entry was apparently neither for the purposes of accuracy nor stylisation. Immediately after she finished writing – or making the note on it – Anne noted that ‘my cousin’s on after the bath’ (214). The onset of menstruation might have exhausted her, leaving her with no energy for writing up a good copy of the journal entry. Anne wrote to Aunt Anne just two days before on 5 January, reporting on her slow recuperation from the changes in the medical management of her venereal condition (ML/190; 212). However, she also described in the journal entry how she had fatigued her hand having sex with Mrs. Barlow. ‘I had’, Anne wrote, ‘one or m[o]re fingers of my right hand up her at least an hour without ceasing’ (214). Sex had so tired her writing hand perhaps, that she found it difficult to write out her a good version of the journal entry. Mrs. Barlow was, Anne wrote, ‘by no means ’either’ tired or perhaps I found it hard work & my hand was quite fatigued’ (214). Mrs. Barlow exclaimed, ‘I never had such a grubbling as this in my life before’, a statement significant enough to be reiterated by Anne in her index (214, index 14). The erotically charged event may explain why Anne chose to rough draft the journal entry rather than make memoranda of it.

Memoranda operated differently; they were notes or aide-mémoires to Anne’s memory, which were later written up in the journal entries. Memoranda were made when busyness denied her proper and timely access to the journal volume, as demonstrated in the late January journal entries when Anne was settling into 15 Quai Voltaire. Or, as seen in the last days of her stay in Paris, memoranda were made entirely in the physical absence of the journal volume. The memoranda were not dependant on the journal volume, for she kept a dedicated textual space for her memoranda. It was a pocket casebook of Eliza’s, which Anne wrote about on 2 September 1822:

Extracting some memoranda from a little red morocco pocket case with asses’ skin leaves that was Eliza Raine’s, previous to rubbing out all the writing & using the case in common for memoranda & notes made on the spot for my journal. This plan will save me much trouble & I shall always be sure, as I travel along,
that my observations when made at the instant, are correct, at least as far as they can be so. (Whitbread 1988, 218–19)

It was most likely that Anne continued to use Eliza’s pocket casebook. On 3 September, Anne wrote in her journal entry, directly quoting from her memoranda, her opinion of a fellow guest. ‘In my memorandum made at the moment’, she wrote, ‘M. le Capitaine is unceremoniously styled “an impudent fellow”’ (69). The memoranda note regarding the gentleman was an observation ‘made at the instant’, as Anne described.

The journal volume performed a very specific purpose in the autobiographical relationship: the textual repository and recording space of Anne’s memories. Anne wrote of the value of this purpose years before in the journal entry of 22 June 1821:

I owe a good deal to this journal. By unburdening my mind on paper I feel, as it were, in some degree to get rid of it; it seems made over to a friend that hears it patiently, keeps it faithfully, and by never forgetting anything, is always ready to compare the past & present & thus to cheer & edify the future. (Whitbread 1988, 154)

Indeed, having worked with Anne’s writings, I agree that the journal volume does not seem to have forgotten anything! Anne was compulsive about recording all sorts of details about her day and a typical journal entry contained any combination of a number of regular features. These elements were not unconnected nor unrelated details or facts, for the journal space charted the materiality and spatiality of Anne’s world. The textualisation of these details in the journal entries mapped out the emotional and corporeal environment she occupied and negotiated in the very process of editorialising the material for her journal entry text. With the incredible amount of detail she did include, there was a remarkably clear immediacy about the world Anne constructed in the journal space, if we analyse her own ways of producing, marking, editing and indexing her journal entry text.

The journal entries seen in Helena Whitbread’s first book, dealing with the eight years prior to the sojourn in Paris, illustrated the range of Anne’s daily activities, mostly at Shibden Hall. There Anne’s time was divided between managing the estate affairs, walking, riding, playing the flute, reading, shooting, attending the Anglican church, visiting acquaintances and the circulating library in Halifax, politicking for the Tory party at election times and travelling around England. As well, she found time to study Greek, Latin, French, mathematics, geometry and history with her teacher the Vicar of Halifax, Rev. Knight. The correspondence, journal volumes and account books also
required time and energy devoted to these important textual activities. As Terry Castle wittily noted in *The Apparitional Lesbian*, Anne sounded very much like a Jane Austen heroine, and her world like any other domestic environment of an Austen novel (Castle 1993, 96). The second of Whitbread’s books *No Priest but Love* was certainly evocative of the breadth of the content of the journal writing during the period of the Paris sojourn. However, the pattern of the journal entries, the methodical regularity of Anne’s writing practices and her continual working over of certain themes were less easy to discern. The journal entries in manuscript were more illuminating. The original journal entries deserve to be more productively analysed for the elements that configured the textual boundaries of Anne’s material landscape.

**ANNE’S LETTERS:**

*‘So Little in the Humour for Epistolizing[sic]’*

The correspondence was another significant aspect of Anne’s material landscape. The letters may not be as recognised as her journal volume as a source for information about her subjectivity, but they are equally important. As was illustrated in the earlier analysis of ‘this treadmill business’, Anne disseminated amongst her correspondents a defence of her character after the events of ‘this treadmill business’ became publicly known. The representation of self in these letters was not written for Anne, as it had been concerning the same upsetting business in her journal entries. Instead, within the stylised space of the letters Anne produced a different subjectivity that was directed to the audience of her family, lovers and friends. The content and purposes of the correspondence were profoundly sociable, bound up with the textual exteriority of the correspondence with Anne’s extensive network of family and loved ones. In a society where the means to leisure and the difficulties of geography could bear upon personal meetings, letters were an integral mechanism in maintaining significant relationships over distance and time. The subjectivity Anne developed in the letters was as critical as the self she represented in the journal volume, as borne out by her epistolary response over ‘this treadmill business’. The crafting of that subjectivity, the distinctive textual practices she employed with her letters, is what I have understood by Anne’s term, ‘epistolizing[sic]’. In this section, I analyse the letters in more depth, examining the mechanics and material practices Anne employed with the correspondence, reintegrating the textual contribution of the letters to her subjectivity and sociability.
Readers of Muriel Green and Jill Liddington’s works will be familiar with the correspondence. Whilst Liddington has not made any of the letters available in print, she has extensively sourced the correspondence for her understanding of Anne’s social history. The full range of Anne’s writings, Liddington wrote, ‘enable us to reconstitute in detail the broad social panorama’ of her world (Liddington 1998, xxi). To access the letters themselves, readers must turn to the editions of the correspondence, Muriel Green’s Miss Lister of Shibden Hall published in 1992, or the less easily accessible but more detailed thesis ‘A Spirited Yorkshirewoman’ from 1938. For the Paris period, Green’s earlier thesis was more useful and comprehensive than her later publication. Both of these works by Green produced an account of Anne’s sojourn that was focused on the social life and environment of Paris. The letters, Green wrote, ‘perfectly re-create the life of the times’ (Green 1992, 66). The social aspects of the correspondence have been comprehensively resourced by Liddington and thoroughly documented by Green. For Helena Whitbread, the focus upon the romance with Mariana excluded the letters as a source for examining Anne’s sexuality. In any case, none of the correspondence between Anne and Mariana has survived. My study seeks to integrate a sociable understanding of the letters into an understanding of her epistolary writing, as a material space for the representation of Anne’s sexuality and subjectivity.

There were nineteen letters altogether for the Paris period in the papers, including the copy of the letter Anne wrote immediately after Paris to Mrs. Barlow [Appendix 1, fig. 1]. The letters totalled seventy six pages of material, all written in the plain handwriting. These nineteen letters were a rather select documentary source for Anne’s life during the Paris sojourn, for the archival collection contained only those letters that were written by her. Fifteen of these letters were to Aunt Anne, with whom she lived at Shibden Hall. This was most likely the reason these letters have survived. Kept by Aunt Anne, they became part of the Lister papers in the Shibden Hall Muniments. A comparison between the summary and the extant letters showed that not all of the letters survived. For the Paris period, Anne wrote thirty letters altogether, not including the first letter to Mrs. Barlow (summary 1–2). Half of these were written to Aunt Anne and all of these letters have survived. Anne also wrote seven letters to Mariana, four letters to Isabella Norcliffe, four letters to Miss Maclean and later her first letter to Mrs. Barlow. None of those letters addressed to Mariana or Isabella have survived, but three of the four to Miss Maclean were amongst Anne’s papers. Perhaps these were returned after Miss Maclean’s death on 16 November 1830 (Green 1992, 11).
The summary list in the journal volume recorded as well those letters Anne received whilst in Paris. Of the thirty seven letters sent to Anne, the majority were from Aunt Anne who wrote fourteen during the time to her niece. Mariana sent Anne seven letters, as did Isabella, and Miss Maclean sent six. Even Isabella’s mother, Mrs. Norcliffe (1762–1835), sent Anne a letter during her stay in Paris, whilst another single letter was written by a “Miss Henrietta C-” (summary 2). The corresponding journal entry for 18 March suggested Miss Henrietta Crompton (n.d.) was a mutual acquaintance of Anne and Miss Maclean (260). There was also a letter sent to Anne from the general post office of London (summary 2). In the journal entry for 21 February, she noted that it was to inform her that a letter, apparently from Mariana, would be held by the post office until the remainder of the postage was paid (246). All of the correspondence was noted in the summary of letters list in the front pages of the journal volume and briefly described, as in the above examples with the letters from Miss Crompton and Mariana, in the journal entries. A few of these letters were so important Anne summarised and even extracted their contents into her journal entries. Anne’s process of bringing her letters into her journal volume will be considered in more detail in the next section. These letters can be traced through the journal volume, but none of the letters sent to Anne in Paris were in the papers.

The letters from Anne in Paris seem a more slender resource compared to the considerable size of the journal volume for the same period. That only a quarter of the complete correspondence for the seven month period has survived – nineteen letters out of an original sixty seven letters – presented its own constraints. The characteristics of the intimate relationships between Anne and her long-term correspondents cannot be examined. None of the eleven letters she wrote, or the fourteen she received from Mariana and Isabella in Paris, survived. There were no examples for an analysis of Anne’s epistolary relations with her lovers. However, what was extant were all of the fifteen letters Anne wrote from Paris to Aunt Anne and nearly all, three of the four, of the letters to Miss Maclean. Yet, an analysis of the letters with these two correspondents was weighted towards Anne’s understanding of the relationship. None of the letters sent in return to Anne from Miss Maclean or Aunt Anne have survived. What remained in the papers was not representative of the entire lifelong correspondence with Aunt Anne or Miss Maclean. Instead, what can be examined is something of Anne’s affective and familial correspondence and relationships with her most frequent recipient, Aunt Anne, and her friend, Miss Maclean.
The selective nature of the archival resource allows us an in-depth examination, rather than a longitudinal or representative one, of the correspondence Anne wrote in Paris. The research questions that were suited to such a particular resource focus upon the materiality and mechanical practices of the correspondence, instead of the relations contained within them. The correspondence was a textual space that created a spatiality both materially and discursively. I consider the epistolary writing space, like the journal volume, was a performative space, constructed and mobilised by Anne to enable her specific authorial purposes. Elizabeth Colwill has examined the epistolary friendships of Anne’s contemporary, the French female philosopher, Constance de Salm (1767–1845) (Colwill 2000). In her feminist analysis of the intimacy between Constance and her female correspondents, Colwill found that ‘female friendship was vital to the construction of the femme auteur’ in the early nineteenth century (Colwill 2000, 59). Anne spoke of the authorial process in a letter to Aunt Anne dated 30 January (ML/161). ‘But, I know not how it is,’ she wrote, ‘I never in my life was so little in the humour for epistolizing[33]’ (ML/161, 3). The nature of the epistolary space can be analysed, examining how Anne’s authorial self engaged in the process of writing letters in her correspondence with friends and family. Such an examination can consider how the particular spaces of the letters functioned and what complex purposes they served in Anne’s sexuality, sociability and other writings.

Anne had special writing equipment that was particular to her epistolary and writing practice. In the journal entry for 29 October, she wrote of a seal that Mariana gave her with the motto ‘à toi pour toujours’, or ‘yours for always’ (121). Anne most likely used the seal only for her letters to Mariana. The writing of her journal entries and letters was so important, Anne had a writing desk compact enough to move around or even travel with. The journal entry for 19 October noted that the writing desk was near the fire at 24 Place Vendôme, but by 23 February it was at 15 Quai Voltaire, placed near Mrs. Barlow’s fire (111, 247). ‘Settling my accounts,’ Anne wrote on the night of 12 March as she began to prepare her writing and desk for her departure, ‘& arranging my writing desk till 2 20/60’ (256). A few weeks later on the night of 30 March before she departed, Anne made sure that her writing desk was carefully packed in her luggage for the trip home (267). Through the construction and repetition of personalised writing rituals – seals, desks, physical arrangement of the writing space – Anne produced a material space for her letter writing.
In France, Anne purchased special letter paper and noted the type of paper, price and quantity in her journal entries. Sending letters in France, which were costed according to weight, was an expensive business. The majority of the letters from Paris were four pages long. One letter that Anne backdated to 29 November to Aunt Anne was shorter at only two pages long (ML/155). A letter to Miss Maclean, written over ten days from 27 September to 6 October, was crossed (ML/148). At seven pages, it was the longest extant letter Anne wrote in Paris. The letters were generally written on one large sheet that she folded to write the letter, including the address panel upon the last page. Anne described the letter writing process in the journal entries, usually as she finished each letter, prior to posting them. The journal entry from 14 December was typical. Anne noted, she ‘wrote 3 pages & the ends, & under the seal to Miss Mc.L.’ (190). The journal entry referred to the only letter to Miss Maclean from the Paris period that was not in the papers. As well, Anne often described her type of handwriting in these same journal entry notes. In the journal entry for 29 September, she commented that the letter to Aunt Anne was written ‘small & close’ (89; referring to ML/149). Indeed, this ‘small and close’ letter was written in very small handwriting, crammed close to include all the detail and descriptions about Anne’s life and health in Paris.

Despite the small and close handwriting, the letters are easier to read than the journal entries. There were other material differences between the letters and journal volume. Anne used very few abbreviations even with Aunt Anne, who was possibly familiar with the shortened handwriting style. As with the journal volume, Anne would read over her writing, but there were few corrections marked in the letters. The reason was she carefully drafted her letters. As she explained to Mrs. Barlow on 8 November, ‘I might write half a dozen letters before I wrote one that pleased me’ (137). A journal entry from 28 November illustrated the attention given to the letters. Anne wrote that she spent ‘about an hour writing the rough draft of what I may probably write tomorrow to my Aunt after consulting M. Dupuytren’ (165). The journal entry a few days later recorded how she used the rough draft to compose the letter sent to Aunt Anne. Anne wrote on 30 November, that she ‘arranged a letter to my Aunt from what I wrote on Sunday night & wrote it on two pages’ (169). The letter ML/155 was part of the papers but, unfortunately, the draft was not extant. This meant I could not provide an analysis of a drafted letter to elucidate Anne’s editorial and stylistic shaping of her epistolary writing. However, the evidence of these practices from the journal comments
alone was revealing. The drafting and arranging of the correspondence demonstrated Anne’s careful material preparation of her individual letters.

No drafts have survived from the period in Paris, but there was a copy of a letter in the papers. The copy, made on 8 April 1825, was of the first letter Anne wrote to Mrs. Barlow after leaving Paris (ML/166; 279). Once the letter was finished, she copied it out immediately on another piece of paper. On 8 April, Anne wrote in her journal entry, she sat up ‘till one copying the first & half of the third & the ends of my letter to Mrs Barlow’ (279). The first and third pages Anne copied were precise extracts from the letter, for she enclosed these sections in quotation marks. The material that was evidently not as important, such as a description of the journey back to England, was summarised in the plain handwriting. After completing her quotation of the first page from the epistle, Anne noted, there followed ‘after saying I had a pleasant voyage across the channel, the account of my travelling to town’ (ML/166, 1). The summarising of the contents continued until, with the comment ‘beginning about the middle of page 3, is as follows’, Anne took up the thread of her copying again (ML/166, 1). The emotive content of the original letter was clearly outlined, highlighted by the excision of these irrelevant details. It was evidently an important letter, and Mrs. Barlow a significant correspondent, for Anne to trouble with copying – exactly or in substance – the entire letter. The pains Anne took with her letters extended beyond this single item to her correspondence as a whole.

Anne’s attention to the preparation of her letters was temporal, as well as material. The letters from Paris were often written over a period of several days. The crossed letter to Miss Maclean, for instance, was written on three separate days over a period of ten days. Beginning on 27 September, she continued the letter on 5 October, and finished on 6 October (ML/148, 1, 4, 2 crossed). Anne also spent more time writing a letter, than she did on her journal entries. As she noted in her journal entry on 27 September, Anne spent more than six hours writing only three pages of the crossed letter to Miss Maclean (88). The careful arrangement of a letter over time and the draft preparation of a letter indicated that the correspondence was textually differentiated from the journal space. The writing process with both of these formats was outlined in detail in the same journal entry. As Anne noted, she ‘came off to bed at 9 20/60 – then wrote the last 12 ½ lines of yesterday & all the above of today which took me till 11 ½’ (88). From 11.30 p.m., she wrote, she sat up ‘writing 3 pages very small’, and as she completed in her margin, ‘&
The mediation of the journal material before becoming arranged into epistolary material suggested there was another, but distinctive, layer of composition to the letters. The journal entries and letters canvassed the same topics, but the accounts Anne wrote in the letters were more polished and extensive than the brief reports in the journal entries. A comparison of the material contents of these formats revealed two distinctive features of the letters: descriptive passages and detail, and Anne’s emotive language. There were a variety of subjects that Anne described in her letters, ranging from her sightseeing around Paris, as Muriel Green has previously noted, to descriptions of her immediate environment, such as the people and situations around her. For instance, it was clear from the first letter to Aunt Anne, written from 8 to 12 September, that the letters were a distinctly and descriptively different format (ML/146). Anne’s report on her fellow guests was noticeably detailed in her letter. By contrast, Anne’s introductions of other guests in her journal entries, from her arrival on 1 September until she sent the letter to Aunt Anne on 13 September, were short and almost cursory (67–76). The letters were of a distinct composition to the journal entries, charting Anne’s corporeal and emotional landscape. In characterising and explaining matters to a correspondent, the letters provided a more seamless narrative than the journal writing.

Anne’s style in her letters was expressed sentimentally and emotively. Even in the regular letters to Aunt Anne, the language use was unfailingly affectionate and dutiful; Anne always addressed her as ‘my dear aunt’. However, the most sentimentally mannered letters were directed to Anne’s friends and lovers. The first letter to Miss Maclean begun on 18 August, but sent from Paris when Anne finished the letter on 12 September was a lovely example of Anne’s epistolary rhetoric. In the letter, Anne discussed the nature of her regard for her friend:

I have made sure of your regard ever since seeing you at Esholt; but, till this moment, I have been so fearful to presume too much, perhaps I have hoped too little – I have read over your letters again and again, and dreampt[sic] over them a thousand pleasing dreams from which it was almost pain to rouse myself; but, in
my hours of broad-awake existence, I have never ventured on the vain imagining that you had given me such power to disappoint you, or such an influence over the gathering clouds of your unhappiness. (ML/147, 1)

Emphatic elements like the dotted underscoring, and sentimental elements like the highly stylised language, were more frequent in these affective letters to friends and lovers, than in the familial letters or journal entries. The letters were a textual space which Anne used to develop a decidedly romantic rhetoric.

Sentiment, or the manifestation of feeling was a particularly Romantic concept and it was the currency of the correspondence. The expression of affection was the indication or level by which sentiment was measured by Anne. A letter Anne wrote to Mariana was, she noted in her journal entry of 17 November, ‘very affectionate – pretty & sentimental’ (149). Anne wrote to Mariana, she ‘liked to have her always with me when away from her like a little skiff sent out to sea nor hand nor helm to guide it thro’ the trackless deep’ (149). Mariana’s reply was received and noted in the journal entry for 5 December (175–76). When it was read to Mrs. Barlow, Anne noted Mrs. Barlow’s opinion that the letter was ‘no answer’ to Anne’s pretty and sentimental letter (175). Mariana’s letter took ‘no notice of all the affection expressed in my last’ (175). Rather, Mariana’s letter consisted disappointingly of only ‘what might be read to all the world’ (175). For Anne, the language of affection and of sentiment in the letters was synonymous with the expression of intimacy and love. Jill Liddington has stated that sentimentality ‘masked’ Anne’s homosexual meaning in her letters (Liddington 1994, 57). These letters suggested otherwise: that it was with a distinctly Romantic language that affective and emotional meanings were expressed. Anne’s sentimental and Romantic ‘epistolizing’ demonstrated the strategic uses such language could be put to, to communicate, not mask, homosexual love in the early nineteenth century.

Anne’s ‘epistolizing’ was structurally and compositionally distinct from that of the journal volume. Both textual spaces were intended to be communicative, but the correspondence was discursively different to the journal entries. The difference can be articulated through denaturalising the authorial relationship to text. This was what Suzanne Bunker termed the writer’s ‘sense of audience’ (Bunkers 1987, 8). While the journal accounts were written for Anne herself as audience, the letters were instead the relation of herself to another as audience. The contrast between the two authorial spaces revealed the gaps and presences of Anne’s authorial self and where it required repetition, silence or representation to herself, or to others. Areas existed where her
authorial self was embedded within the texts, or was by contrast markedly present as she communicated this knowledge to an audience of one, or a network. In the epistolary space, where Anne made meaning of herself in relation to her family, friends and lovers, it was the Romantic and sentimental self that was most strongly figured.

Anne’s use of Romantic rhetoric in her correspondence was profoundly sociable in purpose. The Romantic period had, as Gillian Russell and Clara Tuite contend, a sociable and performative collective self, the converse of the more familiar Romantic image of the solitary genius poet (Russell and Tuite 2002). Anne did not draw on a Judaic Marian or classical Sapphic tradition in her writing, unlike the nineteenth century English writers Ruth Vanita has studied in *Sappho and the Virgin Mary* (Vanita 1996). The literary ancestry Anne used to authorise her writing was not a Marian ideal of the eroticised mother-daughter relation, nor the Sapphic ideal of communal, lyrical, passion between women (Vanita 1996, 2). Anne’s authorial subjectivity, especially in her correspondence, was deeply Romantic. The Romantic sociability in the correspondence was a powerful statement of Anne’s authorial self within her social and historical context. The letters maintained intricate relationships across and amongst groups of people and social structures, over great distances. The summary pages for the Paris period showed that the majority of Anne’s correspondents were either her lovers such as Mariana and Isabella, friends like Miss Maclean, or family members who accepted these relationships, like Aunt Anne. It was these networks of relationships, affective and amatory, that were fundamental to Anne’s construction of her epistolary self. The correspondence was the site for the expression of Anne’s sociability and that sociability was a deeply Romantic and sexualised one.

Turning to the archival letters, the extant letters from Paris were all directed to Aunt Anne or Miss Maclean. It was these familial and affective networks that were the most detailed of her sociable relations in the correspondence. In the letter to Aunt Anne of 18 October, Anne wrote that if she had not heard of an improvement in her father’s ill health, she had been planning to return to Shibden, after only six weeks in Paris (ML/150, 1). The letters from Paris document that the connection to her family was affectionate and strong. The familial network was not strictly defined by Aunt Anne or her niece; the extent of their household included Anne’s close friends and lovers, Aunt Anne’s friends and the Lister extended family. Each letter from Anne related news of friends, or forwarded on news from friends, to her Lister family. In the first letter home
of 8 to 12 September, she commented upon Isabella’s mention that Aunt Anne and
Uncle James were well. ‘This was indeed most welcome intelligence’, Anne wrote to
Aunt Anne, ‘for, tho’ I have not expected hearing from you, I begin to think I shall not
feel quite comfortably settled till I have heard’ (ML/146, 4). The letter dated 31 October
relayed a message to Aunt Anne from Mariana. ‘She told me,’ Anne wrote, ‘she meant
to send you some game as soon as she could, but it was very scarce with them’
(ML/151, 2). Whilst travelling, the correspondence performed the sociable attachments
of family, affection and love, maintaining these extended networks between the
significant people in Anne’s life.

The sociability of the familial correspondence worked as an exchange. Part of Anne’s
reciprocity was to communicate news about herself, particularly about her health and
the progress of the treatment of her venereal disease. Aunt Anne and Uncle James were
aware of the reason, although not the true cause, for the trip to Paris. ‘I had told my
uncle & aunt’, Anne said to Mrs. Barlow on 27 November (163). Aunt Anne knew a
little more about the matter, although not the truth of it. Aunt Anne, Anne told Mrs.
Barlow, ‘was satisfied with my story of having caught it at a dirty cabinet d’eau’
(163). However, Uncle James and Aunt Anne’s concern was more broadly indicative of
the close relationship between Anne and her kin. Each letter gave Aunt Anne an
overview of Anne’s medical and physical status, providing a comprehensive account
over time. The letters described Anne’s health and how she was feeling overall, the
system of her treatment, the effects of various treatments like bathing, and how she
came to take her baths in Mrs. Barlow’s rooms at Place Vendôme.34 As she began to
prepare for the return home, Anne assessed the impact of Paris, discussing her sense of
gratitude to Mrs. Barlow, and her feeling that she was essentially recovered from the
venereal condition.35 As she wrote to Aunt Anne on 14 March, Anne had ‘not felt
myself so well for I know not how long’ (ML/164, 1). It was in the correspondence to
Aunt Anne – not in the journal entries – that Anne expressed her feelings about the
progress of the medical treatment and the management of her venereal disease.

Anne’s ‘epistolizing[sic]’ encompassed a wider framework, delineating the structures of
her broader social context. As Jill Liddington has noted, class was a defining category
of Anne’s identity as seen in her journal entries (Liddington 1998, 251). The journal
entries noted the interactions with higher social orders like French nobility, and with
different social groupings like skilled tradespeople. By contrast, the correspondence
focused upon domestic class relations involving servants. The most striking example was the epistolary inclusions concerning her maid, Cordingley. In the journal entries, Cordingley regularly appeared in the domestic background in reference to her duties, especially as such duties disturbed Anne and Mrs. Barlow before, during or after sex. The letters to Aunt Anne however, described Anne’s sociability with servants within the familial network. One instance was Cordingley and Anne’s anxiousness over the trouble Aunt Anne was experiencing securing a new cook at Shibden. ‘Poor Cordingley seemed very sorry,’ Anne wrote in her letter of 28 to 29 September, ‘and hoped I should not forget to give her duty to her master and mistress, and say, she was “very much grieved they should be so much put about”’ (ML/149, 1). Even Cordingley’s health was discussed, particularly the state of her bowels in the letters (ML/146, 4; ML/149, 1). Servants were regarded by Anne as part of a more extended conceptualisation of the household. Discussion of servants bridged the demarcation between familial and estate concerns, and economic and domestic matters.

The correspondence expressed social and class relations and was an ideally suited space for the expression of Anne’s understanding of herself in relation to her society. The sociability of the correspondence, which incorporated familial and domestic networks, was in its broadest form, a national sociability. The description of the sights and culture of Paris led Anne to reflect politically and patriotically on her love of home and England. In one of the letters to Aunt Anne, from 7 November, she wrote:

> they laugh at my patriotism, – that pride of country & that love of home which however talked of by others, is surely not better known by any nation under the sun, than the English – “England! with all thy faults, I love thee still”; and Shibden will probably be the last place on earth that fades from the remembrance & from the heart of yours, my dear aunt most affectionately AL-. (ML/152, 4)

Anne’s sentimental language was at its fullest effect when Romanticising her nationalism, a style of patriotic writing not seen in the journal entries. In the ultimate of sociable relations, Anne’s patriotism expressed her gendered engagement with the public sphere in a way that was both extremely interesting and yet deeply conflicting. For whilst her identification with nation, with England, might appear politically conservative, Anne’s sexual and gender positioning made such patriotic identification a more radical restatement of early nineteenth century British subjecthood.

The discursive space of the letters related Anne’s sociability to family, to friends and lovers, to class and to country through the language of affection, love, domesticity and
patriotism. These systemic ideologies shaped her interactions with her society, but were engaged with specifically through an epistolary mode by Anne, as an agent negotiating subjectivity within that society. However, letters themselves could be a textual space where sociability was measured. On 6 December, Mrs. Barlow read to Anne parts of a friend’s letter, ‘to prove the character she has in Guernsey’ (177). In the early nineteenth century, letters testifying to bourgeois character acted in a similar fashion as the character references that were required of working class people at the time. Carolyn Steedman has argued that elite Western autobiographical traditions appropriated these enforced narratives of the self from the poorer classes of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries (Steedman 2000). For instance, Anne told Aunt Anne on 28 to 29 September, that amongst the Place Vendôme guests she had ‘the reputation of being “a character”’ (ML/149, 3). Later on 3 November, Anne read aloud parts of Mariana and Miss Maclean’s letters to Mrs. Barlow, ‘to shew[sic] what my friends thought of me & that I was relly[sic] respectable’ (128). The correspondence with her lover and friends proved Anne’s ‘respectable’ character, as it was known amongst her social peers, to Mrs Barlow. Within Anne’s society, letters testified to a person’s self or character and their capacity to be appropriately or respectably sociable.

Just as letters were an apparatus for establishing a sociable character, so too were they a means for severing it. Anne told Mrs. Barlow the reason she was not on speaking terms with Mariana’s husband, Charles. Retelling the story in the journal entry on 9 December, Anne wrote that Charles ‘got hold of a letter of mine’ (181). The contents of the letter were such that it ‘finished the matter’, she wrote (181). Letters were a mechanism of sociability, establishing the character of a person in relation to others, or as with Charles, becoming grounds for the social relationship that existed between them to be cut. A letter introduced someone into society as a worthwhile and valuable acquaintance or connection but, equally, a letter denounced and dissolved the relationship as no longer functional, as unsociable. Letters were therefore integral texts in establishing, communicating, facilitating and severing early nineteenth century social relations. Through an analysis of the letters we can see what a correspondence signified within the sociable relations of family, friends, lovers, classes and nation, and how letters were styled and used within Anne’s culture. From the journal entries, we can further understand the contextual and embedded nature of a correspondence; how Anne used her letters to prove her character and how her character was reviewed and responded to via letters within her early nineteenth century society.
ANNE’S INTERTEXTUALITY:

The Letters in the Journal Volume

Contextualising the letters within the journal space makes aspects of Anne’s writings evident that cannot be seen when these different formats are considered separately and independently. It is only through an analysis of the letters as she discussed them in the journal entries that the sociable relations regarding character and reputation can be made visible and intelligible. Similarly, it was only through examining the specific event of ‘this treadmill business’ in the plain handwritten spaces of the journal entries, that the interconnection can be seen between Anne’s defence of her character as it was extracted from the letters. In the next section, I continue the study of the correspondence, specifically investigating the overlap between the journal volume and letters. The journal volume and letters were each valuable textual spaces in their own right, but the ways that they interrelated and overlaid each other were complex. Anne herself brought these two different texts and modes of writing into relation with each other. The intertextual connection between the correspondence and journal volume has a material and a performative role in Anne’s subjectivity and life that was distinct from the autonomous functions these writings also accomplished. An analysis of the production and purposes of the letters in the journal volume enables a more layered understanding of Anne’s authorial self and of the complex and connected role of her writings.

Anne most likely began with the summary page when dealing with her letters within the space of her journal volume. The summary pages were located in the front papers at the start of the journal volume. As I discussed earlier, these pages consisted of a three page list of letters that she sent and received, not only during her Paris sojourn, but also for the duration of the volume. When Anne received or posted a letter, the correspondent and sometimes the direction were noted against the date. One of the first summary notations in Paris was a good example of her practices. Isabella’s letter, sent whilst she herself was travelling, was received on 10 September in Paris and was noted as ‘IN (Inverness)’ (summary 1). Such a summary table provided a great deal of information in a very compact space. It would have allowed Anne to see immediately which letters were awaiting replies. The summary pages were structured around the notion of epistolary reciprocity. In Paris, she replied to all the letters from Aunt Anne and Mariana within a few days, and always within three weeks to those from Isabella and Miss Maclean. Anne was clearly a regular, habitual and systematic correspondent.
The correspondence Anne received or sent in Paris was noted in the journal entry space with a marginal mark. The marginal mark for letters was ‘L’. The format of the letter and correspondent were written in the journal entry itself, like Mariana’s letter which was received and recorded in the journal entry for 31 December. Anne ‘... found a Letter from M- (Lawton) waiting my return –’, she wrote, ‘3 pages the ends & 1 2/3 pages crossed tho’ rather wide’ (206). The employment of the letter ‘L’ mark was restricted to the journal margins; it did not occur in other textual areas like the indices for the Paris period. The letter ‘L’ mark was similar in practice to the use of the literary plus ‘+’ mark. Both signs designated intertextual elements like the letters or reading material that Anne brought into relation to her journal text. It was in addition, a compound mark, as the ‘L’ was used to note both the receipt and posting of a letter. The ‘L’ letter mark was employed to reference her correspondence, rather than to create symbolic meanings through her textual spaces, like her metasigns. As a reference mark, the ‘L’ letter mark indicated the shift from the journal entries to the summary list, or vice versa. Where the summary list noted the incidence of a letter, the ‘L’ letter mark designated these letters within the journal entry space.

Such methodical authorial habits can be highly relevant for modern researchers using Anne’s writings. The importance of the intertextual connection between the letters and journal volume becomes evident when examined more closely. The sorts of details she collated in the journal entries were not restricted to the format and correspondent of the letter. As part of the regular material that compiled a day’s journal entry, Anne paraphrased or summarised the contents of letters she wrote and received. Where the subject matter was significant, she would even make direct quotations from the letter. On 20 September, Anne wrote an entire journal page marked with quotation marks, prefacing the continuous quotations with the comment that ‘the following begins at line 8 from the bottom of page 3, & takes up almost all the 2 ends’ (79–80; 79). The quoted material in the journal entry was a direct transcription of what were the last pages of a letter to Isabella. Once Anne had concluded quoting the epistolary material in the journal entry, she had summarised the rest of the letter contents. Anne noted that, ‘except what I have extracted nothing particular in my letter’ (80). Thus, there was ‘nothing particular’ in the letter to Isabella, except what Anne had ‘extracted’ – the quotations from her letter to Isabella constituted this process of extraction. Importantly, Anne made extracts both from her own letters and from those she received. As an
historical repository, these journal entries sometimes extracted and recorded details about individual letters that have not survived to be part of Anne’s papers.

It is possible to trace some of the lost letters of the Paris period in the journal volume. Of the letters that were not extant in the papers some have been extracted, although these were seldom extracted in much detail. There was a single letter from Miss Maclean from the Paris period, which was an uncommon combination of both factors. The letter has not survived, but it was extensively extracted into the journal entries. Anne received the letter on 13 September and made extractions from it that took up nearly a page of her journal entry (76–77). Lengthy extractions such as these were most likely due to the gratifying contents of the letter, which clearly expressed Miss Maclean’s ‘partiality’ for Anne (77). ‘I know not any of her letters’, Anne wrote, ‘that has given me more pleasure’ (76). One of the letters to Isabella has also not survived in the papers. It was however, recorded in the journal entry for 20 September (79–80). These particular extracts took up more than a page in the journal entries explaining to Isabella, Anne’s side of ‘this treadmill business’. Due to the wealth of detail provided, these extracts gave the best account of the incident. As many of the intimate letters have not survived as archival material, they can only be reconstructed now through the intertextual connection between the journal entries and correspondence. Here, parts of these letters can be analysed from the letter extracts, to understand more fully Anne’s textual, sexual and sociable relations.

How were the letters brought into relation with the journal volume? A Boxing Day letter to Aunt Anne and the related journal entry illustrated the process. In her journal entry for 26 December, Anne wrote:

> From 12 ½ to 2, wrote ‘sealed and directed’ 3 pages & the ends to my aunt – merely to thank her for [h]er last & say I was going on well – “I am [b]etter, certainly” tho’ not gaining ground quite s[o f]ast as M- might at first expect – “tho’ a very low [d]iet does not make one [f]atter or st[r]onger, yet I bear it admirably (my pocket suffers most), [a]nd am in far better spirits than I was a month ago”… I feel myself “in good hands, & am perfectly satisfied – at all events, could you see the attention Mrs. Barlow pays me, you would be quite convinced, I have no want of nursing” … (200)

Anne began with noting the format of the letter, ‘three pages and the ends’. After that, she continued with a commentary on the letter’s contents, which included her thanks and a report on her condition to Aunt Anne. Next, she extracted into the journal entry the significant parts of her letter ML/159: concerning her health (ML/159, 3), which
was not as good as Mariana expected (ML/159, 1), her diet (ML/159, 2), and an acknow-
ledgement of Mrs. Barlow’s nursing (ML/159, 1). The quoted extracts were exact except her reference to Mariana which Anne paraphrased in unquote. Written in plain handwriting, the extracts were marked off from the other matters of the journal entry with double quotation marks “ “, even when Anne cited herself. Examining the relation between these formats showed that when Anne interpolated the correspondence into the journal entries, the extracts of her letters contained a detailed record of the format and significant contents of the correspondence.

Letter extracts could also be written in the journal entries in the crypt handwriting. Extracts of letters that were to, or from, all of Anne’s main correspondents in Paris – Aunt Anne, Mariana, Isabella and Miss Maclean – had at least one instance of the crypt handwriting. It was not the subject matter that warranted crypt handwriting, for plain handwritten extracts on the same topics also occurred in the journal entries. For instance, extracts concerning sartorial affairs, financial issues and servant matters all appeared crypted. These same topics were also extracted in the plain handwriting, with letters that were sent to and from Anne. Likewise, Anne made extracts of letters regarding her attractions and relationships with the Place Vendôme gentlewomen in both crypt and plain handwriting. Even the notorious ‘treadmill business’ occurred in the extracts in the journal entries in both crypt and plain handwriting. None of the letters, at least to Aunt Anne or Miss Maclean, were written in part or wholly in crypt handwriting; the encryption of these extracts was entirely done within the journal entries. Such a finding questions Helena Whitbread’s analysis of the crypt handwriting. For the same matters to be recorded plainly in the journal entries and at other points crypted, suggested that the rationale for crypt handwriting was other than furtive secretiveness. There was no such straightforward demarcation between the crypt and plain handwritten spaces in the letter extracts in the journal entries.

If only the journal entries are considered, not the letter extracts, it may have been the particular subject matter that led Anne to use the crypt handwriting. To follow Helena Whitbread, Anne did write about her clothes in the crypt handwriting in some instances. It was one explanation for Anne’s distinction, but it cannot be assumed that all such content was always or only contained in crypt handwriting. There was another more plausible reason for a strategic textual distinction: discretion. Withholding the crypt solution from her family, friends or lovers permitted Anne to maintain her privacy and
restrict access to her journal volume. When necessary, it appeared that the letters were similarly treated. The journal entry of 22 May 1817 demonstrated that she wrote letters to Mariana in the crypt hand. ‘Wrote 2 ½ pp. to M-,’ Anne noted, ‘chiefly in our secret alphabet which I have lately, in my letters to her, used a great deal’ (Whitbread 1988, 8). Perhaps it was their usual practice for Anne to write crypted letters to Mariana, as she did also on 8 February 1821 (Whitbread 1988, 145). Mariana evidently had a copy of the crypt solution. Anne’s use of the crypt handwriting was also strategic to the situation – the former journal entry related to a period in her relationship with Mariana when Charles, in a ‘jealous fit’, was controlling their correspondence (Whitbread 1988, 8). Anne gave another of her lovers, Miss Vallance, a copy of the crypt solution on 7 January 1821, but there was no evidence in Paris that she did the same with Mrs. Barlow (Whitbread 1988, 142). Only some intimate correspondents were admitted into the crypted passages. Discretionary use of the crypt and its solution allowed Anne to determine exactly who had access to what material in her letters and journal volume.

What became of the lost letters to or from Anne and Aunt Anne, Mariana, Isabella and Miss Maclean? The journal entries provide an explanation for the lack of extant correspondence – the letters were burnt by her or her correspondents during her lifetime. The practice was described in the journal entry for 10 November. Anne wanted to know what Mrs. Barlow would do with her letters, if they corresponded. ‘I asked’, Anne wrote, ‘if she would burn my letters’ (139). A journal entry from 20 September contained extracts from a letter to Isabella, which gave an account of the embarrassing ‘treadmill business’. Anne requested that Isabella never name the business to anyone and to ‘“burn the paper”’ (80). Destroying letters was a common way of dealing with sensitive subjects revealed in a correspondence. Anne destroyed her letters on a regular basis. On 20 November 1823, she wrote, she was ‘arranging my box of oldest letters & papers. Burnt several letters’ (Whitbread 1988, 314). ‘I hope I shall go on & destroy my letters as soon as answered’, she continued (Whitbread 1988, 314). Extracting letters allowed the more significant material of a correspondence to be recorded immediately and the letter destroyed. Extracting letters also enabled Anne to record epistolary contents discretely in crypt handwriting, beyond the life of an individual letter.

The practice of burning letters was centrally bound up with Anne’s textual subjectivity. Recalling the much quoted journal entry of 29 January 1821, Anne wrote she was busy,
Arranging & putting away my last year’s letters looked over & burnt several very old ones from indifferent people notes &c. & ‘some’ copies of my own letters written to Miss M. & Mrs. Duffin 10 & 12 years ago – sad stuff they seem to me now – i.e. too much palaver – & if I still felt twice as much (for I well know I never wrote what I did not think & feel at the time), half as much said would be more than enough to please me now – Tho’ the heart teem with feeling, let it speak briefly [“]Concise your diction, let your sense be clear, Nor with a weight of words fatigue ye ear” – 10 or 12 years ago, I could write in frank & easy carelessness “my heart is open as the day – if it esteems it loves, & if it loves adores” – o day of youth! how are the clouds of caution gathered round – how art thou darkened, & set amid the glimmerings of the past! – burnt all Caroline Greenwood’s foolish notes &c. & Mr. Montagu’s farewell verses that no trace of any man’s admiration may remain it is not meet[sic] for me I love & only love the fairer sex & thus beloved by them in turn my heart revolts from any other love than theirs. (SH:7/ML/E/4, 240)77

The passage allows a profound insight into the specific purpose of the practice of burning letters. Keeping and putting away the important letters of lovers and friends produced a textual space in the journal entry where Anne could declare her homosexual ‘love’ for women. Burning poetry from men like Mr. Montagu enabled her to reject the heterosexual ‘admiration’ that was an unsuitable love for Anne. Sorting and burning letters from ‘indifferent people’, letters from past affections such as Miss Mary Marsh (1770?–1855) and Mrs. Duffin (d.1825), and letters from previous infatuations like that with Caroline Greenwood allowed her to move beyond infatuations, in favour of the stronger resolution of her love for the ‘fairer sex’. The journal entry documented the epistolary process, keeping a record as a memoir of the correlated mechanisms that Anne employed to negotiate her sexual identity. It was through the physical and ritualistic habits of arranging or burning her letters that Anne actively constructed and maintained her own and other’s knowledge about her sexuality. Thus, the letter management practices, and the journal record of it, were used to structure a material space for the protection and affirmation of Anne’s sexual identity.

Anne’s identifications through her letter practices involved the collection and retention of letters, but keeping the original of a letter was not always possible. When this was the case, copying a letter would suit her epistolary purposes. The copy of the first letter to Mrs. Barlow after Anne departed from Paris was all that remained of the letter in the papers (ML/166). There were no extracts at all in the journal entries from the original letter she began writing on 4 April to Mrs. Barlow. Extracting the letter was insufficient, nor could Anne keep the letter, which was intended for Mrs Barlow. Instead, she made a copy of the original letter she wrote. The length of the copied text to Mrs. Barlow was
two and a half dense pages of directly quoted text kept in a letter-like format. Anne went to a great deal of effort to preserve the letter as a separate item that was not textually related to the journal volume. Similarly, a letter from Miss Maclean was retained as an independent item. It was extracted into the journal entries, but Anne could not part with the actual letter. Anne wrote in her journal entry of 13 September, ‘I shall keep & read it by wa[y] of stimulus’ (76). These two instances indicated her purpose for keeping letters: they were evidence. Anne may have kept letters and copies of letters as material and substantial evidence regarding her sexuality.

The significance of Anne’s epistolary processes went beyond an individual sexual agency, to a broader social understanding of sexuality and correspondences. An example was her request on 10 November that Mrs. Barlow burn her letters, discussed earlier (139). Mrs. Barlow promised she would do so. The conditions of Anne and Mrs. Barlow’s future correspondence were agreed to; Mrs. Barlow joined Anne’s other intimate friends and lovers as another of her amatory correspondents. This understanding permitted Anne certain liberties with her letter writing. As she wrote in the journal entry of 10 November:

*I should then write more at my ease assured that she would destroy all that it might be imprudent to keep this is sanction enough to my writing what I like observed that many things I said ‘it’ would not be prudent to write if she kept my letters. (139)*

Mrs. Barlow’s affirmative indicated her ‘sanction’ of an epistolary relationship. Anne understood that Mrs. Barlow agreed to have an entirely ‘imprudent’ correspondence. Both gentlewomen recognised that exchanging letters signified a deeper level of commitment, for it brought about a new intensity in their courtship. Establishing a correspondence could perform a sexual role in a relationship in the early nineteenth century. The art of crafting letters in a correspondence, or ‘epistolizing’ [sic], was a part of the textual process of seduction.

Another correspondence attested to other intimate attachments besides the courtship between Anne and Mrs. Barlow. Anne and Mariana’s correspondence came to bear an increasing weight in Mrs. Barlow’s judgement. On 17 November, Anne read aloud her letter to Mariana. Mrs. Barlow declared the ‘letter very warm enough from a husband to a wife’ (149). Anne read a number of letters to Mrs. Barlow, that she received from Mariana and replied to whilst she was in Paris. On 23 January 1825, at the risk of Mrs.
Barlow having a ‘little jealous fit’, Anne carefully edited Mariana’s letter as she read it (227). The editing occurred at the point where Mariana had acknowledged she was the ‘cause’ of Anne’s venereal condition (227). Anne and Mariana’s letters bore witness to their own epistolary and sexual relationship; the difficulty lay in Anne’s attempt to bring their correspondence into a forced sociability with Mrs. Barlow. In the journal entry from 23 January, Anne also read aloud to Mrs. Barlow, Mariana’s statement that it was she who was to be pitied, for “‘a stranger is gaining the opportunities I am losing of endearing myself to you by numberless nameless acts of love gratitude & attention’” (227). Anne finally persuaded Mrs. Barlow to send a message in return to Mariana, despite Mrs. Barlow’s inclination to “‘throw her into a ditch’” (227). The correspondence was a space where Anne enacted her homosexual relationships, even though these epistolary relationships were not always in easy relation to each other.

The incorporation of letters or a correspondence into a mode of seduction was not an amatory style unique to Anne. From the journal entries, it can be seen that Mrs. Barlow’s correspondents and their letters also came into the sexual dynamics of her relationship with Anne. Mrs. Barlow’s letters, far from being a straightforward exchange like Anne’s with a lover, were intricately embedded within a matrimonial situation that was in the process of determination. Mrs. Barlow’s complicated situation created an epistolary triangle between her suitor Mr. Hancock, Mrs. Barlow’s aunt and Mrs. Barlow. When Anne arrived in Paris, Mrs. Barlow was already being courted by letter by Mr. Hancock, a previous guest of Place Vendôme. Mrs. Barlow told her own aunt ‘all but n[o]t the name’, some time prior to this discussion on 21 November (155). Mrs. Barlow’s aunt was in full favour of encouraging the potential of the situation to develop into marriage. The aunt was, Anne found out on 24 January, ‘all for her marrying Mr. HH[sic]’ (229). Mrs. Barlow did not let Anne know of any of the contents of her aunt’s letters until 24 and 25 January, many months after Anne first became aware of the correspondence (229). Even as Anne prepared to depart from Paris, Mrs. Barlow had not given Mr. Hancock an answer. Mrs. Barlow remained unwilling, whilst she was attached and in love with Anne, to declare herself to Mr. Hancock either way.

Mrs. Barlow was not as forthcoming in sharing her intimate correspondence with Anne. Mrs. Barlow’s reply to Mr. Hancock’s initial letter on 3 November, Anne referred to with heavy emphasis in her journal entries as ‘the letter’. Despite Anne’s questioning Mrs. Barlow about the matter, Mrs. Barlow kept the contents of her letter secret for
some weeks. Mrs. Barlow finally conceded to Anne’s request to see the letter on 23 November.\textsuperscript{51} Mr. Hancock had ‘\textit{a tradesman-like hand}, Anne wrote, ‘\textit{well enough expre}[	extit{sic]} tho’ not [q]uite in the style of a gentleman’ (157). Mr. Hancock was a wealthy grocer who was the subject of a scandalous ‘crim.con’ trial, Anne found out from Mme. de Boyve on 20 November, for which he had to pay large damages to an unnamed husband for the seduction of his wife (153, 154). Criminal conversation, ‘crim.con’, was the legal recourse open to husbands to seek damages from the third party for the loss of a wife’s virtue. Katherine Binhammer made a detailed study of crim.con cases in her analysis of the English sex panic of the 1790s (Binhammer 1996).\textsuperscript{52} The trope of the female body, Binhammer argued, was increasingly policed as the site of extramarital sexuality. It was not the wife in this case, but Mr. Hancock and by association, Mrs Barlow. It ‘\textit{sounded oddly}, Anne said, for Mrs. Barlow to be known as a friend and correspondent of such a man, even a wealthy one (158). It was ‘\textit{foolish}, Mrs. Barlow admitted (158). To Anne, the situation could impugn Mrs. Barlow’s reputation of virtue.

Mr. Hancock himself brought the undecided situation to a head by writing a letter of declaration. Anne read the letter on 15 March (259). It was, she wrote the next day, ‘\textit{a love le}[	extit{tt}er in proper[ly] [wr]apt up terms’ (259). Over the seven months of the Paris period, Mr. Hancock used his solicitous letters to develop an amatory correspondence and relationship with Mrs. Barlow. From initial letters of interest and concern, Mr. Hancock shifted the mode of their correspondence into a courtly one, in which he could make a proposal of marriage to Mrs. Barlow. Even when Mrs. Barlow replied belatedly in some cases, her participation and continuing re-engagement in the epistolary connection maintained, rather than retracted, the sociability of the correspondence. Anne likewise brought her own correspondence with Mariana into the developing intimate space of the new relationship with Mrs. Barlow. Through her own epistolary connections, Anne actively created ways to sociably represent her sexuality to Mrs Barlow. These two complex networks of letters and their interaction with, and effects upon, the relationship between Anne and Mrs. Barlow show that the Romantic sociability of a correspondence could be concomitantly a sexual sociability in the early nineteenth century.

The space where Anne integrated the letters into the journal entries occurred within the overall journal structure and format. The point where Anne dealt with her letters was
marked out by her through a referential mark ‘L’, and the format of the letters, like the extracts, was distinguished with quotation marks, but the content entered into the journal entry came from the letters themselves. Yet, the areas where Anne interpolated her letters into the journal entries were otherwise undifferentiated from the daily habitual business of her journal writing. The entire journal volume was Anne’s repository for her summation and discussion of her letters, but these documents originated out of, or returned back into the journal space. The matters that she wrote about in the journal entries provided much of the content for the letters. Concomitantly, the content of the correspondence could on occasion be of enough significance, that Anne extracted it back into her journal space. Even where she created independent copies of the letters, or retained the actual letters, the process of managing, collecting or rejecting the material was recorded in the journal entries. Thus, the journal volume provided a context within which the material and discursive processes of the letters can be comprehended, as a space where the performance of Anne’s epistolary subjectivity could be reconstructed. The authorial space of the journal volume encompassed and incorporated all matters related to the correspondence. Thus, the entire journal volume was the originative or primary authorial space for Anne’s subjectivity.

The complex interrelation of the letters and journal volume showed that a consideration of Anne’s sexuality cannot be confined to a singular feature, or space in her writings. Anne found ways to write about her own sexuality through the construction of textual spaces such as crypt and plain handwriting, journal entries, indices, letters, extracts and lists. Anne was able to construct and negotiate her sexuality within her writings through the employment of textual management practices like crypting, marking, indexing, extracting, drafting, copying, sorting, burning, keeping and listing textual elements. Through the utilisation of Romantic cultural products like literature, imagery and discourse, Anne brought her sexual identification into the textual space of her writing. Lastly, through the creation of signifying systems such as the crypt and plain handwriting, symbols and marks, Anne was able to distinguish and retrace those aspects of her experience that were most significant to her. Like the textual imperative of erotic novels and pornography to record libertine sexual encounters, so too the journal volume, through the journal entries, index, markings and metasignage marked out Anne’s autobiographical project as a history of the sexual self. Therefore, sexuality was one aspect of Anne’s subjectivity that was pervasive, even fundamental, to all of her writings. Anne’s understanding of her homosexual identity, and her textual and sexual
practices should all be considered as equally structural, integral, social and historical as other categories of analysis employed to theorise her life and writings.

My analysis of Anne’s writings began with the journal volume that she wrote in Paris. At once practical and accessible, crypted and constructed into a narrative, the journal volume diversely reflected and mobilised cultural values of the early nineteenth century. Anne’s interest in scientific systems of classification was adapted to construct from the journal entries a history of her amatory progress in Paris in her index. It was here that her strongest identification with Byron and Romanticism can be seen in the textual production of self, sexuality and memoir. The letters and correspondence were distinct from the journal volume in style, arrangement and composition. The epistolary space that she constructed was discursively different from the journal space. It described and engaged a notion of the self that was also Romantic, but profoundly sociable; through letters Anne established, maintained or severed social relations with others in her society. The letters were the textual space that displayed Anne’s subjectivity within her sociable relations of familial, amatory, affective, classed and national networks. Anne brought her letters and journal volume into relation to each other, linking these two forms of writing. The last section of the chapter studied the intertextual connection between these types of writing. It was only through an analysis of the letters as they were integrated into the journal entries, that it was possible to understand Anne’s textual fashioning of her own sexual subjectivity in her historical context. It was the journal volume that contextualised the significance and meaning of the letters, revealing the enmeshed and complex purpose of the correspondence, ‘epistolizing[sic]’, sexuality and sociability. Anne’s textual account of her sociable relations in Paris will be the focus of the next chapter.
ENDNOTES

1 The first letter was from Isabella Norcliffe enquiring if it was Anne who was the visitor. Anne extracted the letter into her journal entry of 10 September (74). In the journal entry of 20 September, she quoted the long explanation she sent in reply to Isabella (79–80). Aunt Anne also mentioned it in a letter that Anne received 24 September (85). The response to Aunt Anne was in the papers, dated from 28 to 29 September (ML/149, 3–4), as well as discussed in the journal entry of 29 September (89). The final letter was from Mariana, which Anne received 1 October (92). The summary of Anne’s response was written in the journal entry for 10 October (99).

2 For gossip about Anne amongst the guests and visitors to Place Vendôme, see 27 September, 3 and 18 October, and 17 and 18 November (88, 94, 109, 150, 151).

3 For crypt handwritten journal entries, see 10, 12 and 27 September, 3 and 18 October, and 17 and 18 November (74, 75, 88, 94, 109, 150, 151).

4 For plain handwritten letters extracted into the journal entries, see 20, 24 and 29 September, and 1 and 10 October (79–80, 85, 89, 92, 99).

5 In one of the rare errors in the journal entries, Anne had incorrectly stated she read aloud her journal account from 26 October (252). After reading it, Anne had continued that ‘Mrs. B- anno[s]ed that I would not read her that part about M. Chateavillard[sic] I had given Madame de B- [¶] my honour I would never mention’ (252). The journal entry for 26 October did not contain a discussion about M. Chateauvillard; the matter Anne referred to was in the journal entry of 29 October (117, 121–22). By 3 March, she was beyond the journal entry for 26 October, which had already been read to Mrs. Barlow a week earlier on 28 February (250).

6 Anne’s incursion of a cross whilst thinking about Ann Walker for the ‘first time’ on 5 September 1832 was not explained by Jill Liddington (Liddington 2003, 56).

7 There was a single instance in the journal entries in Paris where Anne ‘incurred a cross’ that was unmarked, see 27 January (230).

8 The rare exceptions were 22 and 29 November, and 23 January (157, 167, 227). These plus ‘+’ marks were marked in the margin further into the journal entry. True to form however, all of these instances were still accompanied by the explicit note that Anne ‘incurred a cross’.

9 Other timed instances of a ‘cross’, for Anne’s rising time, see 13 October (as an ‘x’ mark), 28 November, and 10 and 14 January (101, 164, 216, 220); for Anne’s bedtime, see 16 October (as an ‘x’ mark), 11 and 25 November, 5, 9, 17 and 18 December, and 3 January (108, 140, 161, 175, 180, 191, 192, 209). On 1 January, Anne wrote of Mrs. Barlow, ‘I incurred a cross while thinking of all the liberties she had allowed me to take’ (207). However, the mark at Anne’s rising and bed times in the journal margin was too indistinct to make out. The two crosses for the journal entry of 10 January were in fact duplicates, for Anne wrote of the one instance of her incurring a cross, but marked it against the time as well as in the
margin further into the journal entry against the incursion (216). The journal entry for 29 November instanced a linked pair of the plus ‘+’ signs, both marked against the journal entry text, rather than Anne’s rising or bed times. The first cross marked Anne’s attempts to imitate her doctor’s examination to experience ‘all the pleasure of coition’ (166). It was the second instance of the plus ‘+’ sign further on in the journal margin, that Anne noted she had ‘incurred a cross my own way’ (167).

10 The only exception was a sole instance of a double plus ‘++’ sign in the journal entry of 20 November (154). It most likely related to the matter of Anne’s scheme with Mme. de Boyve which will be discussed further in Chapter Two.

11 For what Anne was reading, recommended or discussed, noted in the journal entries, see 20 September, 9 (twice) and 19 (twice) October, 13 (twice) and 26 November, and 5 February (80, 98, 110, 142, 162, 237), and noted in the index, see 20 September, and 10, 15, 17 and 26 October (index 8–10); for sermons noted in the index, see 31 October (index 10); for the Proteus Anguinus noted in the index, see 2 October (index 9); for book purchases and gifts, noted in the journal entries, see 16 October, 11 November and 2 December (108, 141, 172), and noted in the index, see 17 and 18 September, 6 December, 5 and 16 February, and 23 March (index 8, index 12, index 16–17); and for learning languages, noted in the journal entries, see 4 October and 1 November (twice) (95, 126), and noted in the index, see 11 and 14 September, 4 (twice), 7 and 11 October, and 12 and 29 January (index 7–9, index 15–16).

12 For Joannes Secundus, noted in the journal entries, see 9, 16 and 19 October (98, 108, 110), and noted in the index, see 26 October (index 10).


14 Read in combination, the index and journal entry regarding the ‘jean’ discussion were priceless. In the index, Anne noted with waggish brevity, that her journal entry contained an ‘explanation of the word jean’ (index 14). The corresponding journal entry recorded how Anne enquired of Mme. Galvani the meaning of the word ‘jean’. Mme. Galvani ‘began to say something I only half understood & not liking her to explain much before Mrs B- she wrote in pencil jean foutre so that it seems th[i]s name is used to signify foutre that is fucker & it would not do to talk of old fuckers’ (196–97). Indeed.

15 The footnote hash was used as a pair, to mark the insertion and to mark the footnote information, written either in the margin or at the bottom of the page. For paired examples, noted in the journal entries, see 3 and 5 September (69, 71), and noted in the index, see 19 February (index 16). The single hash on 13 September referred the reader to the journal entry for 21 June (with no hash), at the start of Anne’s 1824–25 journal entries (76, 1–2). Likewise, the hash on 18 November was marked at the additional information, but was missing its first referent hash sign (151). There was one intriguing instance of a pair of double ‘##’ hashes in the journal entry for 14 October (104–05). It linked two parts of a single conversation about Marie Antoinette between Anne and Mrs. Barlow spread over two pages, which will be discussed further in Chapter Three. Very rarely, Anne used a pair of section ‘§’ marks to override the hash ‘#’ sign function, to footnote and to index, see 16 September, 28 December and 2 January (77[sic], 202, 207). Once, Anne struck through the pair of section ‘§’ signs to make a hashed footnote as ‘§’, see 4
January (211). Unlike the override section marks, this instance was not correlated with an index comment. The single instance of double section '§§' marks struck through in the journal margin of 5 November as ' §§' was an error, where Anne correctly inserted the indexation section marks further into the journal entry (132).

16 For examples of 'vid.' in the text of journal entries in plain hand, see 20 (twice), 23 September, 1, 6 (twice), 10 (twice), 11, 13, 15 (thrice), 20 and 31 October, 13 and 18 November, 12 (twice) December, 4 January and 7 March (79, 80, 84, 92, 96, 99, 102, 107, 111, 125, 143, 151, 187, 211, 254); for journal margins, see 10 and 12 September, 9 and 16 December, and 10 January (74, 75, 181, 191, 217); and for 'vide' in journal entry text in crypt hand, see 3 November, and 5 and 15 December (128, 176, 190). The crypt hand 'vide' did not occur in the journal margins or in the index at all in Paris. The plain hand abbreviation 'vid.' occurred in the index text on every page of the indices for Paris (index 1–25). In the index margins, 'vid.' occurred only twice, see 13 and 28 January (index 15).

17 Baron Guillaume Dupuytren (1777–1835) was a French doctor and pathologist who attended at the Hôtel Dieu for more than thirty years, eventually becoming the surgeon in chief.

18 According to the Oxford English Dictionary, 1989 second edition, s.v. 'grubble' meaning to grope, was a term used from the late seventeenth to early eighteenth century, and subsequently obsolete. However, Anne’s use suggested the term continued to be used in the early nineteenth century. Anne possibly sourced it from the poems of John Dryden (1631–1701) written in the style of Ovid (43 BC – AD 17), ‘Ovid’s Amours’. A stanza in Elegy IV read:

When all depart, while compliments are loud,
Be sure to mix among the thickest crowd:
There I will be, and there we cannot miss,
Perhaps to grumble, or at least to kiss. (Ovid's Art of Love 1884?).

Anne was intimately familiar with the original classic text which Dryden was imitating, Ovid’s Art of Love (c. 2 BC). For the sexual details from Ovid that Anne related to Mrs. Barlow, see 1 and 5 December, and 22 January (170, 175, 227).

19 October totalled thirty four pages, November forty two pages and December thirty six pages.

20 September totalled twenty three pages and January twenty seven pages.

21 February totalled fifteen pages and March sixteen pages.

22 For Mr. Hancock’s age, see the journal entry of 20 November, where Mrs. Barlow told Anne he was now aged twenty seven (154).

23 For the letters received and sent regarding ‘this treadmill business’ as Anne discussed in her journal entries, see 20, 24 and 29 September (79–80, 85, 89).

24 For the St. Cloud fête, see 26 September (86–87); for the King’s return and review, see 27 and 30 September (88, 90); for Luxembourg paintings, see 29 September (89); and for the French Opera, see 29 September (90).
For Melle. de Sans’ age, see the journal entries of 2 and 14 October, where Anne noted Melle. de Sans was in her twenty sixth year but not yet twenty six (93, 105).

For alternate days, see also 5 (for 4), 7 (for 6) and 27 (for 26) September (71, 73, 88).

For alternate days, see 17 (for 16), 18 (for 17), 23 (for 22) and 31 (for 30) December (191, 192, 196, 206).

For alternate days, see 2 (for 1), 5 (for 4), 16 (for 15), 21 (for 20) and 25 (for 24) January, and 2 (for 1) February (207, 212, 222, 225, 229, 235).

For the exceptions, see 11 (for 10) and 26 (for 25) February, and 11 (for 10) March (240, 250, 255).

See 2 April, where Anne noted, she ‘wrote the whole of Wednesday, Thursday, yesterday & today’ (269). The travelling journal entries were written up slightly differently to the usual journal entries. Distinctly organised around the theme of travel, these journal entries were comprehensive and detailed records, complete with margin notes for easy referencing.

For rough drafting the index, see 20 September, 13 and 26 December, and 10 and 23 January (80, 189, 200, 217, 228).

One of Isabella’s letters was noted by Anne in her summary list as from ‘Miss Norcliffe’ (summary 1). From the corresponding journal entry of 22 November, it became clear Miss Norcliffe was not Charlotte (1788–1844), Isabella’s sister; it was instead a rather formal reference to Isabella, more usually noted as ‘IN-’ (157).

According to the Oxford English Dictionary, 1989 second edition, s.v. ‘epistolize’ meaning to write a letter, first came into usage in the late seventeenth century.

For Anne’s state of health, see the letters from 29 November (backdated) ML/155 and 7 December ML/157; for the system of treatment, see the letter of 12 December ML/158; and for treatment effects and bathing, see the letters dated 26 December ML/159 and 5 January ML/190.

For Mrs. Barlow’s help, see the letter of 30 January ML/161; and for Anne’s recovery, see the letter of 10 to 14 February ML/163.

For Cordingley disturbing Anne and Mrs. Barlow before sex, see 18 January, 3 February and 31 March (222, 235, 267); for during sex, see 31 December, 4, 9 and 30 January, and 11 February (206, 210, 215, 233, 240); and for after sex, see 22 November, 22 and 28 December, 10 February and 31 March (157, 195, 203, 239, 267). On 10 January, Cordingley disturbed Anne ‘in the midst of incurring a cross’ (216).

For other letters to Mrs. Barlow used to display her character, see 14 November and 10 January (145, 217).

There was a single instance of Anne’s receipt of a note, marked in the journal margin with the note ‘N’ mark, in the journal entries in Paris. On 12 March, Anne noted in her journal entry that Mme. Galvani had sent her two tickets for the Chambre des Députés, or Chamber of Deputies in the Parliament, ‘with a very civil note’ from Mme. la comtesse de Fumeé’ (255).
There was just a single error in the seven months of journal entries from Anne’s sojourn in Paris. The letter to Aunt Anne that Anne backdated, ML/155, was incorrectly letter ‘L’ marked against the journal entry for 30 November (169). Anne struck through the mark and correctly re-entered it against the 1 December when the letter was posted (169). There were also two letters in Paris that were missing the letter ‘L’ mark in the journal margins. The first was a letter she received from Miss Maclean on 5 October, which was not marked (95). The second was a letter Anne wrote to Isabella on 15 February, which she recorded in the journal entry for this date, but did not letter ‘L’ mark (243). According to the summary of letters list, Anne posted the letter on 18 February (summary 2). Unusually, the relevant journal entry had no record of the letter being posted, nor a letter ‘L’ mark (244).

For crypted handwritten extracts on sartorial affairs, see Miss Vere Hobart’s (n.d.) letter enclosed in Miss Maclean’s letter, regarding the amount of money spent on Miss Hobart’s dress, 13 September (77); for financial issues, see the letter to Aunt Anne asking for money, 14 February (242); for servants matters, see Aunt Anne’s letter that the new cook will suit her place, 19 December (193).

For plain handwritten extracts on sartorial affairs, see the letter to Aunt Anne and Mariana regarding shawls worn in Paris and their prices, 13 September (76); for financial issues, see Aunt Anne’s letter telling Anne the loan of money was remitted as she requested, 3 March (252); for servant matters, see Aunt Anne’s letter that the cook was not well enough to keep her place, 28 January (231).

For Anne’s attractions in crypt handwriting, see Miss Maclean’s letter regarding her jealousy over Anne, 13 September (76–77); and for plain handwriting, see the letter to Aunt Anne that Mrs. Barlow attended to and nursed her well, 26 December (200).

For ‘this treadmill business’ in crypt handwriting, see Isabella’s letter asking if it was Anne who visited the treadmill, 10 September (74); and for plain handwriting, see the letter in reply to Isabella that gave a lengthy explanation of the business, 20 September (79–80).

For instance, see the letter dated 10 to 14 February in the papers asking Aunt Anne for a loan of ‘fifty or sixty pounds’ (ML/163, 3). The letter extract in the journal entry of 14 February, for the ‘fifty or sixty pounds more’ appeared in crypt handwriting (242).

Whether correspondents crypted their replies to Anne was inconclusive from the journal entries in Paris. For instance, see Mariana’s letter Anne extracted in her journal entry for 23 January (227). The extracts were crypted, which included some direct quotations from the letter that were also crypted. Anne read part of the letter to Mrs. Barlow, but noted how she turned down the ‘top of the second page’ (227). It was to conceal a phrase in Mariana’s letter, that specifically acknowledged it was Mariana who was the ‘cause’ of Anne’s venereal condition (227). The incident suggested Mariana might not have used crypt handwriting in her letters, even regarding extremely sensitive topics like venereal disease, if Anne had to turn down pages to prevent Mrs. Barlow reading the letter.

See also a letter from Miss Maclean that arrived on 13 September, which enclosed a letter written by Miss Maclean’s niece Miss Hobart. After Anne read Miss Hobart’s letter, she was instructed by Miss Maclean to burn it. ‘I am to burn the letter’, Anne wrote (77).
According to the *Oxford English Dictionary Online*, 2001 draft revision, s.v. ‘meet for’, [http://www.dictionary.oed.com](http://www.dictionary.oed.com) (accessed 24 May 2006), meaning suitable, fit or proper for some purpose, was a phrase used from the late fifteenth century to early twentieth century, and subsequently obsolete.

For Anne’s reading aloud letters from Mariana, noted in the journal entries, see 3 and 5 November, 5 and 31 December, and 23 and 24 January (128, 131–32, 175, 206, 227, 229), and noted in the index, see 5 November (index 11); for the letters to Mariana, noted in the journal entries, see 17 November, 9 December, and 3 and 24 January (149, 180, 209, 229), and noted in the index, see 17 November (index 11). Anne regularly read her letters to Aunt Anne, to Mrs. Barlow, see 1 and 8 December, and 31 January (169, 179, 234); and from Aunt Anne, see 5, 14 and 26 November (131, 145, 162). On rare occasions Anne read aloud other letters, such as her letters from Miss Maclean, see 3 November (128); for letters to Miss Maclean, see 15 December (190); for letters from Isabella, see 10 December (182); and for letters to Isabella, see 9 December (180).

Mrs. Barlow’s aunt was possibly the aunt mentioned in the journal entry of 11 November (140). The aunt was related by blood, as she was Mrs. Barlow’s mother’s sister, but also by marriage, for she was the late widow of Colonel Barlow’s oldest brother, General Barlow (n.d.). Mrs. Barlow’s aunt was ‘the widow of her husband’s oldest brother General Barlow who was also her aunt her mother’s fister’, Anne wrote (140).

For instances of ‘*the letter*’, see 8 and 20 (twice) November (136, 154), and for the unemphatic form ‘*the letter*’, see 3 (four times), 20 (thrice) and 21 November (127–29, 154–55, 155–56).

For other letters from Mr. Hancock that Mrs. Barlow read or showed to Anne, noted in the journal entries, see 26 January, and 15 and 16 March (230, 259), and noted in the index, see 16 March (index 17).

Originally, details of crim.con cases were published as pamphlets, but as Tim Hitchcock has noted, by the 1780s and 1790s sets of cases were available in book format, like the *Cuckold’s Chronicle* (1793) (Hitchcock 1997, 16).
CHAPTER TWO
ANNE’S SOCIETY:

SOCIABILITY IN PARIS 1824–25

Just two weeks before Anne was due to leave Paris, Anne and Mrs. Barlow went on a visit to the prison of the Conciergerie at the Palais de Justice on 14 March (257–58). It was in this prison that Marie Antoinette, the late Queen of France, was locked up during the French Revolution before her death by guillotine in 1793. The two gentlewomen found Marie Antoinette’s prison cell powerfully evocative. Anne wrote in her journal entry of the dramatic, even embodied, effect of the place on them. She recorded that,

the formerly dark, damp cells where Marie Antoinette & the princess Elizabeth were confined (separated only by a wall though they did not know they were so near) is therefore interesting, and the cells themselves, now turned into an Expiatory chapel, are particularly so – Lighted and aired ventilated as they now are, Mrs. B- could still scarcely bear the cold damp floor – what must it have been during the revolution? (257)

Anne’s rhetorical question – ‘what must it have been during the revolution?’ – was unusual in the journal entries. It signalled the strength of the embodied impression she experienced visiting the late Queen’s last residence. Similar instances of homosexual romanticisation regarding the late Queen’s life in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries were termed ‘Marie Antoinette obsession’ by Terry Castle in The Apparitional Lesbian (Castle 1993, 107–49). For Mrs. Barlow, the entire impression of the place proved to be too much for her and her embodied reaction was stronger; after their visit she came down with a cold from the damp floors (258).

The Sapphic romance of the late Queen of France’s life and tragedy of her fate made an impression on both Anne and Mrs. Barlow. Anne was a highly sophisticated collector of cultural and textual representations of desire that she drew upon and used to construct her own homosexual self-identification. There was more to come. After their tour of Marie Antoinette’s cell, the two gentlewomen moved on to the Archives. In the Archives, they were shown some of the criminal records that were housed there. Anne especially noticed the case of ‘the famous poisoner mentioned by Mme. de Sevigné[sic] in her letters’ (257). Marie de Rabutin-Chantal Sévigné (1626–96), or Madame de
Sévigné, was a famous French gentlewoman of the refined and intellectual atmosphere of the salons, or précieuse, who was renowned in her own lifetime for her loving friendship with her confidant Marie-Madeleine La Fayette (1634–93), or Madame de La Fayette. The last notable item on Anne and Mrs. Barlow’s day tour was the papal proceedings against Joan of Arc (1412?–31). Included amongst these papers, Anne wrote, was ‘the order of the Pope to have the square [or Place] at Rouen planted with trees in memory of poor Joan’ (257–58). Anne’s sympathy was elicited by the story and life of the female warrior ‘poor Joan’. It was a tour that could have satisfied some of Anne’s curiosity about women who took up roles that were other than prescribed and normative for gentlewomen of her era.

Anne’s autodidactic reading was diverse and exhaustive. She knew of the rumours whispered about Marie Antoinette’s sexual relationships with women, a topic discussed with Mrs. Barlow at the beginning of their relationship, which I will detail in Chapter Three. It was likely that Anne, in the same way, had speculated about the intimate histories of Mme. de Sévigné and Joan of Arc. She may have interpreted her tour with Mrs. Barlow as a procession from the Sapphic significance of the gossip surrounding the late Queen of France, to the romantic and platonic relationship of the letters of Mme. de Sévigné to her friend, and finally to the costumed and complex gendering of the female warrior Joan of Arc. In itself, the tour was a good example from the Paris period of Anne’s thorough reading of cultural imagery, illustrating the processes of her identification with diverse sources of sexual knowledge. However, the women that noted in the journal entry could have had meaning more pertinent to Anne and Mrs. Barlow’s situation. Marie Antoinette, Mme. de Sévigné and Joan of Arc were all women who, in their own lifetimes, displayed variable degrees of success with the fine social art of managing one’s sexual reputation. Within the context of Anne and Mrs. Barlow’s relationship in Paris, these women illustrated a different and very specific meaning; for Anne, and more especially for Mrs. Barlow, the lives of these famous women were an object lesson.

The scandal surrounding Marie Antoinette regarding her sexual appetites was political fuel against her husband King Louis XVI (1754–93). Elizabeth Colwill has analysed the pornography of the French Revolution, which depicted the Queen as a tribade, or, passing for a woman but sexually acting like a man, in order to critique the corruption of the monarchy (Colwill 1996, 58). The doubts about Joan of Arc’s religious calling
centred on questions regarding her transvestism and sexual purity. It was a conflation of ideologies seen in many of the examples examined by Rudolf Dekker and Lotte van de Pol in their history of female transvestism in early modern Europe *The Tradition of Female Transvestism* (Dekker and van de Pol 1989, 43). The lives of both these women were shaped by the social and discursive representation of their sexuality. The ‘monstrous’ desires of the Queen of France were partial justification for her beheading in 1793. Similarly, Joan of Arc’s transvestism inverted the ideological notion of ‘woman’ and implicated her faith as heresy, according to Marina Warner’s feminist biography *Joan of Arc*, validating her death by burning at the stake in 1431 (Warner 1981, 139–58). Of these real women’s lives, Mme. de Sévigné’s close epistolary relationship with her friend Mme. de La Fayette was the most successfully managed social relation. According to Elizabeth Wahl in *Invisible Relations*, anxiety about female intimacy in Enlightenment France particularly centred on the précieuse group of intellectual women, like Mme. de Sévigné (Wahl 1999, 173–211). Yet, in her lifetime, Mme. de Sévigné’s letters were published and widely read amongst the aristocracy. The close acquaintance Anne displayed with the details of Mme. de Sévigné’s letters suggested she had sought them out precisely for their depiction of the intimate relationship between the author and her friend.

Historically very different examples, the lives of these three women were similar in their social import for Anne and Mrs. Barlow. What was at issue for Anne or Mrs. Barlow was how these women failed or salvaged their social character from the aspersion of sexual and gender difference. Anne began thinking over the praxis of sexual relations two years before on 3 August 1822 with her visit to the Ladies of Llangollen, mentioned earlier. ‘I cannot help thinking that surely it was not platonic’, she wrote in her journal entry (Whitbread 1988, 210). Whether the Ladies of Llangollen were lovers was less important, than the example the two gentlewomen set, managing the representation of their relationship as a platonic ideal. Until Anne met and developed her confidential relationship with the gentlewoman Miss Pickford, she perhaps thought herself alone in her desires, or unlikely to be loved as she loved. As she told Mariana on 17 September 1823, Anne had ‘met with those who could feel in unison with me’ (Whitbread 1988, 297). Anne had supposed the relationship between the Ladies of Llangollen was sexual. Yet, these two gentlewomen effectively retained their ability to determine their social agency in early nineteenth century society. Miss Pickford’s exclusive attachment to Miss Threlfall was an actual relationship that was
justified as a romantic friendship, which provided Anne with a praxis for, not a denial of, erotic love between gentlewomen friends.

Anne’s relationship with Mrs. Barlow in Paris was to raise exactly such questions about the management of sociability and sexual relations. After she arrived at 24 Place Vendôme, Anne swiftly became involved in the domestic concerns of the household. Soon after her arrival, Mme. de Boyve began encouraging a match between Anne and a gentleman guest, the young Irishman, Mr. Franks (b.1800?). 4 Primarily, however, Anne’s amorous attentions were progressively engaged with two of the gentlewomen in the Place Vendôme household. One was the ‘pale & rather interesting’ French gentlewoman, Mademoiselle de Sans, Anne noted in her journal entry on 1 October (92). The other gentlewoman she was interested in was the ‘pretty’ English mother and widow, Mrs. Barlow, as Anne told Miss Maclean in a letter from 6 February (ML/162, 4). As Anne’s courtship of Mrs. Barlow intensified, the domestic, sociable and sexual matters of the house became increasingly tumultuous. A conflict with Mme. de Boyve about Mrs. Barlow’s character, and the nature of her sexual reputation within the household, precipitated Anne and Mrs. Barlow’s departure from the pension. Together, the two gentlewomen took up residence at 15 Quai Voltaire. Anne remained there with Mrs. Barlow for a few more months before she returned home in March 1825.

Anne used a specific margin marker to mark out the material conventions associated with sociability. It was the marker ‘Vc’, or sometimes a single ‘V’ in the journal margin, which regularly recorded the formal and conventional practices of calling and visiting. The marker was both classed and gendered – Anne used it to denote those visits and calls between others of her class, as well as those of her gender. There were very few ‘V’ or ‘Vc’ marks against gentlemen’s names – such markings would have indicated a different relationship towards a single gentlewoman such as Anne, one that was matrimonial or amatory in nature in the early nineteenth century. 5 The first variation of the marker was used to indicate when someone paid a visit to Anne and she returned the call, thus ‘Vc’. It could also indicate when Anne received or left a card during the visit. 6 The second variation of the marker was the single ‘V’, which represented a visit that was not returned or, alternatively, where a call was due to be made. Anne used both of these variants in relation to many of the other guests at the Place Vendôme and to her visitors whilst she was in Paris. Unlike the other marginal markers, there was no intertextual or classificatory element to the particular symbol –
instead, it was specifically bound up with the structures of sociability within Anne’s culture and their registration in the journal entries.

These sociable marks were one location where a sociable and textual interconnection was visible in Anne’s writings. An interconnection was also evident in Anne’s employment of style, particularly of satire and comedy, which was highly sophisticated in her writings in Paris. The journal entries and correspondence were not extended forms of humour; rather, humour as a form of social critique was a stylistic tone that was more fragmentary or succinct in nature. Anne’s commentary in Paris was pithy, waggish, often sly and epigrammatic – it was most evident in her acerbic descriptions of the guests. There was for instance one visitor, a Miss Morse (n.d.), who Anne described in the journal entry of 11 December as ‘very pretty, but had her gown far too low behind & too much off her shoulders & jumped too much in dancing quadrilles’ (185). Travelling presented many opportunities for the deployment of this particular form of critique. Style in the journal writing was, as Clara Tuite has analysed, a textual and sexual deployment of sociability, ‘elaborating the complicated relations between the social system and the literary system, sociability and textuality, social agency and textual effects’ (Tuite 2002, 186). In noting the boundaries of normative social behaviour, Anne’s satiric and commentarial writing actively marked out both the maintenance and transgressions of these social interactions.

Anne’s sociability was not an aspect of her historical context that has received much attention in the published versions of her manuscripts. The social context of her environment was unstated in Helena Whitbread’s books focused on Anne’s sexuality. Jill Liddington did a great deal towards supplementing such a focus, but did not consider the relation between Anne’s sexuality and sociality as an important component of Anne’s early nineteenth century history. Muriel Green retrieved the adventurous aspects of Anne’s life, but not as a modus vivendi of a Romantic sociability. This chapter focuses on Anne’s sociability in Paris, as a central concern for the scholarship on her sexuality and writings. I begin by briefly setting the scene of the residence at 24 Place Vendôme, in ‘Anne at the Place Vendôme’. In the subsequent sections, I consider the variety of social and emotional relationships Anne formed with other residents of the Place Vendôme guesthouse. There was the sustaining gentlewomen’s network formed between Anne, Mrs. MacKenzie (n.d.) and her daughter, which I consider first. Next there is the intense friendship and unrequited passion of Anne’s interest in Melle.
de Sans. The matchmaking efforts of Mme. de Boyve and Anne’s gentlemanly regard for Mr. Franks follow. The last section on Mme. de Boyve considers in detail the social spectacle that developed between the proprietor of the Place Vendôme and her guests, Anne and Mrs. Barlow. I analyse the measures Anne and Mrs. Barlow took in that instance to allay any problems that might impugn the social and sexual character of the two gentlewomen. It was this drama with Mme. de Boyve about respectability that led to Mrs. Barlow and Anne departing from the Place Vendôme guesthouse.

**ANNE AT THE PLACE VENDÔME:**
*A Little World*

Anne stayed at 24 Place Vendôme for most of her Paris sojourn, a residence that was owned by the de Boyve family. From the society of Place Vendôme, there were a small number of gentlewomen, and one gentleman, who became acquainted and socialised with Anne in Paris. During her stay, she became part of a circle of close English gentlewomen friends, consisting of two mothers and their adolescent daughters, Mrs. and Miss MacKenzie (b.1808?) and Mrs. and Miss Barlow. The most significant acquaintance Anne made in the small group of English gentlewomen was Mrs. Barlow, who became her lover in Paris. A close and intimate network was established amongst the set of women of a similar class position. As such, they gave each other advice, acted on behalf of each other’s interests and gave Anne important social support. Their network operated to recognise and maintain the status of the group and importantly, allowed interaction as a classed and nationalised whole rather than on an individual basis. A few weeks after Anne arrived in Paris, she wrote in her journal entry about the Place Vendôme. On 15 October, she recorded that Mrs. Barlow ‘has faid before this house was a little world’ (107). Anne agreed, ‘I begin to think so already’ (107). The Place Vendôme household, with its complex domestic relations and tensions, was a study writ small of early nineteenth century English expatriate society.

Anne’s arrival in Paris followed a short and incredibly busy stay in London. The night of 1 September, when she and Cordingley finally arrived in Paris, Anne especially used a single section ‘§’ mark to note the place where the Paris trip began. In her journal margin, Anne recorded in a vertically written margin note that ‘Place Vendôme no. 24, = Paris’ (67). The next morning, she was introduced to many of her fellow guests. A number of French and English people came and went at the Place Vendôme. Many of
the French visitors were not resident at the pension, but were invited as company for the entertainments held there in the evenings. The remarks in the journal accounts about these inconsequential guests and visitors were made in passing. Nonetheless, any commentary was usually accompanied by sociable, familial and geographical affiliations. There was, for instance, a journal entry from 4 September which noted that ‘our Mr. & Mrs. Brande are from Arlington St. London’ (70). Mr. Brande (n.d.) was not only ‘apothecary to the royal family’, but he was also ‘brother to Brande (William) the professor of chemistry [at] the royal[sic] Institution’ (70). Other guests were of enough importance for Anne to mention them in her letters to Aunt Anne, in her epistolary descriptions of the pension. Most of the guests were seldom mentioned in the journal entries; some received only a single mention in the entirety of Anne’s writings in Paris.

A number of other guests became part of the society of the Place Vendôme household, but were not substantially included into the close circle of Anne’s women friends. These guests cropped up frequently in the journal entries but failed to make the transition from a journal record of their drawing room discussions, to the more social and familiar practice of private calls and conversations. Such acquaintances consisted mostly of other English gentlewomen with only one French guest amongst the set, a Madame Carbonier (b.1780?)⁸. She was, Anne wrote on 5 November, ‘a very good sort of amiable respectable person’ (131). Another guest Miss Vigors (n.d.), a young English girl, caused a minor scandal on 7 December, the only time her name was noted in the journal entries, due to her ownership of Rousseau’s *La Nouvelle Héloïse* (1761) (178).

Some of the gentlewomen Anne mentioned were not guests at all, but acquaintances of fellow guests at the Place Vendôme. The people who belonged to the extended social network were a part of regular entertainments, parties or outings. There was for instance, the friend of a guest Miss Pope – the ‘rather vulgar’ Mrs. Kidd (n.d.), as Anne recorded on 30 September (90). Anne and her fellow English lodgers formed a distinct and insular national coterie at the Place Vendôme, but the set formed a part of, and was connected to, a larger social network of British travellers and emigrants in Paris.

There was as well the whole range of women who called at Place Vendôme for economic reasons in search of custom or employment. Madame Galvani was one of the genteel gentlewomen dependent on the trade of the guests at Place Vendôme. Mme. Galvani or, more frequently, ‘Mme. G-’ was Anne’s French and Italian language teacher in Paris. She fascinated Anne with stories of her own interesting but now
impoverished life. However, being a woman of the world, Mme. Galvani was also one of Anne’s key sources of salacious gossip, sexual information, and illicit and erotic book purchases in Paris. ‘She alone is worth coming to Paris for’, Anne wrote of Mme. Galvani in her first letter to Miss Maclean, finished on 12 September (ML/147, 3). It was most likely only Mariana, Isabella and Aunt Anne who were aware of Anne’s other reason for coming to Paris: to seek expert medical treatment for her venereal disease. The French lessons were one of the stated reasons she publicised amongst her friends and family for travelling to Paris. Anne was taken with Mme. Galvani from the start and the two gentlewomen formed a confidential and close friendship that warrants further study. For Mme. Galvani to have such a high standing in Anne’s estimation suggested that the sociable aspect of the Parisian sojourn was as important a rationale as the medical and sexual purposes of the journey.

Gentlemen were the most frequent social callers upon the guests at the pension, invited by the proprietor, Mme. de Boyve. Anne noted, for instance, the French gentlemen who called, like Monsieur Sorteval (n.d.) ‘with mustaches[sic]’ on 4 September, M. Bellevue (n.d.), ‘(he is a captain in the National Guard)’, and M. Dacier (n.d.), ‘(a banker in Geneva)’ on 26 September (70, 86). There were also some gentlemen who were guests at Place Vendôme, such as Mr. Moore (n.d.). Anne made such rare mention of these gentlemen that they seemed entirely peripheral to her authorial attention. For instance, Mme. de Boyve’s husband Monsieur de Boyve (n.d.), who was also the proprietor of Place Vendôme, was mentioned only a few times over the entire seven month period of Anne’s stay. Altogether, the entire group of people – visitors and guests, gentlemen and women – were considered by Anne to be acquaintances. Anne’s interactions with them, recorded in her journal entries and correspondence, were maintained on an informatory and reserved social level, rather than an intimate or companionable one. These relations nonetheless served significant sociable purposes within the Place Vendôme household. The conversations she recorded, mostly with the gentlewomen, provided Anne with important knowledge, information and gossip. Anne learnt from these gentlewomen the status, relations and activities – sexual and social – not only of members of the house, but of the wider English community in Paris and of men and women universally.

It was a conglomerate but disparate group of people of various nationalities, classes and genders, that formed the society of Place Vendôme. The small society quickly accepted Anne and she soon found her place within the social activities of the household. Within
her first fortnight in Paris, Anne thought self-importantly on 10 September that she was ‘a favorite in the house’ (74). As a party, the guests and visitors to Place Vendôme would all go to see the sights. One such instance was 19 September, when the group went to look at a view of Paris from the hills surrounding the city. The view was beautiful, even if Anne also found the idling about annoying. As she wrote, ‘these lounges[sic] are dullish to me but I went to see the place’ (79).10 The English guests would visit the English ambassador’s chapel for Sunday services together, lend each other books to read on French natural history, or swap tickets for entry to the sights of Paris like the Botanical Gardens, the Jardin des Plantes.11 These parties were a necessary means for touring Paris for an unaccompanied gentlewoman. Anne found the limitations on her movements could be frustrating. As she wrote on 17 September, in the first month of her Parisian sojourn, ‘I cann’t[sic] go to the boulevards at night without a gentleman I hate confinement’ (78).12 However, it was possible to go to public events alone, such as King Louis XVIII lying in state on 19 September, or King Charles X receiving the keys to the city on 27 September (79, 88). Anne had a qualified liberty as a gentlewoman tourist to immerse herself in the culture and arts of the city.

**THE MACKENZIES:**

‘Êtes-Vous Achille’

Amongst the other English guests Anne met at her first introduction on 2 September were Mrs. MacKenzie and her sixteen year old daughter Miss MacKenzie (68). The mother and daughter resided at Place Vendôme only until mid October, but they had an immediate impact upon Anne’s life in Paris. The journal entries showed the impression the MacKenzies made upon her, for she still referred to the MacKenzies’ room long after they departed. On 1 January 1825 for instance, Anne wrote that ‘my bath was prepared (in what was Mrs. MacKenzie’s room)” (207). The day of the MacKenzie’s departure on 13 October, a description of their leave-taking took up a substantial part of the day’s two page journal entry (101–3). It was an honour that no other guest received; not even Anne’s own departure merited more than a single page of reflection (267– 267[sic]). Upon her return to London on 4 April 1825, Anne called on the MacKenzies (index 18). Anne wrote an account of ‘my going to Hammersmith to see the Mc.K-s, & dining with them’ on 6 April, which she included in her first letter to Mrs. Barlow after her departure from Paris (ML/166, 1). Shortly after, the MacKenzies faded from view and there was no immediate correspondence with them. However, some six years later
on 18 May 1832 at Shibden Hall, when Anne was thinking of friends she could visit, she wrote that ‘the thought struck me of going from Croft to Edinburgh to see the MacKenzies’ (Liddington 2003, 28). Anne may have maintained some of the friendships from Paris, like that with the MacKenzies, in her later life.

Mrs. MacKenzie was a widow, Anne told Aunt Anne in her first letter home written from 8 to 12 September (ML/146, 1). Mr. MacKenzie had been ‘paymaster general at Calcutta’, Anne noted in the same letter, but the MacKenzies were not well off for he had ‘gambled the last twenty or thirty years of his life’, she found out on 13 October (ML/146, 1; 102). The MacKenzies would ‘probably settle in Bath’, Mrs. MacKenzie told her on 11 September, for they ‘know many Indians there’, or East India company people (75). The MacKenzies were also well connected in Yorkshire. As Anne noted on 2 October, ‘their Yorkshire connections were Pennymores, Gees, Fairfaxes, &c. very good’ (93). Anne liked the mother and daughter, as she told Aunt Anne on 8 to 12 September, ‘Mrs. MacKenzie has been a beauty – Miss Mc.K- is a ladylike, clever, nice girl’ (ML/146, 2). They were ‘nice people enough’, Anne told Miss Maclean in a letter dated 18 August to 12 September (ML/147, 3). Like others that Anne became friends with in Paris, the MacKenzie gentlewomen had a variety of nominations in the journal volume. Most commonly, she referred to them as ‘Mrs. & Miss MacKenzie’, which appeared as ‘Mrs. & Miss Mc.K-’ when abbreviated. Only the abbreviated version occurred in the index; the mother and daughter were never lengthened to ‘MacKenzie’ in this notational area of the journal volume. When she employed the crypt hand in the index and journal entries, the MacKenzies were more regularly designated as Mrs. or Miss ‘MacK-’. As the crypt alphabet had no discernible capitalisation, the decrypted representation I have adopted follows the plain hand format.

Initially, it was the two widows who took the unmarried gentlewoman under their wings. Mrs. MacKenzie and Mrs. Barlow showed Anne around Paris accompanied by their respective daughters. As a sociable network of gentlewomen, they all called on each other nearly every day in September and October. During the first week or two, Mrs. MacKenzie and Mrs. Barlow took Anne shopping, an indolent activity she did not like. Shopping was, she wrote on 8 September, ‘a bad lounge[sic]’, a comment that she reiterated in the index for the same day (73, index 7). Yet, she enjoyed spending her time with the MacKenzies. Anne went walking with them in the Tuileries Gardens; visited the Luxembourg together; exchanged tickets for the Jardin des Plantes; played
chess against Miss MacKenzie or her mother in the evenings; and borrowed or lent them reading materials. On 29 September, Anne asked her grocer to supply extra baskets of Fontainebleau grapes. Two of the baskets Anne kept, for keeping her bowels regular, but she sent for more as a gift to ‘Mesdames Mc.K- & Barlow’ (90). Anne’s gesture demonstrated the felicity of her relationship with the MacKenzie and Barlow families.

Anne particularly liked Miss MacKenzie. Once or twice she entertained the thought of attaching her. As Anne wrote on 13 October, the day of the MacKenzie’s departure, ‘I could ‘attach’ Miss MacK- I am sure if I liked’ (102). Mrs. Barlow was certainly aware of the possibility. Two weeks later, Mrs. Barlow asked Anne on 25 October, her ‘particular object’ with Miss MacKenzie (115). Had Anne ‘made up to her’, Mrs. Barlow wondered (115)? ‘I declared with truth’, Anne wrote, ‘I had had no object but to take her to see things & that I had never said a word to her that could be improper or needed to b[e] wished unsaid’ (115). Anne concluded, ‘no no I was not so bad as this nor as Mrs. B- seemed ‘to’ think me’ (115). The attraction between Anne and Miss MacKenzie, as witnessed by Mrs. Barlow, was evident. However, it appeared to be an attraction of the like-minded, rather than of lovers. When the MacKenzies departed from Place Vendôme on 13 October, Miss MacKenzie was very thoughtful with her farewell gift to Anne. She gave her ‘a list of books to read’ that Anne wrote out in the journal entry, and noted in the literary index as ‘Miss Mc.K-’s list of books to be read’ (103, index 3). Amongst the list can be seen a number of titles concerning Roman and Islamic history (103). Miss MacKenzie was only a young woman, yet she had, perhaps like Anne at the same age, an incredible range of historical and classical knowledge.

It was clear Miss MacKenzie was more knowledgeable than most young women, as Anne had been at that age. A rather risqué conversation in the drawing room one evening was an example. On 3 September, Anne, Miss MacKenzie and Miss Barlow were discussing a forfeit for speaking English. One of the French visitors, Captain de St. Auban (n.d.) suggested the forfeit be to ‘baiser un Français’ (69). To kiss a Frenchman, or more vulgarly, to fuck one, might have been the Captain’s idea of a joke. Anne thought it would have been wise for the mothers to be more careful with such ‘giddy girls’ in the society of French men (69). It was Miss MacKenzie’s response that perhaps Anne appreciated the most, for it concluded the journal account. Anne wrote, ‘said Miss MacKenzie “they are all alike – at least all I have seen – always something about baiser”’ (69). After Anne spent the evening of 10 September in the company of
Miss MacKenzie and Mrs. Barlow, ‘apparently all well satisfied with each other’s company’, she remarked, continuing, ‘Miss Mc.K- is a nice girl’ (74). The following day Anne asked Miss MacKenzie to go out walking and ‘to accompany me sometimes of which she seemed glad’ (75). After being acquainted with the MacKenzies for a month, Anne revised her opinion of the mother. On 3 October, she wrote that Mrs. MacKenzie was ‘rather a grumbler & putter on of black spectacles’ (93). It was Miss MacKenzie whom ‘I begin’, she wrote, ‘to like the better of the two’ (93). Anne preferred nice Miss MacKenzie to the more doleful mother.

Gentlewomen like Mrs. MacKenzie came to know Anne better, but likewise they bore the brunt of her rare irritability. On 30 September, Anne argued with one of the gentlemen guests, Mr. Moore. She wrote, it ‘put me a little out of patience’, but her full censure was reserved for the gentlewomen (91). Mrs. MacKenzie was ‘not genteel’, Mrs. Barlow was ‘sillily[sic] vain’, and their daughters were ‘merely rather improved editions of their respective mothers’ (91). Mrs. MacKenzie may not have been genteel, but she was astute. On 27 September, Mrs. MacKenzie ‘asked if it was I who had seen the treadmill’ (88). To prove herself to Mrs. MacKenzie, Anne ‘read her my journal on the subject’ (88). It was the only occasion in Paris when Anne granted the privilege to someone other than Mrs. Barlow. Mrs. MacKenzie was as insightful regarding Anne’s gender. In late October, Anne found out that Mme. Galvani initially thought she was a man. Mrs. Barlow told Anne on 26 October, ‘the MacK-s too [were] had wondered’ (117). Mrs. MacKenzie correctly understood gentlemanly behaviour and she interpreted Anne’s gestures in this light. According to Mrs. Barlow on 25 November, Mrs. MacKenzie said Anne ‘was always kissing or taking hold of Madame de B-‘s hands’ (161). Anne denied it, ‘wondering how Mrs. MacK- could so mistake’ (161). Perhaps Mrs. MacKenzie was not so mistaken, for Anne was at first very attentive to Mme. de Boyve. Anne was not always able to control the significance others placed upon her self-representation as gentlemanly Romantic lover.

Miss MacKenzie was not mistaken about Anne’s gentlemanly manners. On 12 October, the day before the MacKenzies were due to depart, Anne went to their room to assist with the packing of their gowns, caps and bonnets. Mrs. Barlow also came and Anne ‘talked flattering nonsense to her as usual’ (100). Watching the amatory interaction, Miss MacKenzie said to Anne, ‘I have a question to ask you’ (100). Anne noted, Miss MacKenzie ‘wrote it “Êtes-vous Achille”’ (100), ‘Are you Achilles?’ Miss MacKenzie
had written. The reference was apt. ‘I laughed’, Anne wrote, ‘& said she made me blush’ (100). In Greek myth, Achilles once disguised himself as a woman and romanced the daughter of the King of Scyros. It had occurred to Miss MacKenzie, she said to Anne, ‘from my manner of talking to Mrs. Barlow’ (100). The question spoke to Miss MacKenzie’s understanding that she could draw connections between classical traditions and Romantic forms of sexual knowledge and behaviour. Afterwards, Anne and Miss MacKenzie sat and talked privately in Anne’s room. The question, Anne said, ‘was exceedingly well put’ (100). Miss MacKenzie said, Anne ‘was the only [sic] in the house to whom she would have written it because the only one who could have so soon understood it’ (100). In the index for the day, Anne wrote in crypt ‘êtes-vous Achille’ with a single section ‘§’ mark against it (index 9). That Miss MacKenzie recognised Anne’s behaviour was noticeably important to her.

Anne was civil to the MacKenzies during their stay at Place Vendôme. The three adult gentlewomen, Mrs. MacKenzie, Mrs. Barlow and Anne, formed a close female network and the journal entries reflected it with sociable visiting marks. The MacKenzies paid Anne three formal visits and received two calls from her in return. All of the visits were marked as ‘Vc’, as each visit was reciprocated with a call. Similarly, the section marking in the index was also indicative of the relationship with the MacKenzies. There were three single ‘§’ markers and one double ‘§§’ marker in total. The single section markers traced the female sociability that existed between Anne, Mrs. MacKenzie and her daughter. The exception was the single section ‘§’ marker on 12 October, that noted the gendered understanding implied by Miss MacKenzie’s question ‘êtes-vous Achille’ (index 9). The network formed between these gentlewomen was homosocial and classed in nature. The MacKenzies and Anne established a collective acquaintance, which could operate as a unit in activities and interactions that were part of gentry women’s daily lives in the early nineteenth century.

Sociable attentions between Anne and the MacKenzies included the gentlewomen advocating and assisting each other. In the weeks before the MacKenzies departed, Anne helped arrange the mother’s passport with the Prefecture of Police on 7 October (97). The sociable gesture was marked out with a single section ‘§’ mark against the visit to the ‘Préfecture de police’ on 7 October (index 9). Anne sought Mrs. MacKenzie’s advice, particularly over matters where her feminine experience was critical, like everyday illnesses, shopping or smuggling cloth into England for Isabella.
In return, Mrs. MacKenzie confided in Anne, that ‘she is out of her element in society in London’ (74). Anne could understand the situation. Perhaps the section ‘§’ mark in the index about the 10 September conversation spoke to their common understanding (index 7). Anne found out a few days later that Mrs. MacKenzie and her deceased husband had, like Anne’s own parents, not been happily married. Mrs. MacKenzie ‘has had much unhappiness’, Anne wrote on 13 September, ‘married against her choice from conve’n’ience a man thirty years older than “herself” who made her unhappy’ (75). However, it was to Mrs. Barlow that Anne later revealed the similarity, when, on 14 December, she told of ‘my father & mother’s not being happy some of the circumstances of her death it was a foolish match he nearly twenty years older than she’ (189). The revelation from Mrs. MacKenzie concerning the ‘history’ of her own unhappy marriage was the only note in the index that received a double section ‘§§’ marker (index 8). These sorts of sociable relations, where Anne and the MacKenzies acted to assist and advise each other, were intricately bound up with the similarity of the social positions and histories of these gentlewomen.

Yet, Anne was not sorry to see the MacKenzies leave the Place Vendôme pension. When Mrs. MacKenzie became jealous of Anne’s attentions to Melle. de Sans, Anne did her best on 7 October to ‘ſet all right again now’ (97). However, only a few days later on 9 October, she wrote, ‘Mrs. MacK- would soon be tiresome to me ’I fear’ if she staid[sic] or she would take huff~~ ’on this account’ I am not sorry they are going next Wednesday’ (98). On 13 October, the day of the MacKenzies’ departure, Anne wrote, ‘they are amiable people yet I am not sorry they are gone because I find they would have interrupted me too much & I was always ſpeaking English to them’ (102). The correspondence revealed a few days later what interruption the MacKenzies caused. On 18 October, she wrote to Aunt Anne, the MacKenzies were ‘a great loss to us’ (ML/150, 2). However, as Anne continued, ‘but Mrs. Barlow, Mademoiselle de Sans highly connected here, and myself, form a little party so satisfied with ourselves, that we care not who comes, or goes’ (ML/150, 2). Anne was absorbed by her fascination with Melle. de Sans and her flirtation with Mrs. Barlow. The understanding, but perhaps too observant Miss MacKenzie and the amiable, but tiresome Mrs. MacKenzie, interrupted the progression of Anne’s amorous advances with the other gentlewomen at Place Vendôme: Melle. de Sans and Mrs. Barlow.
Friendship's Prayer

Mademoiselle de Sans' arrival at the Place Vendôme was remarkably timely and claimed Anne’s attention immediately. On 1 October, Melle. de Sans became her dinner table companion. The arrival of an entirely new and charming interest eventually precipitated a choice between her interests in Melle. de Sans and Mrs. Barlow. It was to be Anne’s most critical amatory decision in Paris. The journal commentary on the new guest included the information that Melle. de Sans was ‘French but born in England, who speaks both languages equally well’ (92). Anne delivered the key information last, as was her style: Melle. de Sans was ‘out of health – pale & rather interesting in appearance’ (92). Anne repeated matters that she found fascinating. That evening Melle. de Sans was found again to be ‘rather pretty out of health & interesting’ (92). On 2 October, amongst a party to the Jardin des Plantes, Anne was ‘particularly attentive’ to the Mademoiselle (93). ‘I dare say I shall flirt a little with her’, she decided (93). On the same day, she amended the cumbersome appellation of ‘Madelle. Dessance’ she used initially and perfected her French with the more intimate and elegant ‘Melle. de Sans’ (93). The two gentlewomen ‘get on very well together’, Anne wrote, concluding ‘& she seems to like me’ (93). The flirting with Melle. de Sans was already begun; Anne wrote, ‘she is out of health & I take care of her’, and she noted, ‘we already talk of visiting each other’ (93). Anne was captivated by the interesting and wan Melle. de Sans.

Besides being fluent in English and French, Melle. de Sans was ‘a rather nice girl’, Anne noted on 2 October (93). Melle. de Sans was also young, ‘in her twenty sith[sic] year’ (93). On the evening of 3 October, Melle. de Sans played for all the guests. Anne thought she ‘played on the piano very well – difficult music at sight’ (94). The combination of talents and charms impressed her. Anne called upon her the day after their first dinner conversation, but Melle. de Sans was out. The next day the two gentlewomen passed each other on the boulevard. Anne was upset by the social embarrassment of not being acknowledged. She noted it twice in her journal entry for 4 October; it also occasioned the only crypted notation in the index regarding Melle. de Sans. Against 4 October she noted in her index to ‘see the crypt’ of her journal entry (index 9). In the journal entry Anne wondered, ‘was it intention’al that she did ’[]’ not know me I suspected it was & mused upon it accordinly[sic]’ (94). That evening, Anne forced through the discomfort of the situation indicated by the errors, and remained
downstairs talking with Melle. de Sans. As she said to Melle. de Sans, ‘I should not go to bed till she did, & staid[sic] down stairs till 11’ (95). In response, Melle. de Sans ‘seemed more pleased with me than usual & as if she liked me’ (95). All was resolved. Melle. de Sans became ‘Melle. de S-’ and their mutual liking was established. Anne formally called upon her the following day, on 5 October (95). Their new acquaintance was made official with the first ‘Vc’ in the journal entry margin (95).

Melle. de Sans was not very well and her invalidism was part of her initial attraction for Anne. The first evening they were dinner companions on 2 October, Melle. de Sans told Anne that ‘her complaint is “parting with blood the wrong way”’ (93). Anne wrote, she thought her complaint was ‘the bloody piles I suppose’ (93). On 5 October, when she had a headache, Melle. de Sans revealed the extent of the newly established closeness between them, admitting Anne to her room whilst she was in bed. Anne wrote, Melle. de Sans ‘would not have admitted anyone but myself’ (95). So began Anne’s daily practice of calling upon and visiting with Melle. de Sans, generally after she had called first upon Mrs. Barlow. The notations in the index reflected Anne’s interest – there was an index note regarding Melle. de Sans nearly every day from the day of her arrival on 1 October for the next three weeks (index 9–10).24 From the second day of her arrival, Anne regularly noted in her index that she had either made observations about the Mademoiselle, ‘Melle. de S-. observations’, or merely drew attention to ‘Melle. de S-’, or called upon ‘Melle. de S-’.25 At the early stage of Anne’s flirtation, there were no further markers. There were for instance, no occurrences of section ‘§’ markers that showed matters of especial significance to Anne about Melle. de Sans. While Melle. de Sans’ attraction for Anne was noteworthy enough to be commented upon regularly in the index, it was yet to be developed into something more serious.

Anne’s attentions to Melle. de Sans, particularly in the privacy of her room, caused jealousies amongst the other guests of Place Vendôme. Those most upset were the guests like the MacKenzies and Mr. Franks, who were all due to depart in a few days. Even though Anne made an effort to breakfast with the MacKenzies to set everything right on 7 October, it did not prevent her from twice visiting Melle. de Sans in her room that evening (97). Melle. de Sans was again ‘too unwell’ to dine at the table, but Anne visited her formally before dinner, marked with a ‘Vc’, and informally afterwards, a visit that was unmarked (97). Anne ‘rather flirted with her which she seems to like & understand well enough’ (97). Anne’s absorption in Melle. de Sans also affected
favourites like Mrs. Barlow. Anne wrote that same day, ‘Mrs. Barlow I expect will *not like to* find herself not first with me’ (97). The following day on 8 October, she wrote of the ‘arrant flirting’ with Melle. de Sans (98). Mrs. Barlow remarked upon the increased attention. ‘Mrs. Barlow said at dinner’, Anne wrote, ‘I was fo’n’d of new friends’ (98). The situation with Melle. de Sans and Anne could not be ignored by Mrs. Barlow.

The acute level of flirtation continued. Two days later in the evening of 10 October Melle. de Sans and Anne exchanged mottos. Mottos had a specific value in the early nineteenth century: it was a ritualised gesture of courtly and even erotic exchange. Anne did not record the motto she gave to Melle. de Sans, but the French mademoiselle, she wrote, ‘very especially gave me today, & desired me to keep the following’ (99).

The motto given by Melle. de Sans to Anne read:

Tendre amitié, doux asile des coeurs  
C’est à toi que je sacrifice,  
Si l’amour nous donne la vie  
Toi seule en donne les douceurs. (99)

[Tender friendship, soft haven of the heart  
It is to you whom I sacrifice to  
If Love gives us life  
Only you can give its sweet pleasures.]

The index about the ‘motto given me by Melle. de S-’ was the only notation concerning Melle. de Sans that received a plus ‘+’ sign (index 9). Anne was not using the sign as a literary reference, for there was no corresponding note about the motto in her dedicated literary index. The subject matter of Melle. de Sans’ motto, the ‘tender friendship’ that offered such sweet pleasures, was of a highly codified sexual nature. The plus ‘+’ marker was operating as the metasign, indicating the erotic and intense importance of the motto exchange with Melle. de Sans. Anne appeared to understand the gesture of exchanging mottos as an unambiguous amatory signal in their same-sex flirtation.

The journal volume revealed the intensity and intimacy of the motto exchange. It was from the time of the motto exchange that comments in the index concerning Melle. de Sans became more extensive. Anne and Melle. de Sans’ interactions demonstrated the new social friendship between the two women. It was also on the day following the motto exchange, on 11 October, that Anne was deliberately brought into a more confidential awareness of Melle. de Sans’ medical problems. When Anne went to sit with Melle. de Sans, she told Anne, she ‘had had a very bad night sat on the pot from
eleven to two parting with blood by the anus’ (100). The progress of Anne’s courting was acknowledged. As Melle. de Sans told Anne: ‘she says I am very odd & I certainly pay court successfully’ (100). Like Mrs. Barlow, Melle. de Sans was aware of the divided focus of Anne’s attentions in the Place Vendôme. Melle. de Sans said to Anne on 12 October, ‘I see you talk to her as you do to me’ (101). ‘I am not the same to any two persons’, Anne replied (101). Melle. de Sans ‘fancies me serious with herself’, Anne noted, ‘& flirting perhaps with Mrs. B.-’ (101). The conversation was perhaps uppermost in Anne’s mind the next morning when she wrote at the start of the journal entry, ‘incurred the cross thinking of Melle. de Sans’ (101). The serious, or otherwise, courting of Melle. de Sans was becoming an amatory and sexual affair for Anne.

Courting permitted an embodied expression between the two gentlewomen. When Anne sat with Melle. de Sans on 13 October, she managed to orchestrate a kiss. Melle. de Sans ‘saluted me in the French manner’, probably upon each cheek, ‘then in the English’, perhaps on the lips. (102). Anne returned the kiss, as she claimed, in ‘Yorkshire’ style (102). ‘I immediately kissed her again with a little more pressure of the lips’ (102). Kissing inspired Anne to produce another motto. At dinner, she gave Melle. de Sans ‘a mo[tt]o signifying heaven made her to charm & me to love her’ (102). Anne gave Melle. de Sans another poem that night, but in the journal entries the chronology of the evening was reversed. The transposed ordering illustrated the manifest excitement Anne felt with these exchanges of kisses, mottos and poems. In the evening, the guests passed the time feeling each other’s pulses. Anne audaciously mistook Melle. de Sans’ pulse, ‘ſeveral times’ (102). ‘I could not feel hers correctly’, she claimed (102). Anne wrote out the following lines for Melle. de Sans: ‘when in my hand th[ys] pulse is prest[sic] I feel it alter mine & draw another from my breast in unison with thine’ (102). The index noting Anne’s ‘four lines about her pulse’ received a single section ‘§’ marker (index 9). The response from Melle. de Sans was encouraging. Melle. de Sans replied, Anne wrote, ‘indeed said she if you were a man I know not what would be the end of all this’ (102). Anne understood the remark, as she noted in the index, to be a sign of the ‘progress’ she was making with Melle. de Sans (index 9). The indications were that Melle. de Sans was cognisant of the amatory nature and erotic purpose of Anne’s attentions.

Anne wondered about the extent of Melle. de Sans’ sexual knowledge. On 14 October, they went out together on a romantic tryst in a fiacre, or hired coach. All the while,
Anne wrote, she ‘made love to Melle. de S-’ (105). Melle. de Sans ‘was poorly & low, but still coquetted’, Anne found with a little qualification, ‘pretty very well’ (105). However, during the fiacre ride Melle. de Sans ‘owned she had had many offers’ (105). Melle. de Sans said of herself, ‘she was just the sort of girl for it she could attach anyone &c. &c.’ (105). ‘I cannot help fancying’, Anne wrote of Melle. de Sans, ‘she too is a knowing one considering she is a girl not quite six & twenty’ (105). Coquetting and lovemaking led to a discussion of finances the following day, on 15 October. Melle. de Sans had money in England and Martinique, which provided an income of ‘seven thousand franks a year’ (106). More importantly for Anne, Melle. de Sans ‘would like to live in England & would live with me for asking’ (106). ‘I said I should settle her at York &c. &c.’, Anne told her (106). It was a conversation that was double section ‘§§’ marked in the index, the first of only two instances that directly concerned Melle. de Sans (index 9). The intimacy between Melle. de Sans and Anne was established, the markedly significant matters of love and money were covered – the relationship could progress to some more serious attachment.

Now Anne had two serious prospects for love in Paris. Should she choose to focus her attentions on Melle. de Sans or Mrs. Barlow? Anne’s feelings and the factors that carried weight with her were evenly divided between each of the gentlewomen. Mid October was a time of critical reflection for Anne about her desires, choices and interests. On 15 October, she expressed her irresolution to Mrs. Barlow. ‘I was half in love with Melle. de S-’, Anne said (106). However, it was Mrs. Barlow who ‘had more tact more power over me’, Anne told her (106). That evening, when Mrs. Barlow paid special attention to Anne, she wondered, ‘is she really amoureuse’ (107)? If Mrs. Barlow was really in love with her, it was more than Anne expected. She wrote, ‘this from a widow & mother like her is more than I could have thought of’ (107). ‘I am safer with Melle. de S-’, Anne considered (107). No sooner did she come close to a decision, than she reconsidered. The following day, on 16 October Anne called upon Melle. de Sans, but she was in no condition for visitors. Melle. de Sans ‘calomel kept working her’, Anne wrote, ‘& she was not fit to have anybody’ (108). Ill health was not now so attractive. ‘I shall remember this in future’, she wrote, ‘perhaps Mrs. B- will after [sic] suit me the better of the two for the time’ (108). That evening Anne had a ‘rather flirting sort of conversation with [th]e two ladies’ (108). Either of the gentlewomen, she wrote, ‘would live with me if I choose to be serious about it’ (108). Anne had not yet decided whom she was serious about, Melle. de Sans or Mrs. Barlow.
Melle. de Sans made her own preferences clear. On 18 October, the same evening, Melle. de Sans clearly indicated her own views to Anne. ‘Melle. de S- faid’, Anne wrote, ‘she ’suspecte[d] more than’ knew’ (108). The experience with heterosexual or homosexual relationships that Anne attributed to Melle. de Sans was doubtful. ‘I believe she is not so knowing as I fancied’, Anne concluded (108). Anne continued, ‘it seems she might have been informed but has not [w]ishe[sic] & d’o’es not wish it’ (108). Anne thought Melle. de Sans might well have some information about sexual relations, maybe as she herself acquired a substantial part of her own sexual knowledge, through literature. However, whatever information and lack of experience Melle. de Sans had, she was not desirous of learning more, according to Anne. The discussion with Melle. de Sans can be read in several and not necessarily exclusive ways. Whilst it indicated Melle. de Sans’ suspicions about Anne and what a relationship with her entailed, it seemed to be a more general message about Melle. de Sans’ single status. Melle. de Sans appeared to be disclaiming any sexual knowledge or experience concerning all those she was attached to in the past. On the one hand, Melle. de Sans was declaring to Anne her claims to virtue and inexperience, but her statements also made a strong claim towards knowledge of Anne’s attentions and a lack of attachment to her as a suitor.

Melle. de Sans may not have been prepared to commit to a relationship, but she remained openly accepting of Anne’s attentions. Anne ‘sal[u]ted’ Melle. de Sans on the lips when she came away from visiting her the next day 17 October (index 10). From the journal entries, Melle. de Sans even continued the flirtation with Anne. That evening, Mrs. Barlow, Melle. de Sans and Anne spent the night alone in the drawing room together. The three gentlewomen sat very affectionately with what seemed to be a cross between holding each other’s hands and Anne holding either one of their hands, a state of affairs that appeared to have affected her, judging by the mistakes in the journal entry. As Anne wrote, ‘with ’my having’ hold of each ethe’i’re[sic] hands [sic] great part of the time’ (109). However, it was a transitory period of mutual flirtation between Melle. de Sans and Anne, for in mid October Anne and Mrs. Barlow’s relationship became more serious. Thus, the instance of the double section ‘§§’ mark on 15 October, a few days before, was unique (index 9). The possibilities of the relationship with Melle. de Sans the double section ‘§§’ marks indicated were soon to be superseded by the exclusive focus of the markers on the courtship of Mrs. Barlow. As Mrs. Barlow became the sole object of Anne’s erotic interest, the relations with Melle. de Sans became fonder and less amatory. Anne was ‘very kind & attentive to her’ during their
walk in the Tuileries Gardens on 18 October (109). Melle. de Sans was no longer the central focus of Anne’s attentions.

Anne categorically declared herself in favour of Mrs. Barlow on 19 October. ‘I am paying regular court to her & she admits it’, she wrote in her journal entry (111). After courtship was established, Anne and Mrs. Barlow made their visits and other social engagements together. As noted in the index, Anne and Mrs. Barlow went together to visit Melle. de Sans when she was ‘very poorly’ on 20 October (index 10). The relevant journal entry expressed the pairing of Anne and Mrs. Barlow more emphatically. Anne wrote, ‘Mrs. B- & I went & sat by Miss Melle. de S-s[ic] bedside’ (112). Later again the same day, she noted that, ‘Mrs. B- an[d] I’ sat with Melle. de S- another ½ hour’ (112). The journal entry for the following day accentuated Anne and Mrs. Barlow’s coupling more explicitly. Anne wrote in crypt handwriting on 21 October, she and Mrs. Barlow flirted, as they liked to do. Or, as she wrote, there was ‘a little nonsense as usual’ (112). Anne recorded, she:

held her & would not [l]et her [sic] if said she you do in this way you will prevent my coming again of course I desisted while with Melle. de S- she let me have my hand up her petticoats almost to her knee at last she whispered don’t yet she afterwards let me do it nearly as high. (112–13)

It was an ambiguous journal entry about what events occurred and where exactly they occurred, but other meanings were evident. Anne and Mrs. Barlow were rather openly displaying the progress of their courtship to such a stage of sexual embodiment.

Melle. de Sans noticed the change in Anne’s attentions. She was no longer a direct object of Anne’s erotic interest in a courting triangle, but a vicarious spectator to the amatory and formal partnering between Mrs Barlow and Anne. When ‘we’, Anne and Mrs. Barlow, went to visit Melle. de Sans on 22 October, Anne noted she stayed only a quarter of an hour (113). Melle. de Sans did not ask her to stay. Perhaps a little aggrieved, Anne wrote, ‘Melle. de S- did not ask me to sit down this morning ‘twas inadvertence’ (114). Anne departed, leaving Mrs. Barlow to sit with Melle. de Sans. ‘I think she was not sorr[sic] when I came away’, Anne wrote, ‘she had rather have Mrs. B- f to herself’ (114). The romantic drama of the triangle between these three gentlewomen no longer existed. Evidently, the competing demands for attention remained, as Anne and Mrs. Barlow’s courtship superseded Anne’s notice or interest in other friends and acquaintances at Place Vendôme. For two nights in a row, in the
evenings of 23 and 24 October, Anne sat between Mrs. Barlow and Melle. de Sans but neglected Melle. de Sans. As Anne wrote on the first night, she ‘talked almost entirely to the former’ (114). She ‘laughed & flirted & made love’ to Mrs. Barlow (114). There were no more incidences of mutual and affectionate handholding between Anne, Melle. de Sans and Mrs. Barlow.

Earlier in October, Anne visited Melle. de Sans for substantial lengths of time, sometimes twice a day. During late October, her visits were no more than a few minutes, usually once a day and barely mentioned in the journal entries or index. The decrease in attention was partly due to the increasing ill health Melle. de Sans experienced. In the last week of October, Melle. de Sans was beset by hysteric fits, that were alleviated by Mrs. Barlow’s sole care and ministrations. On 25 October, Melle. de Sans called Mrs. Barlow out of bed early in the morning, for she ‘had had a bad hysteric fit’ (115). Melle. de Sans may have wished to have Mrs. Barlow’s motherly, and possibly amatory, attentions to herself. Anne and Mrs. Barlow did not make any more paired and accompanied visits to Melle. de Sans’ bedside, nor flirt in the privacy of her room. On 28 October, Melle. de Sans ‘had just had a slight hysteric’ (119). Melle. de Sans sent for Mrs. Barlow’s assistance, when Anne and Mrs. Barlow were sitting together in Anne’s room. Mrs. Barlow ‘lingered’, Anne wrote, ‘& certainly would rather have staid[sic] with me but went after sittin[g] with me twenty minutes’ (119). Mrs. Barlow returned to Anne’s room to spend a little more time with her, under the pretence of fetching something she left behind. No sooner did Mrs. Barlow sit down for ten minutes, than ‘Melle. de S’s maid again came for her’ (119). The slight hysteric fit did not prevent Melle. de Sans going out with the party that night to the Port St. Martin Theatre. There was just a hint of jealousy or disappointment in the journal entries about the way the management of Melle. de Sans’ hysteria proceeded.

Something changed with Anne’s feelings towards Melle. de Sans. From 28 October, Anne’s nomination for Melle. de Sans in her text fluctuated evenly afterwards, between the formal ‘Melle. de Sans’ and the previously familiar ‘Melle. de S-’ (120). The designation for Melle. de Sans had reverted to a more conservative usage. A call Anne made to Melle. de Sans on 31 October was merely noted with the single ‘V’ of her visiting mark (124). In a letter to Aunt Anne of 31 October, Anne wrote that it was Mrs. Barlow who was now ‘decidedly my favorite, having no shadow of a rival but Mademoiselle de Sans’ (ML/151, 3). The shadow Melle. de Sans presented to Anne and
Mrs. Barlow’s courtship remained insubstantial. In November, Anne’s few references concerning Melle. de Sans mostly followed the attentions gentlemen paid to the poorly heiress. On 1 November, M. Bellevue made up to Melle. de Sans. Petite Melle. de Sans, ‘tho’ little’, Anne wrote, ‘she is taller than he is’ (126). Melle. de Sans’ interest was soon more regularly and reciprocally sought by another Place Vendôme visitor, Monsieur Dacier. A few days later, Anne wrote of the newly formed arrangement of all the coupled lovers. On 9 November, a party spent the evening at the Italian opera, with ‘M. D- paying attention to Melle. de S- ’to which she shews[sic] no dislike & I to Mrs. B-’ (137). The guests and visitors of the Place Vendôme household were happily settling into romantic attachments with each other.

The intimacy between Mrs. Barlow and Anne intensified. The journal entries and index continued to reflect Anne’s inattention to Melle. de Sans from mid November. She refused a visit from Melle. de Sans on 11 November. ‘I had got so bad headache’, Anne told the maid (140). However, after lovemaking with Mrs. Barlow, ‘the fact was I was heated & in a state not fit to see anyone’, Anne wrote (140). Two weeks later, Melle. de Sans took Anne into her room and played on the piano for her on 25 November. Anne considered, ‘for the moment I thought I could fancy her’ (161). However, their conversation turned not to flirting, but to dislike of Mme. de Boyve, the proprietor of Place Vendôme. A colossal row developed during November and December between the proprietor Mme. de Boyve, and her guests, Anne and Mrs. Barlow. The acquaintance between Melle. de Sans and Anne was increasingly centred on the house politics of Place Vendôme. The house guests, including Melle. de Sans, were all busy displaying their allegiances or taking sides in the slanderous quarrel about Mrs Barlow. In the role of mediator between the main parties, Melle. de Sans was to be crucial, for it was she who revealed to Mrs. Barlow on 8 December exactly what gossip Mme. de Boyve was spreading about her (180). The gossip concerned Mrs. Barlow’s reputation, or lack of, with gentlemen guests of Place Vendôme prior to Anne’s residence there. Melle. de Sans’ news was critical to Mrs. Barlow. It motivated Mrs. Barlow and eventually Anne, to leave the Place Vendôme.

Anne and Mrs. Barlow’s relationship sometimes suffered periods of doubt and lack of trust. At these times, Anne reconsidered the idea of a relationship with Melle. de Sans. Or rather, she toyed with the idea of Melle. de Sans, in order to ascertain the depth of honesty and confidence between herself and Mrs. Barlow. Anne thought, for instance,
she could make Mrs. Barlow jealous of Melle. de Sans. ‘I could easi[ly] make her jealous of her’, she wrote on 16 December (191). Anne could not resist flirting with Melle. de Sans during their fiacre ride on 25 December. Melle. de Sans was successfully sought after by M. Dacier, but she was not averse to receiving Anne’s attentions. She told Anne, ‘what a pity you do not wear pantaloons instead of petticoats’ (198). Anne thought her neglect of Melle. de Sans could be rectified if she so desired. ‘I could soon make up to her if I [ch]ose’, she wrote (198). Yet, she also said she was serious about Mrs. Barlow. ‘I believed I should offer to Mrs. B-’, Anne told Melle. de Sans (198). Melle. de Sans replied, she wrote, ‘oh said she but if you are balancing between us that would not do for me. I must have all or none’ (198). Anne replied, ‘ah said I if you played to me it would be all over I should offer directly’ (198). When Anne was uncertain about Mrs. Barlow, it was engaging to flirt with the attached Melle. de Sans.

Mariana, Anne’s long-term lover, had been led to suspect that the ‘particular attraction’ in Paris was Melle. de Sans (206). After reading Mariana’s letter aloud to Mrs. Barlow on 31 December, the two gentlewomen agreed that Mariana ‘had most likely fixed it on Melle. de S-’ (206). Mrs. Barlow was unwilling for Mariana to have full knowledge about her relationship with Anne. Any disingenuousness or even active misinformation on Anne’s part, about the object of her affections at the Place Vendôme, might have been sensible with Mariana. Yet, Mariana might well have an insight into Anne’s affections from her correspondence that was less perceptible in the journal entries. Early in the New Year, on 1 January Anne was still interested enough in Melle. de Sans to write her ‘eight lines of poetry’ (207). The poetry was to be presented in a book of Campbell’s poetry that Anne especially purchased for Melle. de Sans. Perhaps Anne’s intention was, as she noted two weeks earlier, to make Mrs. Barlow jealous. If so, Anne certainly achieved it. When Mrs. Barlow came to visit that day, Anne asked to borrow her pen and paper. Anne immediately wrote down the poetical lines for Melle. de Sans, without revealing the content to Mrs. Barlow. Not surprisingly, Mrs. Barlow ‘did not say much about it’, nor did she the day before, during Anne’s reading of Mariana’s letter (207, 206). It was not only Mariana, who was actively encouraged to view Melle. de Sans as competition.

Whatever Anne’s purposes, the erotic possibilities of friendship with Melle. de Sans were being tested. Anne sent the book and poetry to Melle. de Sans the next day via Jane, Mrs. Barlow’s daughter. She also wrote out the poetry in plain hand, and without
any abbreviations in the journal entry of 2 January. Anyone – Mrs. Barlow perhaps – could read the poem in the journal entry. The poem in plain hand went:

For you may Hope her pleasures e’er renew;
To you, Louise, may all she tells be True!
Thus when “each” Twelvemonth’s rapid race be run,
Leaving each wish fulfill’d, each purpose done,
May each young year inherit from the past;
And each in turn be happier than the last!
If Friendship’s prayer avail that this should be,
Remember mine, – and then remember me. (208)

The invocation of ‘Friendship’ in the poem could be interpreted in several ways. For Anne, ‘friendship’ had a multiplicity of meanings – erotic, fraternal and sociable – and some of these might have been directed towards Melle. de Sans through the poem. It was also entirely likely that Anne’s gestures were underlaid with the intention of testing Mrs. Barlow. Some of these codified meanings would have been available to Mrs. Barlow, through her relationship with Anne, or her own cultural reading practices. Anne’s courtship of Mrs. Barlow was structured around the negotiation and interpretation of the social and amatory praxis of female friendship.

It was Anne’s ‘nursing’ of Melle. de Sans that most clearly demonstrated her intentions towards both Melle. de Sans and Mrs. Barlow. The afternoon Melle. de Sans received the poetry and book from Anne, she had another hysterical attack. Anne’s remedy for Melle. de Sans’ hysteria, whilst Mrs. Barlow was present, was physical, even sexual. ‘I rubbed her stomach a little over her clothes’, she wrote, ‘then held my hand [o]ver the ’re[g]lion of [th]e wom[b] where there was a considerable pu[l]sation’ (208).30 None of the remarks regarding her nursing of Melle. de Sans were section marked as important in the index. It was instead, rather drolly, ‘Melle. de S-’s rate of fee to her physician’ that Anne deemed most useful to remember (index 14). As with poetry about friendship, the embodied intimate ways that women touched each other was necessarily historical and contextual. However, for Mrs. Barlow, Anne’s nursing was read in a very specific manner. Mrs. Barlow ‘owned she had rather not see me nurse so w[e]ll’, Anne wrote (208). Mrs. Barlow explained herself on 3 January; she desired Anne’s exclusive attention. ‘I think’, Mrs. Barlow told her, “su’ch things are better lett[sic] alone you wow[sic] they [e]xcite feeling which I do not wish you to fee[l] for anyone but me’ (210). Anne’s errors in the journal entry occurred when she related Mrs. Barlow’s comments, not the nursing of Melle. de Sans. Mrs. Barlow seemed fully aware of the
potential for Anne to be inconstant and for her touch to elicit an excited and sexual
response. The focus of these gestures was not Melle. de Sans; it was the effect of such
gestures upon Mrs. Barlow that was uppermost with Anne.

After mid January, Melle. de Sans did not figure in Anne’s retakes on her relationship
with Mrs. Barlow. Once Anne settled with Mrs. Barlow into their new lodgings at Quai
Voltaire, only brief mentions of Melle. de Sans occurred during late January and
February. Mrs. Barlow left the pension under somewhat sensational circumstances, but
Anne and Mrs. Barlow continued to call upon their friends, including Melle. de Sans, at
the Place Vendôme. These visits were formally made and just as officially returned, but
the deployment of the ‘Vc’ mark in the journal margins recognised these group visits,
not the exclusive calls made on Melle. de Sans.31 The other instances when Anne and
Mrs. Barlow saw Melle. de Sans were sociable excursions with Place Vendôme parties,
like concerts or walking around Paris.32 However in March, Melle. de Sans became
involved, without familial approval, with her suitor, Captain de Droz (n.d.). Anne wrote
on 10 March, Melle. de Sans was ‘ferious wi[th] M. de Droz & he with her’ (255). Anne
and other Place Vendôme gentlewomen were the means for the unsanctioned couple to
20 March, Melle. de Sans sent for Anne. Melle. de Sans ‘wanted to see M. Droz[sic]’,
Anne wrote, ‘& me to contrive it’ (261). Anne agreed to their meeting at Quai Voltaire
the next day, unless ‘Mrs. B- had any objection’ (261). On 21 March, she received a
note from Melle. de Sans ‘co[n]taining the single word “no”’ (262). Anne’s brief role as
a chaperone was unnecessary; the tryst between the lovers was cancelled.

Melle. de Sans was due to depart from Paris for her home in Bordeaux in late March,
but Anne did not record her departure. She and Mrs. Barlow visited Melle. de Sans on
21 March, to take their leave of her. Anne recognised the leave-taking with a final ‘Vc’
mark and reported she ‘staid with her 5 mins.’ to wish Melle. de Sans good bye (262).
As a farewell gift, Melle. de Sans gave Anne ‘a little brown silk purse, spotted with
steel beads, she had netted for me’ on 18 March (260). The gift was noted in the index.
‘Called on Melle. de S-‘, Anne wrote, ‘(She gave me a purse)’ (index 17). It was one of
the few comments concerning Melle. de Sans that received a single section ‘§’ mark, to
show its general importance to Anne (index 17). One last piece of information from
Melle. de Sans was significant enough to Anne for her to double section ‘§§’ mark it in
her index. It was Melle. de Sans’ medical treatment of potassium, and the name of the
chemist she used in Paris (index 17). Until Anne departed from Paris, she registered the majority of her calls and visits to Melle. de Sans, or Melle. de Sans upon her, with the conventional marks of ‘Vc’ in the journal entries. Other indicators of sexual or strong interest, such as the double section ‘§§’ marks, were rare. After Anne chose Mrs. Barlow as her amorous interest in Paris, the nomination for the French mademoiselle in her textual references became the more formal ‘Melle. de Sans’. Certainly, Anne’s attraction to Melle. de Sans was intense and absorbing. The possibility of an erotic friendship was considered by the two gentlewomen, as demonstrated by the crypt handwriting about Melle. de Sans. However, the relationship was not fully developed beyond a conventional sociability into a stronger attachment.

Presumably Melle. de Sans departed for Bordeaux in late March. Anne asked Melle. de Sans for her address in Bordeaux on 19 March, for she wanted to ‘hear from her occasionally when an[y] material event [o]ccurred [to] her’ (261). The two gentlewomen did correspond as Anne requested, but it occurred only on one occasion, not as a regular correspondence. The letters were not collected into the papers, but the summary list contained some information. Melle. de Sans wrote a letter that Anne received on 14 May (summary 2). Anne recorded in the index that Melle. de Sans was ‘not so well as in Paris’ (index 21). She also commented obliquely and without naming any parties, that the objections of Melle. de Sans’ aunt towards her suitor Capt. de Droz were being worked upon (index 21). The reply to Melle. de Sans’ letter was posted on 25 May (summary 2). In her letter, Anne wrote in the index for the 24 May, she was ‘affectionate & consolatory to Melle. de S-’ (index 21). After the Paris sojourn, news of Melle. de Sans generally came through letters from Mrs. Barlow to Anne. On 30 July, Anne noted in her index from Mrs. Barlow, that Melle. de Sans was ‘in Paris coming to London to be married’ (index 25). The relevant journal entry elaborated – Melle. de Sans was ‘to be married to Captain Droz of the Swiss Guard’ (333). Anne did not appear to be greatly distressed or interested in the conclusion of the affair.

**MR. FRANKS:**

‘Mr. Franks Was Making Up to Me’

Anne provided an ongoing commentary in her journal entries on the romances of the Place Vendôme pension. The affair, and eventual marriage, between Melle. de Sans and Captain Droz was the third romance amongst the privileged company of English and
French residents and visitors of the guesthouse. The journal accounts traced many of these relations from when the two lovers were initially matched, through the stages of encouragement, to their consummation with gifts, promises and intimacy. Sometimes the journal commentary was detached and aloof when the affairs no longer concerned Anne, as with the romance of Melle. de Sans with Captain Droz. When Anne was involved, her writing was absorbed with the recording of her own fascination and intense engagement in the affair, as with her courtship of Mrs. Barlow. The prevailing atmosphere of the Place Vendôme pension was revealed by the journal and epistolary accounts of all of these affairs. It was more than the just the city of Paris, or the merely the guesthouse, that was the scene of romance. If the Place Vendôme pension itself was an early nineteenth century marriage market, then Mme. de Boyve was the matchmaker. Anne’s own choice for a relationship in Paris settled firmly and finally upon Mrs. Barlow. Yet, upon a closer examination of the journal entries, it was evident that the alternatives were not limited to her exclusive preference for gentlewomen. Another guest, Mr. Franks, was decidedly interested in Anne during his stay at the pension, forcefully supported and abetted by the proprietor Mme. de Boyve.

Mr. Franks was the exception in Anne’s writings in Paris. The gentlemen at Place Vendôme were peripheral to her attention, generally mentioned only in passing in the journal volume and letters. Anne wrote of Mr. Franks, by way of introduction, in her first letter home to Aunt Anne written from 8 to 12 September (ML/146). Mr. Franks was ‘a very gentlemanly Irishman’ (ML/146, 2). He was a ‘very well-informed, agreeable person’ (ML/146, 2). Like Anne’s first impressions of Melle. de Sans, it was the state of someone’s health that drew her attention. Mr. Franks was also ‘rather out of health’, Anne wrote to Aunt Anne (ML/146, 2). It was the only time Mr. Franks entered her epistolary space. The first journal mention of him occurred shortly after her arrival. On 3 September, Anne noted Mr. Franks simply as ‘(an Irishman who is in the house)’, without any further details (69). A few days later on 6 September, she elaborated with more information. Mr. Franks was a young man who, since he was fifteen, had been his own master of a place near Cork. Anne noted he was now twenty four, ‘(at. now 24)’, nine years younger than she was (71). Yet, there was no calling acquaintance between them. Mr. Franks neither paid a visit to Anne, nor received one from her; there was no sociable marking of visits or calls ‘Vc’ or ‘V’ between them. Anne’s disinterest in establishing a sociable relationship with a gentleman was perhaps the reason she did not recognise Mr. Franks’ intentions for some time.
Mr. Franks evidently liked Anne. Two weeks later, on 12 September, Mr. Franks ‘told me seriously tonight’, she wrote, ‘I was very clever & not he only but they all thought so’ (75). The courtly compliment was lost on Anne, or perhaps it was too similar to the compliment she received from Mrs. Barlow the day before, that ‘they all think me a fine woman’, for she miscrypted Mr. Franks in the journal entry as ‘Mrs. Frank[sic]’ (75). Despite his attempts at flattery, Anne was initially interested in Mr. Franks only as a source of useful gentlemanly information. On 16 September, she asked him for the details of his tailor and went to the trouble of making a detailed margin note against the journal entry, as well as a note in the index, of the address and particulars (77[sic], index 8). The journal entry read:

Mr. Frank’s[sic] tailor Anstey 18 George’s St. Hanover square London – makes the best trousers of any man in town – those who are particular have trousers of him & coats perhaps of Stultz – makes ladies’ habits and pelisses very well – dear – charges 5.15.0 for a coat –. (77[sic])

Both of the notes about the tailor were marked with section ‘§’ markers. The margin note in the journal entries had a single section ‘§’ marker, which indicated that she wanted the material to be indexed. By contrast, the index had the only instance of double section ‘§§’ marks regarding Mr. Franks. The marks demonstrated Anne’s keen interest in his sartorial information, on a par, for instance, with the names of good booksellers in Paris or exciting flirtations with Mrs. Barlow.

Anne had limited time for sociable activities with other Place Vendôme guests household. In late September and early October, her flirtations engaged more of her attention. Yet, the party engagements frequently included Mr. Franks and the journal entries mentioned him in social settings more regularly. Having Mr. Franks as a companion on these excursions could have created a neutral and acceptable social space for Anne. As she managed the increasing complexity of her flirtations and courtships, a gentleman escort may have provided a suitable cover and a peaceful reprieve from these various amorous demands. On 25 September, Anne noted she talked with Mr. Franks in the evening (86). The next day, a party went to the fête of St. Cloud, and Anne and Mr. Franks went to see the view of Paris together from ‘the top of the lantern’ (86). On 28 September, she ‘played 3 rubbers at whist’ against him (89). The next day, Anne, Mr. Franks and the MacKenzies ‘set off to see the paintings at the Luxembourg’ (89). However, after her argument with Mr. Moore on 30 September, even Mr. Franks came under fire from Anne’s irritation with her fellow guests. ‘Mr. Frank[sic] is flupid &
gentlemanly enough’, she wrote, ‘but not I think thoroughbred’ (91). It did not stop her from going with Mr. Franks to the Jardin des Plantes on 2 October, or playing a board game called ‘German tactics’ and conversing with him on 5 October (93, 95). Mr. Franks was generally good and enjoyable company for Anne.

On several occasions, Mme. de Boyve accompanied Anne and Mr. Franks on these outings. They went together to see the marionette show at the fête of St. Cloud (87). A few nights later on 28 September, Anne played whist against the pair Mme. de Boyve and Mr. Franks (89). The following night, she went with Mr. Franks in a party with Mme. de Boyve and others, to the French Opera in the Rue de Richelieu (90). Another party included Mme. de Boyve, Mr. Franks and Anne to the Jardin des Plantes on 2 October (93). On the last two occasions, the pairing of the party was obvious, all accompanied by Mme. de Boyve. At the French Opera, Anne and Mr. Franks attended along with the newly courting couple Miss Pope and Mr. Moore, accompanied by Mme. de Boyve. At the Jardin des Plantes, Melle. de Sans came with one of her suitors M. Bellevue, the two young teenagers Miss MacKenzie and Miss Barlow were together, which left Anne with Mr. Franks, again accompanied by Mme. de Boyve. Both of these outings consisted of two adult couples escorted by the proprietor of their residence in Paris. The organisation of these events as chaperoned excursions, suggested they were specifically arranged and supervised entertainments to facilitate amatory matters between the adult pairs. Anne did not recognise it, but the journal entries concerning Mr. Franks suggested he was paying court to her, with the support of Mme. de Boyve.

Mr. Franks made his intentions clearer in early October. On 6 October, Mme. de Boyve, Mr. Franks and Anne went out on an excursion together. The conversation with Mr. Franks was recorded in plain hand in the journal entry. ‘Mr. Franks somehow or other said he was sorry he was going away’, Anne wrote, ‘but hoped we should meet;[sic] each other again’ (96). One significant statement led to another. As Anne wrote, ‘this led to his giving me an invitation to his place in Ireland’ (96). ‘I promised to accept’, she recorded (96). Anne’s reasons for accepting the invitation were different to what Mr. Franks might have hoped. Samuel (1793–1813), her dear brother, had died in Ireland eleven years before in a tragic accident, drowning whilst he was bathing in the Blackwater River. ‘Poor fellow’, Anne added in an addenda to the last letter she wrote to her brother, in February 1813 (Green 1992, 39). Anne told Mr. Franks, ‘I should certainly go there some of these times, mentioning the death of poor Samuel’ (96). Mr.
Franks promised that if Anne came, he and his family would show her the sights. It was a purposeful and meaningful offer, in effect asking Anne to meet Mr. Franks’ family.

Mr. Franks’ offer seems to have been the culmination of over a month’s worth of attentions. Perhaps Mr. Franks’ first interest was indicated with his compliment about Anne’s cleverness in early September. However, the history of the unreciprocated affair can only be traced from the previous fortnight when Mr. Franks became more visible in the journal entries. After his invitation to Anne to visit, Mr. Franks immediately attempted to gauge the nature of her attachment. Mr. Franks said, ‘if he should be married he should be most happy to introduce me to his wife’ (96). The response was not what Mr. Franks perhaps hoped. Anne’s reply was what any companion or friend could expect. She wished him the best: ‘I exprest[sic] my hope that he would marry happily &c. &c.’ (96–97). Mr. Frank’s visiting invitation was politely reciprocated. Anne, she wrote, ‘said I should be happy to see him at Shibden if he came into Yorkshire’ (97). ‘Invitation from Mr. Frank[sic]’, the index simply noted with no markers, or crypting, and without any description (index 9). However, the crypt hand in the journal entry was more revealing. As the concluding comment of her account, Anne wrote, ‘were I different & ten years younger I should fancy somehow or other that Mr. Franks was making up to me’ (97). She at last understood Mr. Franks’ intentions. Despite Mr. Franks’ efforts to make up to Anne, it had little impact upon her.

Mr. Franks was due to depart the Place Vendôme pension with the MacKenzies on 13 October. In the meantime, he accompanied Anne on more visits, still escorted by Mme. de Boyve. From events with larger parties that included Mr. Franks and Anne amongst a number, the last week of outings was mostly restricted to the exclusive group of only Mme. de Boyve, Mr. Franks and Anne. On the evening of Mr. Franks’ invitation to her to visit, Anne, Mr. Franks and Mme. de Boyve went to the Vaudeville (97). Two days later on 8 October, they all went to the Louvre, squashed together in a fiacre along with Miss MacKenzie (98). Despite rain on 10 October, Mme. de Boyve, Mr. Franks and Anne all went by fiacre to the Protestant church in the Rue St. Honoré (99). Afterwards, the couple and their chaperone walked to the Louvre again. They were able to enter through a private door, where Mr. Franks showed his passport and gained them special admittance to the gallery (99). On their return to the Place Vendôme, he got them another fiacre, in which they again all crowded for the ride home. On the evening before Mr. Franks was due to depart, they all went off together yet again to the Vaudeville, in
convoy with another teenager from Place Vendôme (101). The number of outings and the exclusive nature of the party confirmed Mme. de Boyve and Mr. Franks’ intentions to make a match with Anne.

Even at the conclusion of the unrequited affair, Mr. Franks did not enter Anne’s writings in any substantial manner. Anne and all the Place Vendôme guests saw Mr. Franks off on 13 October. ‘Mr. Frank[sic] repeated his invitation’, Anne noted in her index without any marks (index 9). Mr. Franks said, she recorded in the journal entry, ‘how happy he should be to see me – begged I would go anytime’ (102). He left his address for Anne with Mme. de Boyve. The index referring to it was marked for future reference, with the only single section ‘§’ mark regarding Mr. Franks (index 9). However, she did not use the address. There was no record in the summary of any correspondence with Mr. Franks after Paris. She did not consider their companionship to be close. Anne consistently utilised his proper name as her nomination for Mr. Franks, which occurred twice as ‘Mr. F-’ when it was repeated in the same passage, excepting the one occasion when Mr. Franks became Mrs. Franks (96, 99, 75). The crypted journal comments concerning him bracketed the story of his unreturned attentions to Anne. There were his compliments to Anne in mid September, her irritation in late September and his making up to her in early October (75, 91, 97). The clearest indicator of Anne’s relationship with Mr. Franks was the plain handwriting of her journal entries. All of these mentions of Mr. Franks were social, with Anne briefly noting his company on tours or in the evenings. Whatever Mr. Franks’ intentions towards Anne, her relation to him was as one gentleman to another – informatory, companionate and polite, but not interested.

MME. DE BOYVE:

‘Madame de B-’s’ History of the Flirtations of Mrs. B-

Mme. de Boyve spent a considerable amount of effort in attempting to make the match between Anne and Mr. Franks. Mme. de Boyve’s husband was ill during the first half of October. Despite this, Mme. de Boyve accompanied Anne on many outings that included Mr. Franks. Mme. de Boyve clearly took a fancy to her latest English guest. ‘Luckily for me,’ Anne wrote to Aunt Anne in her letter of 8 to 12 September, ‘Made. de B- seems to have taken a fancy to me’ (ML/146, 1). It did not necessarily mean the same thing for her as it did for the Place Vendôme proprietor. For Anne, Mme. de
Boyve’s fancy signalled encouragement of her attentions. For instance on 5 September, she wrote, ‘I am certainly attentive to her with that something of flattery’ and manner she is not used to from ladies’ (71). Their intentions were at variance however, for Mme. de Boyve clearly had a different purpose to her social connection and flattery of Anne. When not managing her family, house or entertainments, Mme. de Boyve was absorbed in forming matrimonial attachments amongst her guests and visitors.

Without the presence of Mr. Franks to obscure her observation, Anne’s flirtations in the house may have become more visible to Mme. de Boyve. It was Anne herself who might have demonstrated it to Mme. de Boyve. On the evening of 18 October, she waylaid Mme. de Boyve in the dark drawing room. Mme. de Boyve ‘took me round the waist’, Anne recorded, ‘& I therefore gave her a kiss’ (109). It was a noisy affair, Mrs. Barlow told Anne later that night. It was a kiss ‘which Mrs B- declared she heard in the other room’ (109). Both gentlewomen were subtly vying for Anne’s notice. Anne wrote in her journal entry, Mrs. Barlow and Mme. de Boyve ‘certainly flirt exceedingly’ (109). The competition, and threat posed by Melle. de Sans, forced Anne to declare her intentions to, if not categorically, at least explicitly. On 19 October, Anne wrote, ‘the thing is now decided enough’ between herself and Mrs. Barlow (111). She was courting Mrs. Barlow ‘& she admits it’ (111). It did not prevent Anne from continuing to charm Mme. de Boyve. On 25 October, Anne and Mme. de Boyve went together to the best pâtissier in Paris (115). Anne flattered and ‘agreeableized’ with Mme. de Boyve (115). ‘I complimented her beauty & manners &c. &c.’, she wrote (115). Whether or not Mme. de Boyve was interested in flirting with Anne, she was certainly aware of the focus of her attentions in the Place Vendôme.

Mme. de Boyve found an opportunity to influence Anne’s opinion of Mrs. Barlow only a few days later. On 29 October, Mme. de Boyve had a cold and Anne ‘sat by her bedside’ for nearly two hours (121). Mme. de Boyve decided to tell her an account of Mrs. Barlow’s sexual history prior to Anne’s arrival at the Place Vendôme. Or, as Anne indexed and double section ‘§§’ marked it, this was ‘Madame de B-’s history of the flirtations of Mrs. B-. Observations vid.’ (index 10). These disquieting revelations came at a critical time in Anne’s relationship with Mrs. Barlow. Earlier that day she had confided some revealing stories of her own ‘gaieties’ to Mrs. Barlow (index 10). The stories Anne told Mrs. Barlow concerned her own sexual past, including the attachment to Eliza Raine. In the index, she noted and double section ‘§§’ marked the conversation.
Anne had, she wrote, ‘told Mrs. B- too much’ (index 10). The qualification – ‘too much’ – makes sense if it was written after the revelations were made by Mme. de Boyve. With their declaration of courtship, Anne entrusted Mrs. Barlow with some of the story of her own sexual past, her ‘gaieties’. However, Mme. de Boyve’s ‘history’ cast doubt on Mrs. Barlow’s ability to be trusted with these stories of Anne’s past indiscretions.

The journal account of the sexual ‘history’ from Mme. de Boyve took up a page of densely crypted writing (121–22). That the history deeply affected her was illustrated not only by the double section ‘§§’ marks in the index and quantity of crypted writing, but also by the high incidence of mistakes and insertions. The mistakes suggested both the haste and passion involved in the writing of the journal entry. The insertions indicated the editorial reconstruction – Anne’s need to achieve a textual and emotional veracity – which she carried out once the journal entry was written. For instance, Mme. de Boyve claimed that ‘five or six people had said they did not like Mrs. B- she had always something satirical en [e]critique to say of everyone’ (121). Mrs. Barlow was, Anne verified with the insertion of additional information, satirical in her criticism. Further into the journal recounting of the conversation, another claim of Mme. de Boyve’s was substantiated with an insertion by Anne. According to Mme. de Boyve, Mrs. Barlow professed everyone to be in love with her. As Anne recounted it, without a verb in the sentence, Mrs. Barlow ‘always [sic] everybody in love with her’ (121). Inserted after and above this claim was her verification of Mme. de Boyve’s characterisation of Mrs. Barlow. Anne inserted, ‘true [e]nough’ (121). Mrs. Barlow was accused by Mme. de Boyve of being too ‘satirical’ and thinking everyone was ‘in love with her’. From the editorial commentary, it would seem Anne agreed with the accusations; Mrs. Barlow was unsociable in behaviour and inappropriately immodest.

The accusations levelled at Mrs. Barlow spoke to the boundaries of both social and gender constructions of behaviour in the early nineteenth century. More seriously, however, Mme. de Boyve argued that Mrs. Barlow contravened the boundaries of propriety. Mme. de Boyve was most informative on the topic and it was these transgressions that were recorded in the most detail in the journal entry. The substance of Mme. de Boyve’s history of Mrs. Barlow’s flirtations concerned Mr. Hancock, the grocer who was writing to Mrs. Barlow. Mme. de Boyve rather appropriately misnamed him ‘Mr. de Cock’ in the ‘history’ she told Anne (122). As Mme. de Boyve related it, and Anne recorded it in her journal entry:
Mrs. B- had at one time received a Mr. de Cock an English man perpetually in her room sat with & walked with him tête à [sic] for hours together perpetually till all the servants began to joke & M. de B- desired Madame to tell her of it for if it was not given up she really must leave the house Madame de B- did tell her of it & this was the only thing she ever took well Madame de B- only wished her to receive him in the drawing room for nine or ten days [h]e did not come then he was bad as ever again then luckily he went away. (122)

The account Mme. de Boyve gave to Anne was her only direct evidence against Mrs. Barlow. It was the only instance Mme. de Boyve witnessed herself about Mrs. Barlow’s sexual history whilst at the Place Vendôme.

To support the authority of her direct claim, Mme. de Boyve also told Anne another ‘history’ of Mrs. Barlow. This ‘history’ was an unsubstantiated account of another affair, as told by a French gentleman visitor to Place Vendôme, Monsieur de Nappe (n.d.). M. de Nappe’s story was itself unproven, for he heard it from a third party, later identified on 18 November as Monsieur Chateauvillard (n.d.) (150). It was M. Chateauvillard, ‘a gay French man’, who apparently paid his addresses to Mrs. Barlow, so Mme. de Boyve continued on 29 October (122). According to the source of the gossip, M. de Nappe, ‘this man had slept one night with Mrs. B-’ (122). Mme. de Boyve ‘declared it could not be & it was not so’ (122). M. de Nappe swore it was the truth, for he ‘declare’d the man had told him so’ (122). Mme. de Barlow brought the discussion with Anne to a damaging conclusion. M. Chateauvillard might be a loose or immoral gentleman, but Mrs. Barlow, Mme. de Boyve said, ‘had received attentions from this man’ (122). Mme. de Boyve protected herself and ‘left me [t]o judge for myself’, Anne wrote (122). There was no room for any doubts. Not only was there a history of improper behaviour that Mme. de Boyve could testify to, there was the account of another flirtation made by a third party, M. de Nappe. However, the common factor in all of these accounts was not only Mrs. Barlow; there was also Mme. de Boyve to consider. Mme. de Boyve’s reasons for these disclosures to Anne were not certain.

Anne wondered about the damning information regarding Mrs Barlow and was shocked into silence. ‘I heard but said [I]ittle or nothing to Madame de B-’, she wrote (122). The question she struggled with was precisely whom to believe. As Anne wrote in crypt handwriting, ‘thought I to myself again her conduct to me has not given the lie to all this’ (122). Whether she referred to the lie of Mme. de Boyve’s conduct or Mrs. Barlow’s was ultimately immaterial. Like many of her contemporaries, Anne’s method of establishing the truth of the matter was to read it through an exteriority of ‘virtue’ or
Anne recalled the knowing comments from the gentlemen of the Place Vendôme. Mr. Franks had said to Mrs. Barlow, ‘he “thought she could love very much”’ (122). He had heard the rumours from M. de Nappe, Anne guessed. It was a remark that Mrs. Barlow took as flattery, for she repeated the comment to Anne only a week before on 22 October. At that time prior to Mme. de Boyve’s ‘history’, Anne even agreed with him. ‘I agr[ee]d with Mr. Franks’, she wrote, ‘thought she could love ’very’ warmly’ (113).

Anne remembered that one of Melle. de Sans’ suitors, M. de Bellevue, recently whispered to Mrs. Barlow ‘Saint Enis touch’ (122). It was Anne’s closest English approximation, ‘according to the sound’, for the French ‘sente ni touché’, as she later wrote it on 7 December (122, 178). In French, to be ‘senti ni touché’ was to neither feel nor touch; it was to be ‘sly’, Anne had explained on 29 October, ‘a saint in public but not in private’ (122). Anne was courting a gentlewoman whose virtue had been brought into question – how was she to manage the situation? The evening of Mme. de Boyve’s ‘history’, Anne wrote in her journal entry, with telling mistakes, ‘I could never forget this flirt[ing] with these men’ (123). She concluded: ‘well said I to myself what hands have I got into how get out again let this be a lesson to me fo[r] the future’ (122).

Anne would keep the revelations close until she could determine what to make of them.

‘Madame de B- Is Certainly & Evidently Jealous’

The ‘history’ might have convinced Anne that it was Mme. de Boyve who had her best interests at heart. However, Mme. de Boyve’s nomination in the journal accounts shifted at this time to a stable system of referencing. Previously, Anne had alternated between using plain hand nominations ‘Made. de B-’ and ‘Mme. de B-’ to refer to the proprietor of Place Vendôme. In the earlier journal entries of Anne’s stay, when she referred to Madame de Boyve with others – and more specifically with others that defined her material position in the world like her husband, son or a guest – she used
‘Mme. de B-’. When Anne referred to the French proprietor alone, or in connection to herself, Madame de Boyve became ‘Made. de B-’. However, it was from 30 October, that the plain hand referrals to Madame de Boyve became consistently ‘Mme. de B-’ in the journal entries, and from 3 November in the index (123, index 10). As an indication of Anne’s relations to a person, the shift in plain hand nominations suggested a subtler interpretation of her upset about the new knowledge from Mme. de Boyve. The shift in late October and early November to a consistent use of ‘Mme. de B-’ suggested Anne was relying on a less intimate, more classed nomination for Madame de Boyve. Mme. de Boyve was being reconsidered in terms of her material relation to Anne herself – she was not a close friend, nor an equal, but more clearly the mistress of the house, with access to specialised forms of knowledge both domestic and sexual.

What exactly Mme. de Boyve’s intentions were can only be surmised. Possibly, Mme. de Boyve wanted to reinterest Anne in the now absent Mr. Franks. Perhaps Mme. de Boyve was annoyed at the failure of her match between them. If it was to foil the match between Anne and Mrs. Barlow and to make her doubt Mrs. Barlow’s character, then Mme. de Boyve only partly achieved it. Anne herself had suspected that she was not fully informed of Mrs. Barlow’s previous affairs. She wrote on 3 November, ‘I thought of what Madame de B-told me about Mrs. B-’s conduct’ (129). However, in the journal reflections about the matter, the attempted match with Mr. Franks was irrelevant. Anne considered that Mme. de Boyve was jealous. Earlier that evening, Mme. de Boyve remonstrated with her over Mrs. Barlow’s detrimental influence. As Anne wrote:

Mme. de B-began about my never speaking French: it was all Mrs. B-I was tied to her apron string (lié à son jupon) – It had been the case with 4 or 5 gents. who on becoming so intimate with Mrs. B-, had gi[v]en up speaking French – I had forgotten a good deal, she added, & did not speak so well as 3 weeks ago. (128)

Hearing the exchange, Melle. de Sans voiced her suspicion to Anne that ‘this is very like jealousy she is jealous’ (129). On 5 November, Anne wrote, ‘Madame de B-is certainly & evidently jealous of her’, which was similarly repeated in the index, ‘Madame de B-jealous’ (133, index 11). The next evening Anne thought Mme. de Boyve was ‘deadly jealous’ (134). Mme. de Boyve’s jealousy was increasingly public and noticeably worsening.

The concentrated jealousy between Mme. de Boyve and Mrs. Barlow began in the period before Anne arrived at the Place Vendôme. Mme. de Boyve revealed to Anne
during the conversation of 29 October, that she and Mrs. Barlow were ‘mutually not at ease’ (121). Even as early as 4 September, Anne was warned by Mrs. Barlow that ‘Madame de Boyve was selfish’ (70). The introduction of Anne into the rivalry between Mme. de Boyve and Mrs. Barlow seemed to drive the uneasy triangle into the foreground of the household affairs. The appearance and behaviour of M. de Nappe precipitated the first altercation between Anne and Mme. de Boyve. On 8 November, Anne was sitting next to Mrs. Barlow when M. de Nappe arrived. He was, she wrote, ‘inclined to take little liberties with Mrs. B-’ (136). Anne cut him. ‘I put on a face as grave as possible sat close to Mrs. B-’, she wrote (136). ‘Kept him at bay, & hardly uttered’, she continued (136). At dinner the following night, Anne told Mme. de Boyve, ‘he incommode Mrs B-’ (138). The discomfort M. de Nappe caused Mrs. Barlow was not Anne’s business, Mme. de Boyve said to her: ‘she said that was not my affair’ (138). Anne declared categorically, ‘all Mrs. B-’s affairs are mine’ (138). These progressively fraught encounters between Anne, Mrs. Barlow and Mme. de Boyve provoked an open confrontation between them and eventually amongst all the guests.

‘Intrigues Carried on in the House’

Anne publicly defended Mrs. Barlow against Mme. de Boyve’s jealous accusations, but she had not entirely dispelled her doubts about Mrs. Barlow. On 14 November for instance, Mrs. Barlow bluntly refused Anne’s request to dismiss her maid, Mrs. Page (n.d.), when they were together. Mrs. Barlow told Anne, Mrs. Page ‘guards me & nobody can say anything against me’ (145). The admission about Mrs. Page was shortly to take on an entirely different implication. The following day, Mrs. Barlow at last gave Anne her account of the ‘intrigues carried on in the house’ (index 11). According to what Mrs. Barlow knew of the clandestine liaisons at the Place Vendôme, it was not quite the respectable boarding house Anne thought. The housekeeper Madame Chenelle (n.d.) was procuring and providing sexual services to the male guests, as well as the other servants. One guest, Colonel Wilson (n.d.), had ‘the housekeeper & then her cousin [w]hom she brought into him with whom she might perhaps share the profits’ (146). Madame Chenelle was also known to have ‘intrigued with the men servants too & others’ (146). The revelations about the real affairs of the house changed Anne’s mind about Mme. de Boyve’s accusations against Mrs. Barlow.

The procuring was more pervasive in the household than just servants’ business. The implication was that these ‘intrigues’ occurred in the house with Mme. de Boyve’s
knowledge. Another male guest ‘had had women in his room constantly’, Mrs. Barlow told Anne. Even worse, ‘Madame de B- knew it’ (146). However, if Mrs. Barlow considered her information to be true, then such knowledge placed her in a compromising position. ‘Madame de B- did not know Mrs. B- knew of all this’, Mrs. Barlow told Anne, ‘if it were not so she could not have staid in the house’ (146). Mrs. Barlow’s departure would be for the sake of propriety, for a claim of ignorance could protect her virtue, where knowledge could not. Such a move would also, on Mme. de Boyve’s part, avoid the possibility of her house becoming publicly disreputable. Thus, knowledge of the real affairs of the Place Vendôme house threatened the class boundaries that restricted gentlewomen’s awareness of such occurrences, whilst continuing to enable gentlemen’s sexual access to servants and domestic staff. It was Mrs. Page who had most likely revealed the full extent of the sexual economy of the household to Mrs. Barlow, but was being deployed as a chaperone. Mrs. Page’s use revealed something of the way the domestic class of workers were increasingly subjugated by, yet integral to, the creation and maintenance of the social structures of the emergent middle class in Britain at this time. Mrs. Page was necessary to Mrs. Barlow as a way of actively maintaining the social conventions regarding her reputation, given the risk of compromise to her reputation at the Place Vendôme.

Why was Mme. de Boyve so critically positioned in the saga? That Anne was attracted to her does not adequately explain why the household drama prefigured so largely in the journal entries. To comprehend the importance of Mme. de Boyve, the drama over contested amatory histories must be contextualised within an understanding of these sociable interactions. Mme de Boyve was not merely gossiping, nor was Anne simply responding to, or refuting these claims. The purpose that Mme. de Boyve’s claims served was to delineate the boundary of acceptable behaviour; the role that Mme. de Boyve enacted in the mise en scène was that of social gatekeeper. Such an understanding of Mme. de Boyve’s social role provides a more penetrating insight into Anne’s relations with her, adding an extra dimension of intention to these subtle domestic exchanges. Mme. de Boyve was both a source of information about the affairs of the house and the arbiter of the management of domestic and amatory affairs within the house. Anne’s first gestures towards Mme. de Boyve, such as her attentions, visits and outings, demonstrated her delicate management of Mme. de Boyve. Anne was specifically managing Mme. de Boyve to achieve a smooth operation of her own sociable and sexual arrangements in the household.
Anne’s management of Mme. de Boyve became increasingly ineffective, as she attempted to juggle an intensifying courtship with Mrs. Barlow. The boundaries between sociability and domesticity became blurred, with far-reaching and socially dire effects. That these differences between Mme. de Boyve, Mrs. Barlow and Anne were more than minor quarrels of a household was demonstrated by the dramatic outcome and resolution of the row. Mrs. Barlow, and eventually Anne also, found it necessary to implement the drastic action of renting another residence and removing themselves from Place Vendôme. It was a measure that allowed Anne and Mrs. Barlow to defend their social standing by separating themselves from the reputation, or lack of it, of Mme de Boyve’s guesthouse. The drama was more than an insignificant argument between these three gentlewomen. It was centred upon and profoundly bound up with the constitutive social and material conditions of their everyday experience, particularly concerning the disputed issues of propriety, virtue, reputation and character.

The climax of these domestic and sexual anxieties occurred on 17 November. It transpired when Mrs. Barlow’s maid Mrs. Page made a complaint about Mme. Chenelle, the housekeeper. It was a complaint that Mrs. Barlow became involved in, and legitimated, by taking it to Mme. de Boyve. What the complaint entailed was not detailed by Anne but, from the journal entry, it appeared to be about Mme. Chenelle’s sexual services. Anne also necessarily became implicated in the affair when Mme. de Boyve requested she and Mrs. Barlow discuss the matter. Anne wrote:

Immediately after dinner Mme. de B- wished to speak to Mrs. B- & myself – we sat 40 mins. with her in her own room till 7 25/60 – then going up to Mrs. B-‘s room to talk it all over (a useless row about Mme. Chenelle whom she believes all that suits her), after calling in Page, & hearing what she had to say – agreed to let the thing rest. (149)

The thing did not rest there however, for Mme. Chenelle’s position in Place Vendôme as both servant and procurer, transgressed the borders between domesticity, class, sexuality and sociability. Discussion of Mme. Chenelle became the symbolic focal point for much of the cultural anxieties of the house.

The matter lead directly to the conversation of ‘that Thursday’, as Anne termed it even weeks later (162, 180). On Thursday 18 November, Mme. de Boyve and Anne had an extremely upsetting discussion. Mme. de Boyve was moved to accusations, especially against Mrs. Barlow. Anne thought that ‘Madame de B- is certainly jealous of Mrs. B-‘ (151). Mme. de Boyve did appear to be motivated by an intense jealousy and at the
same time, directly responding to interference in house matters over Mme. Chenelle. Mme. de Boyve’s accusations were twofold and both automatically involved Mrs. Barlow. The first accusation concerned M. de Nappe’s response to the gossip concerning Mrs. Barlow. When Mme. de Boyve had questioned M. de Nappe, he had again ‘declared upon his honour’ his statements were true (150). “M. de Ch. had slept with her all night”, M. de Nappe stated to Mme. de Boyve (150). Mme. de Boyve delivered her masterstroke, that ‘if well educated people could so scandalize[sic] a gentlewoman & believe it all well might Mrs. Page or others in low life scandalize[ sic] Madame Chenelle’ (150). Mme. de Boyve drew an explicit connection between the slandering of Mrs. Barlow and that of the housekeeper. It left the issue of truthfulness untouched. Instead, it was the knowledge of such scandal, and the class and gender of those who knew it, that was critical. If Mrs. Page could so ‘scandalize[ sic]’ Mme. Chenelle she was not a credible chaperone, which exposed Mrs. Barlow’s reputation. Whether true or not, M. de Nappe’s knowledge in no way reflected on his respectability, but he could bring Mrs. Barlow’s social reputation into disgrace.

Mme. de Boyve was not so kind in introducing the second of her accusations. It concerned Mrs. Barlow’s first impressions, regrettably discourteous, of Anne when she first arrived at the Place Vendôme. Mme. de Boyve said it entertained her to see Mrs. Barlow with Anne so much now, ‘after all she said of me at first’ (151). According to Mme. de Boyve, Mrs. Barlow said of Anne, ‘she could not be seen with me &c. people would think she was with a man in women’s clothes’ (151). As indicated by the index, it was the remark that affected Anne the most. She wrote and double section ‘§§’ marked how Mrs. Barlow ‘abused me at first’ (index 11). The index note itself was more revealing about what particularly affected Anne about Mrs. Barlow’s remarks. The index note continued, ‘she abused me at first the treadmill business & c.’ (index 11). Therefore Mrs. Barlow’s thinking Anne was a man in women’s clothes was not only an observation of Anne’s sartorial style, but a direct result of the ongoing notoriety Anne received from ‘this treadmill business’. The dishevelment of Anne’s reputation preceded her own arrival at Place Vendôme and the ‘treadmill business’ was once again the source of the doubts about Anne’s character. The domestic drama that Mme. de Boyve had precipitated had originally involved only Mrs. Barlow’s propriety. By the climax of the affair, the reputations of many of the women at Place Vendôme, mistresses and servants alike, had come into question.
Anne could forgive Mrs. Barlow the comments about her clothing. She told Mme. de Boyve on 18 November, ‘I neither wondered at nor blamed Mrs. B- it was all natural enough’ (151). However, Anne yielded to her persistent doubts concerning Mrs. Barlow’s ‘history’. She became involved in a devious plan with Mme. de Boyve, to coerce further information from Mrs. Barlow. On 20 November she wrote, ‘I sat on the sofa in close tête à tête with Mme. de B-’ (153). Anne wanted to know the specifics about these gentlemen, including the names of the two men and some of the details as to their characters. Mme. de Boyve schemed ‘to find some opportunity of mentioning these two names so that I could catch at them’ (153). What followed was the ‘dénouement respecting Mr. Hancock & M. Chateauvillard’, as Anne described and double section ‘§§’ marked it in the index (index 11). Anne detailed how the scheme played out, in two entire journal pages of densely crypted handwriting (153–55). Mme. de Boyve was telling fortunes of the guests, but she was ‘foretelling’, as Anne wrote, ‘according to my desire where we should all be two years hence’ (154). Mme. de Boyve told Mrs. Barlow, she ‘would be travelling in France w[i]th two gentlemen’ (154).43 Anne immediately ‘asked their names’ (155). She wrote, ‘voilà how ingeniously we managed the thing’ (155). The effect of the scheme was immediate; Mrs. Barlow ‘begged I would say no more about it then[sic] I had’ (154). ‘I alone’, Anne wrote, ‘saw the momentary paleness that quivered on her cheeks & lips when first sh[e] spoke’ (154). Ingeniously managed or not, later Anne regretted the unkind undertaking.

Everyone but Anne and Mrs. Barlow eventually left the drawing room. Anne then ‘questioned her closely & so decidedly’ that Mrs. Barlow at last revealed the details of the relationship with Mr. Hancock and the fact of their correspondence (154). It was ‘the letter’ business that Anne had been trying to uncover for some time (154). Mrs. Barlow told Anne that Mme. de Boyve ‘behaved ill’ towards her in that affair, creating similar domestic predicaments to those Anne and Mrs. Barlow experienced (154). Mme. de Boyve obstructed the opportunities for Mr. Hancock and Mrs. Barlow to meet and prevented them from visiting together in the salon, claiming it inconvenienced her. Mrs. Barlow and Mr. Hancock ‘incommoded her’, Mme. de Boyve said to Mrs. Barlow (154). The acceptable social option of the drawing room was closed to them. Instead of not meeting at all, Mr. Hancock and Mrs. Barlow took the risky and potentially scandalous alternative of meeting in Mrs. Barlow’s room. Mrs. Barlow qualified to
Anne, ‘but we always fat with the door open & Page was in the next room’ (154). Keeping Mrs. Page near was a strategy that Mrs. Barlow employed to protect her reputation of virtue concerning her relationship with Mr. Hancock, and given the questionable conduct of the household. Anne was now fully informed about the activities, both social and sexual, proper and improper, at Place Vendôme. She actively tested Mme. de Boyve’s claims against Mrs. Barlow’s protestations of innocence.

Anne started to express a dislike for Mme. de Boyve. When Mme. de Boyve called on her three days later, it was not a welcome visit. On 23 November, Anne merely noted the call with a ‘V’ in the journal margin (158). She told Mme. de Boyve, ‘that Mrs. B- & I had had much conversation about Mr. Hancock’ (158). ‘I was quite satisfied’, Anne said to her (158). At once, Mme Boyve made light of her previous allegations. Regarding M. Chateauvillard, Mme. de Boyve ‘owned that was only a business of ten days’ (158). Anne wrote, ‘then why thought I did you make so m[m]uch of it before’ (158)? ‘Madame de B- certainly wished to lessen my favour towards Mrs. B- at first’, Anne wrote (158). She concluded that Mme. de Boyve’s about-face occurred because ‘she now sees she cannot manage it’ (158). Anne told Mrs. Barlow on 25 November, ‘the more I liked Mrs. B- the less I liked Madame de B-’ (161). As far as Anne would admit to it, Mrs. Barlow ‘was the sole cause of it tho’ the innocent one’ (161). It made Mrs. Barlow suspicious. ‘Mrs. B- will have it’, Anne wrote, ‘she has told me something against her but this I fight off & will not allow’ (161). Anne could not allow it, for revealing Mme. de Boyve’s accusations would uncover her compromised role in the scheme. As she wrote, ‘I often think could Mrs. B- know all what a rowe[sic] it might make’ (161). The dislike of Mme. de Boyve was perhaps prompted by Anne’s remorse or compunction over her part in the scheming. It was also undoubtedly in Anne’s own interest to protect her complicity in the domestic saga.

The ‘dénouement’ and its consequences brought Anne some measure of resolution. The November’s journal entries had the highest page count for any month whilst she in Paris. There were forty two pages of journal entries diligently tracking the domestic and amatory saga. The drama began with Mme. de Boyve’s ‘history’ of Mrs. Barlow on 29 October and it diminished in importance following the ‘dénouement’ a month later at the end of November. The December rate of journal entries, at thirty six pages, was a slight decrease. However, the focus of the journal entries had completely shifted, charting out the growing intimacy between Anne and Mrs. Barlow. The tensions and
pressures exposed by the drama with Mme. de Boyve served to draw Anne and Mrs. Barlow closer and Anne was increasingly attentive to her. Concomitantly, there was a perceptible lessening of emphasis in the index markings regarding the drama. The entangled row with Mme. de Boyve and the courtship of Mrs. Barlow were both metasigned in Anne’s autobiographical account in her index with the double section ‘§§’ markers. On 25 November, the index note about the ‘conversation about Madame de B-’ was only marked with one section ‘§’ marker (index 12). Thus, the sexual and domestic sociability of the household was no longer in spectacular and painful collision, as she dealt with or dismissed the impacts of these sexual histories and intrigues. Claims by Mme. de Boyve were divorced from the sociable interactions and cultural interpretations Anne placed on Mrs. Barlow, and vice versa. Mme. de Boyve’s account of Mrs. Barlow’s sexual history was not treated any more by Anne as claims to truth; rather she began to personify these statements as reflective of Mme. de Boyve’s character. Anne may well have decided to place her trust in Mrs. Barlow.

Anne explicated and disseminated information about the row amongst the other gentlewomen guests. It achieved the important social function of establishing an interactive distance between herself and Mme. de Boyve. As well, it allowed her to declare publicly and openly, her loyalty to Mrs. Barlow. Anne began immediately on 25 November, starting with Melle. de Sans. ‘I did not like her so well as at first’, she said of Mme. de Boyve, ‘& it was for this conduct of her’s to Mrs. B-’ (161). Mme. de Boyve used every opportunity, it seemed, to continue to try and catch Mrs. Barlow out. On 30 November, Mme. de Boyve brought up M. Chateauvillard’s name in front of Anne and Mrs. Barlow. The tone of the journal entry recording the incident suggested Anne’s reluctance to discuss the matter. ‘I must observe’, Anne wrote, ‘that at dinner today Madame de B- asked me to have some of the game M. de Ch- had sent her’ (168). Mme. de Boyve continued, ‘saying he was an adorateur of Mrs. B-’s’ (168). The correction from Mrs. Barlow was immediate, ‘with[o]ut the least [e]mbarrassment’, Anne wrote (168–69). M. Chateauvillard was not her adorer, Mrs. Barlow replied, he was ‘an adorateur of Madame de B-’s & to[sic] much taken up with Madame de B- to think much of her Mrs. B-’ (169). Anne and Mrs. Barlow found these remarks unpleasant. However, it was a necessary opportunity to question Mme. de Boyve’s character, as well as correct the public representation of Mrs. Barlow’s reputation.
In this domestic drama, the reputations of these gentlewomen were relative to each other, where the central problematic was the possession of sexual knowledge. Mme. de Boyve’s claim to Anne was that Mrs. Barlow’s ‘history’ of flirtations meant she possessed a past that was not virtuous or reputable. When Anne and Mrs. Barlow defended themselves against Mme. de Boyve’s continuing accusations, it was using the rubric of excessive sexual knowledge against Mme. de Boyve. In other words, Mme. de Boyve was too knowledgeable of the world. On 6 December, Anne and Mrs. Barlow ‘talked of Madame de B-’s’ worldliness &c. &c.’ (177). In the early nineteenth century, such a claim of worldliness spoke of sexual knowledge as well as moral transgressions. It was a pejorative description of someone thought to be overly socialised, too removed from a natural or moral ethic. Anne closely identified with Rousseau’s belief in spiritual individualism, as both Clara Tuite and Helena Whitbread have noted (Tuite 2002, 198–202; Whitbread 1988, xxiv). Mme. de Boyve’s contravention of the boundary concerning appropriate knowledge for her class and gender was increasingly the way that household complaints against her were voiced. It was through the claim of worldliness that Mrs. Barlow and Anne legitimised their critical respectability, as well as distancing themselves from social association with Mme. de Boyve.

It dawned on Anne that Mme. de Boyve might have told other guests of the ‘history’ of Mrs. Barlow’s flirtations. A conversation with a guest, Miss Harvey (b.1784?), on 7 December confirmed Anne’s suspicion.45 ‘I know something of this’, Anne said to Miss Harvey, ‘perhaps you know it by the same means’ (178). Miss Harvey admitted she did. Anne concluded and double section ‘§§’ marked in her index, ‘Madame de B- must have told her about Mr.[sic] B- & M. Chateauvillard’ (index 12). The drama involving Mme. de Boyve was once again a significant focus of Anne’s textual attention, as she index marked it, in her autobiographical account of Paris. That Anne was upset by the resurgence of the row with Mme. de Boyve was indicated by her error with Mrs. Barlow’s crypted name, ‘Mr. B-‘. To Miss Harvey, Anne solemnly ‘promised to keep all this to myself’ (178). However, such an action would have been impossible. Mme. de Boyve was not merely intervening in the affective relationship between Anne and Mrs. Barlow. By making Mrs. Barlow’s sexual past more widely known amongst the guests, the effect of Mme. de Boyve’s confidences might be considerably more damaging. Anne could not rule out that Mme. de Boyve intended to ruin Mrs. Barlow’s reputation amongst the Parisian community of expatriate English gentlewomen.
A confrontation between Anne and Mme. de Boyve resulted. That same day on 7 December, Anne was forced to express her position to Mme de Boyve to her face. As Anne indexed, she ‘Told Mme. de B- I did not like her so well as at first. Explained why’ (index 12–13). The importance of the conversation was duly noted with double section ‘§§’ markers. Anne wrote in her journal entry, ‘Mme. de B- asked me to explain’ (178). Anne’s reason was, of course, that she did not like Mme. de Boyve’s gossiping about Mrs. Barlow’s reputation and character amongst their society. ‘I said’, Anne wrote, ‘I did not like … the way in which she had spoken of M. de Nappe’s conduct to Mrs. B-’ (178). The authorial flourishes – the plain to crypt handwriting and four point ellipses – had all the impact of the tension of a pause before a spectacular revelation. Anne and Mme. de Boyve were, by now, creating a noticeably public scene. They had, Anne wrote, ‘already taken each other apart to whisper too much’ (179).

Perhaps the shift in dramatic tone signalled the beginning of the intense whispering about Mrs. Barlow’s reputation. Civil to the last, at least in the observance of sociable rituals, the two gentlewomen ended their dispute ‘& we wished good night’ (179). The confrontation began with Anne’s remarks amidst a general audience in a very sociable space, but it was carried out and concluded in whispers, in full view of all the guests.

Anne could defend Mrs. Barlow because she chose whom to believe. ‘I always put all things together’, Anne said to Mme. de Boyve, ‘& then judged which was right’ (178). When in late November Anne judged Mrs. Barlow to be the rightful party in the domestic drama, she held to her loyally thereafter. However, in the public space of the Place Vendôme pension, Anne’s particular objections to Mme. de Boyve were unknown. The outspokenness to Mme. de Boyve would have seemed unprovoked, in terms of what Anne and Mrs. Barlow expressed to other guests about Mme. de Boyve’s worldliness. The drama that Anne’s confrontation with Mme. de Boyve caused can be seen in the reportage and confusion within the journal entry. That the conversation was highly emotional was clear. Besides the narrative confusion, other key indicators were all present in the journal entry. The journal entry was extremely detailed, particularly with the recording of the conversation between Anne and Mme. de Boyve. Anne’s interest in the accuracy of her autobiographical writing was amply demonstrated. She wrote some of the conversation in French and she included reportage elements like ‘I said’ and ‘she said’. The journal entry also displayed editing elements like struck through errors, insertions and elaborations made above the original writing. Anne’s
autobiographical need for veracity and accuracy in her journal entry demonstrated the sociable tension and significance of the dénouement with Mme. de Boyve.

After such a scene Mrs. Barlow was determined to find out the substance of Mme. de Boyve’s allegations. Anne would still not reveal what she was told by Mme. de Boyve. As she wrote, on 8 December, she ‘would not & did not say at all what I had promised not’ (180). Mrs. Barlow therefore paid a visit to Melle. de Sans. It was Melle. de Sans who ‘told her many things Mme. de B- had said of her’ (180). The gossip that Melle. de Sans knew was not as wounding perhaps to Mrs. Barlow’s reputation, as the accusations that Mme. de Boyve made to Anne. Mrs. Barlow was upset with the little she learnt from Melle. de Sans. Anne wrote, Mrs. Barlow ‘seemed much annoyed & hurt even for a moment or 2 to tears, but was determined not to mind it, & not to stay here longer than could be helped’ (180).

Anne had the opportunity to make amends. Without acknowledging ‘anything in particular’ to Mrs. Barlow, she made her apologies for her former deception:

   apologized[sic] for my formerly so mistaking her. said I had behaved dishonora[ ] that Thursday & could ‘not’ bear to think of it but I was then systematically trying her. (180)

After Mme. de Boyve reiterated her accusations about Mrs. Barlow on ‘that Thursday’ of 18 November, Anne was not sure whether she could trust Mrs. Barlow. She dishonourably tried to find out Mrs. Barlow’s affairs with Mme. de Boyve’s scheme two days later on 20 November. It was Mrs. Barlow’s appearance of truthfulness that made Anne believe her. She said to Mrs. Barlow, ‘her manners had then convinced me of my error & I had endeavoured to at[o]ne f[or] it ever since’ (180). Whatever Mme. de Boyve’s role in instigating and developing the drama, Anne took the ultimate responsibility for her part. She concluded, ‘indeed I do think I did do her great injustice’ (180). Mrs. Barlow was ‘a virtuous woman’ in both the journal entry and index (180, index 13). That it was an extremely significant recognition of Mrs. Barlow’s character was demonstrated by the first use of the triple section ‘§§§’ mark in the index. Mrs. Barlow’s reputation was finally vindicated in Anne’s autobiographical account of Paris with the highest valuation she could make of Mrs. Barlow’s propriety.
Someone in the house told Mme. de Boyve that Mrs. Barlow was aware of the accusations she made about her ‘history’ of flirtations. During dinner on 10 December, Mme. de Boyve ‘suddenly dr[ew] her chair more distant from Mrs. B- saying, Mrs. B- was afraid of her’ (182). The message could not have been clearer or more public, but the immediate response was bemused rather than shocked. As Anne wrote, ‘we all smiled at such folly but sai[d] nothing’ (182). However, it did precipitate another confrontation. ‘Grand discussion between Mrs. B- & me with Mme. de B-’, she wrote in the index (index 13). It was clearly a discussion of some magnitude for it was double section ‘§§’ marked in the index note (index 13). It also took Anne one and a half pages to relate the ‘grand discussion’ in her journal entry (182–84). For once, unusually, the textual discussion in both the index and journal entry were written entirely in the plain handwriting. The record of the ‘grand discussion’ was designed to be an accountable and transparent description of the confrontation. It was not ultimately a confrontation that occurred by design or intention; it came about as a specific response to the public behaviour of Mme. de Boyve. Even so, Anne intended to observe and document the whole ‘grand discussion’, perhaps as proof and justification of their actions.

The initial ‘grand discussion’ was restricted to Mme. de Boyve and Anne. Whilst Mme. de Boyve appeared more concerned about who was responsible for the broken confidence – a claim Anne could rightly deny – Anne was more preoccupied with gauging Mme. de Boyve’s response to the different options available to Mrs. Barlow. Anne agreed with Mrs. Barlow about her choices. The only way to maintain Mrs Barlow’s reputation was for her to find another residence. Anne told Mme. de Boyve, ‘the best plan was for Mrs. B- to leave the house, as soon as she could fix herself co[m]fortably elsewhere’ (182). It would cause a stir, as Mme. de Boyve said, it ‘would make a great éclat’ (182). Such a situation would not reflect well on Mrs. Barlow. Mrs. Barlow would create a fuss and give rise to speculation regardless of any plausible reason given for her departure. Choosing this alternative could be damaging to Mrs. Barlow’s reputation, as much in fact as if the actual gossip were to be revealed. Mrs. Barlow’s departure was not a good alternative for Mme. de Boyve either. As Mme. de Boyve said, ‘that would hurt my house’ (183). Any domestic or material reason supplied by Mrs. Barlow would be detrimental to Mme. de Boyve’s establishment.
Mme. de Boyve insisted on speaking alone and separately to Mrs. Barlow. Perhaps Mme. de Boyve wanted to tell her side of the situation, which would no doubt include Anne’s involvement. Anne refused and remained when Mme. de Boyve stopped Mrs. Barlow. ‘Poor Mrs. B-’, Anne wrote, ‘was made very nervous by this sort of thing at first’ (183). Mrs. Barlow was able to defend herself to Mme. de Boyve, Anne noted, ‘very quietly & judicially’ (183). Mme. de Boyve ‘vowed her great friendship’ towards Mrs. Barlow (183). The proof was, Mme. de Boyve rather unwisely said, her own defence upon hearing these stories of Mrs. Barlow. Mme. de Boyve claimed ‘she had defended her as tho[sic] she had been her mother or sister’ (183). The ‘story of [M....] …..’ that Mme. de Boyve hinted at was presumably, the very same ‘history’ that Mme. de Boyve slanderously told Anne (183). Mme. de Boyve failed to convince or influence Mrs. Barlow. When Mme. de Boyve left, Anne wrote, ‘she put her cheek to Mrs. B-‘s in vain’ (183). The unusual emphasis indicated the upper hand Mrs. Barlow held in the situation. It was Mrs. Barlow who would decide upon the advantages and disadvantages of remaining or departing the Place Vendôme. ‘Pro & con’, Anne wrote (183). Mrs. Barlow would not be swayed from protecting her own best interests. The tension over the matter was beginning to be felt by all parties.

Mrs. Barlow finally granted Mme. de Boyve’s request for an unaccompanied audience. However, Mrs. Barlow was already ‘too nervous to bear this sort of thing’ and retired (183). Instead, Mrs. Barlow sent a message, which stated she ‘wished to say nothing more on the subject as it was [h]er fixed determination to go as soon as she could’ (183). Anne went with the message, only to find that Mme. de Boyve had also taken to her bed. Using M. de Boyve as a translator, Anne stayed for an hour in discussion. Mme. de Boyve at first disclaimed she ever told Anne the ‘history’ of Mrs. Barlow. Contradictorily, Mme. de Boyve attempted to argue that it was a result of a language barrier. To that, Anne said, ‘I could not but add, w[eil]l!’ (183). Anne and the French Melle. de Sans could not both be wrong. It was Mme. de Boyve’s own behaviour, which gave it all away to Mrs. Barlow, Anne said. As she wrote:

it was Mme. de B- herself who had l[e]d Mrs. B- to suspect & question me, tho’ in vain, by mentioning together the names of ….. the 2 gents…… as she did [o]ne evening. (183)

Disguising the two gentlemen’s names was the only masking Anne used in this section of her journal entry. Apart from this one subtle instance, these conversations with Mme.
de Boyve were all written in plain handwriting. Anne claimed that responsibility for the outcome with Mrs. Barlow lay almost entirely with Mme. de Boyve.

Mme. de Boyve attempted to appeal to Anne on the basis of sociability. What impact could be expected from the situation, except a negative and damaging character? Mrs. Barlow’s standing within the English community in Paris would be blemished. Mme. de Boyve told Anne it would ‘[hu]rt Mrs. B-’s reputation’ (183). Mrs. Barlow was in danger, Mme. de Boyve declared, of tarnishing her reputation: ‘sa reputation[sic] serait ennuyée’ (183). Having done so much to compromise Mrs. Barlow’s reputation in Anne’s eyes, Mme. de Boyve’s petition seemed not to have made any impact upon Anne. In her opinion Mrs. Barlow’s reputation would not be lost. ‘I replied’, Anne wrote, ‘I did not think so’ (183). After the conversation was finished, Anne returned to Mrs. Barlow and tried to calm her. Anne ‘made the best I could of the thing, & tranquillized[sic] her’ (184). The whole business made Mrs. Barlow ‘ag[i]tated & nervous, & un[w]ell’ (184). In the only crypted section regarding the day’s events, Anne told Mrs. Barlow, ‘whatever she did to keep to her resolution to leave the house as foon as she could’ (184). Anne thought it was the best plan for everyone concerned.

What followed was a series of messages and interventions by third parties, as everyone in the Place Vendôme became absorbed into the domestic drama. After breakfast on 11 December, Miss Harvey gave a message to Anne. Mme. de Boyve, Anne wrote, ‘wished me to p[e]rsua[d]e Mrs. B- to stay’ (184). Unfortunately, not fully apprised of the situation, Miss Harvey passed on the message under the impression that Anne was ‘the instigator of Mrs. B-’s going’ (184). Mme. de Boyve blamed Anne and it had become known to Anne. It was bound not to improve the situation. Later in the day, Monsieur de Boyve was appointed to the task. Anne wrote, he ‘tried all means to make her stay but in vain ~ he begged & prayed & cried’ (184). It was to no avail. M. de Boyve figured unsuccessfully in his rare appearance in the journal entries. Dinner presented more opportunities for persuasion. First there was Miss Harvey, followed by Melle. de Sans. Separately, each of the gentlewomen delivered contradictory messages from Mme. de Boyve. Miss Harvey said Mme. de Boyve ‘had told her she thought it was best for Mrs. B- to go’ (184). Then came Melle. de Sans who said that Mme. de Boyve ‘had desired her to say’, Anne wrote, ‘she wished Mrs. B- to [s]tay & would do anything to induce her to do so’ (184–85). It was too late, for Mrs. Barlow could not now be induced to stay. Mrs. Barlow said to Anne, ‘what dependence can be placed on a
woman who thinks one thing at 2 o’clock and another at 4 o’clock today?’ (185). If Miss Harvey and Melle. de Sans’ reports were both correct, then Mme. de Boyve herself tactlessly brought about the finale of the situation she was trying to avoid.

Mme. de Boyve undertook the matter. The next day 12 December, Mme. de Boyve had a ‘long interview with Mrs. B-’, Anne noted in her index (index 13). Anne was concerned about what Mme. de Boyve would say to Mrs. Barlow about Anne’s role in the scheme with the gentlemen’s names. She wrote, ‘I cannot help fancying Mme. de B- has insinuated I have been too deep for her – too artful, of course, she means’ (186). Mme. de Boyve blamed Anne for instigating the whole affair. Yet, it was the vital histories that Mme. de Boyve provided that gave Anne the impetus to doubt Mrs. Barlow in the first place. As she wrote in the journal entry:

how should I have known how to do so, had she not first given me the requisite knowledge which He[aven] she did voluntarily enough apparently nothing either to suggest – (to give rise to) – or to answer the questions of which she now seems to have complained. (186)

Without the gossip from Mme. de Boyve, Anne considered there would have been no reason for her to question Mrs. Barlow. There would have been no need for Mme. de Boyve to tell fortunes with the two names. There would have been no knowledge or even suspicion for Anne to act upon. It was a complicated sociable situation of vital significance, for the damage would be felt almost entirely by Mrs. Barlow.

Outrageously, Mme. de Boyve told Mrs. Barlow that everything she had said to Anne was a joke. ‘Now she says’, Anne wrote, ‘all she said was “plaisanterie” – mere plaisanterie’ (186). Joke or not, Mme. de Boyve gave Mrs. Barlow pause for thought about Anne. Anne wrote in the index, Mme. de Boyve ‘made her doubt me for the moment’ (index 13). Mme. de Boyve told Mrs. Barlow about Anne’s involvement in the scheme the night of 20 November, ‘that when she mentioned the 2 names (vide the bottom of page 154.), I had asked her to do so, & it was [th]us concerted between us’ (187). Anne did not deny it, but defended her silence to Mrs. Barlow. ‘How could I so commit Mme. de B-,’ she asked Mrs. Barlow (187)? Now however, Mme. de Boyve had committed herself. ‘I am’, Anne felt, ‘no longer [b]ound in honour or imprudence to withhold it’ (187). Mrs. Barlow ‘shall therefore have that part of my journal relative to this’, she said (187). Anne’s promise seemed sufficient, but later that afternoon she disturbed Mrs. Barlow ‘reading my journal’ (187). Mrs. Barlow wanted to read ‘what
passed between Madame de B- & me the other night’, Anne wrote, ‘but nothing material is ever in plain hand’ (187). It was not until 3 March that Anne ‘read aloud my jou[r]na[l] [o]f October 26[sic]’ (252). Months later the drama was still distressing, for it was the journal entry of 29 October, not 26 October, which contained the record of the histories Mme. de Boyve had related (121–22). Mrs. Barlow’s choices were clear. In her own apartment, Mrs. Barlow could salvage her reputation and continue her relationship with Anne. At the Place Vendôme, she risked future scrutiny of her relationships and further discredit. Mrs. Barlow chose to leave.

‘Our New Abode’

With Mrs. Barlow’s departure decided upon and no possibility of her changing her mind, the everyday dramatics with Mme. de Boyve died down. From very lengthy passages focused on Mme. de Boyve a week before, the journal entries from mid December completely discarded the topic. The journal entries took up instead the subject of the search for a new residence for Mrs. Barlow. Even at this late stage, Anne’s own plans were undecided. She could leave Place Vendôme with Mrs. Barlow. Or, she could remain at the Place Vendôme just for the ‘4 or 5 weeks longer’ she intended to stay in Paris, as she told Miss Maclean on 15 December (190). On 13 December, Anne and Mrs. Barlow discussed Anne sleeping with her in the new residence. ‘I should go & sleep with h[er]’, Anne said to Mrs. Barlow (189). It was not clear whether Anne was to reside with Mrs. Barlow or merely visit overnight. Interestingly, the decision to leave was not clearly articulated by Anne in the journal entries. The only indication was the comment on 18 December when Anne wrote she would try to achieve her desire of kissing Mrs. Barlow’s breast ‘in our new abode’ (192). By 3 January, Anne wrote to Mariana to notify her of the new address for their correspondence, and Aunt Anne was notified in the letter of 5 January (209; ML/190, 2). Sometime before early January, the plan for Anne to accompany Mrs. Barlow to her new premises became more concrete.

Yet Mme. de Boyve did not seem to be reconciled to the new state of affairs. Whether she acted out of pique, frustration or a sense of righteousness, a few days later she disturbed the temporary calm in the pension. In spite of everything, Mme. de Boyve held firm to her views on Mrs. Barlow. On 26 December, Mrs. Middleton reported a conversation with Mme. de Boyve to Mrs. Barlow and Anne. Mme. de Boyve told Mrs. Middleton, ‘you know Mrs. B- always received gent[l]emen in her bedroom & ladies in
Mrs. Barlow developed a bad nervous headache as a result. The index, which read similarly, was only marked with a solitary section ‘§’ marker (index 14). Mme. de Boyve’s speaking foolishly was not such an issue once Mrs. Barlow determined to depart, although her actions still appeared to be a major subject of discussion amongst the gentlewomen guests. The next evening when Monsieur de Boyve came into the drawing room, Anne noted that all the gentlewomen departed the room for bed almost immediately. Mrs. Cunliffe (n.d.), Mrs. Barlow and Anne chatted till ‘after 11, when M. de B- came,’ Anne wrote, ‘& we all went to our rooms at 11 10/60’ (201). Mme. de Boyve’s obstinate behaviour was perhaps the final straw for the sociability of the Place Vendôme pension.

Mrs. Barlow agreed informally to take 15 Quai Voltaire a few days later on 28 December. With all these affairs settled, relations between the three gentlewomen lost some of its tension. Most social interactions between the gentlewomen in the house were undertaken through intermediaries. On 29 December, through Melle. de Sans, Anne offered her concert ticket for that evening ‘as a present to Mme. de B-’ (205). All domestic troubles were soon to cease, for on 4 January 1825 Mrs. Barlow signed her lease for 15 Quai Voltaire (211). On 14 January, for the final time, Anne and Mrs. Barlow ‘both paid M. de Boyve’ (220). ‘Left M. de B-’s with Mrs. B-‘, Anne noted the following day in her index with a triple section ‘§§§’ marker (index 15). Other than a rude snubbing by Mme. de Boyve, Anne and Mrs. Barlow’s departure for their new residence at 15 Quai Voltaire was unremarkable. ‘Mrs. B- & I’, Anne wrote, ‘put the remainder of our things into a fiacre took Cordingley in with us, & got here (number 15 Quai Voltaire) about 2’ (220–21). Mrs. Page met the party there, having gone earlier in the day to get the new residence ready. The visits and calls made by Anne and Mrs. Barlow as they departed were officially designated with the ‘Vc’ mark in the margin (220). Anne was keeping track of those gentlewomen that were to remain friends and acquaintances. Mrs. Barlow was leaving with her reputation in good standing with the other English gentlewomen of the household.

It was a week before Mme. de Boyve called on Mrs. Barlow and Anne at their new abode. Other friends or visitors from Place Vendôme like Mme. Galvani or Melle. de Sans called in the very first days of their arrival. On 22 January, Anne described how Mme. de Boyve called for half an hour with Miss Harvey (226). She marked it out in the journal margin as a formal call with a ‘Vc’ (226). Mme. de Boyve, she noted, was
‘all smiling on Mrs. B-’ (226). Anne and Mme. de Boyve were more distant with each other. As Anne wrote, ‘she & I tho[sic] civil, yet evidently shy towards each other’ (226). Anne maintained the social distance for a month after their departure from the Place Vendôme pension. Perhaps Anne did not forgive Mme. de Boyve for blaming her as the supposed ‘instigator’ of the entire drama. After a suitable interval on 12 February, Anne noted formally and without her usual abbreviations or contractions, that ‘I left my card for Mme. de Boyve’ (240). The visiting card was marked in the journal margin with a ‘Vc’, the only time Anne ever reciprocated a call upon Mme. de Boyve (240). Anne’s attempt to broach the reserve between them with her formal call upon Mme. de Boyve was a social gesture to make peace.

The disgruntlement amongst the guests at Place Vendôme continued after Anne and Mrs. Barlow’s exit. However, none of the guests went to the extreme of risking social disapprobation like the two gentlewomen did. The scale of Mrs. Barlow and Anne’s action was appropriate to the risk of loss to Mrs. Barlow’s reputation. M. and Mme. de Boyve only returned Anne’s call late in March, a few days prior to her departure from Paris. Anne merely noted it, formally using their full surname again and with the proper sociable recognition of the ‘Vc’ mark. M. and Mme. de Boyve, she wrote on 25 March, ‘left each one card for Mrs. B-’ (265). It was the last time the de Boyves were mentioned in the journal entries or index for the period of the Paris sojourn. She did not call on them before she departed, nor did she leave from Paris on better terms with them than she appeared to have been when leaving the Place Vendôme. Mentions of the de Boyves after Paris appeared occasionally in the index. The information was second hand, communicated in Mrs. Barlow’s letters from Paris to Anne. Anne certainly did not send the de Boyves any correspondence after she left Paris at the end of March 1825. Nor did she write any letters to them for the remainder of the journal volume, according to the summary of letters and index.

Anne was a pivotal figure in the drama that unfolded between Mrs. Barlow and Mme. de Boyve. The heart of the struggle between these three gentlewomen was bound up with concerns over respectable and disreputable sociability. These histories, revelations, confidences and conflicts that arose in the Place Vendôme household operated on a number of complex and intertwined social levels. There was the gendered dimension of the nuanced tensions between feminine virtue, sexual knowledge and character seen in the production and consequences of the ‘history of the flirtations of Mrs. B-’. Mrs.
Barlow’s authorisation of her social reputation, through invested claims to morality, was dependant on the presence of her maid, Mrs. Page. The instance demonstrated the mechanism by which the emergent middle class increasingly appropriated the testimonies of the working class to bolster class structures and privileges. The Place Vendôme household was the location for social, cultural and historical concerns writ small. The dramatic tableau of the struggle with Mme. de Boyve illustrated in fine detail the material sociability in Anne’s culture. As such, it was very much a drama of early nineteenth century society: sociability and the discourses, practices and materialities bound up with it were not transhistorical. The domesticity of the Place Vendôme household constructed, and was in turn constituted by, the sociable relations amongst these gentlewomen. Concomitantly, the propriety of the social behaviour of these gentlewomen determined, and was determined by, the sexual relations of all of these gentlewomen amongst themselves and others.

My analysis in this chapter focused upon each of the close relationships Anne formed at the Place Vendôme. Beginning with the establishment of a tie, I traced Anne’s first impressions with each person in her writings, through to the engagement in a romantic and erotic intimacy as passion and love progressed. The ‘Ve’ and ‘V’ marks in the journal entries tracked Anne’s observance of the conventions of calling and visiting, delineating the sociable interactions between her and the guests of the Place Vendôme. These relationships did not develop in the same manner, nor did Anne’s attachments all progress from friendship to a closer intimacy of affection, or even romance. Rather, charting these special relationships through the journal entries and letters makes it possible to reconstruct these narratives of Anne’s affective and emotional connections with gentlewomen in particular, and amongst those of her society in general. Exploring Anne’s life and loves with gentlewomen, and her friendship with a gentleman whilst she was in Paris, reveals the experience and agency a gentlewoman who loved the ‘fairer sex’ could negotiate within her society, to form relationships that were affectionate, homosocial, gentlemanly, respectful, passionate, romantic or domestic (Whitbread 1988, 145). In elaborating the interactions and relations between each of these people and Anne, the sociability and sexuality of Anne’s intimate world has been restored and contextualised within her historical and cultural context.

The social and domestic conditions of Place Vendôme were at first inconsequential to Anne. The romantic interest in Melle. de Sans had been one of her first serious
attachments in the house, but the relationship offered by Melle. de Sans, as a companion once she married, was a future Anne rejected. The genuine intimacy that had developed between Anne and Mrs. Barlow was what she eventually chose as the most rewarding relationship for her future. Without the potential match between Anne and Mr. Franks to absorb Mme. de Boyve’s attention, Anne’s exclusive interest in Mrs. Barlow was more evident. Mme. de Boyve attempted to intervene in Anne and Mrs. Barlow’s relationship and Anne became unwillingly involved in the domestic concerns of the Place Vendôme household, as she attempted to sociably manage her sexual relationship with Mrs. Barlow. It was not until they moved into their own residence, that Anne and Mrs. Barlow were better able to control their reputation whilst sorting out other issues regarding their relationship. As Anne was aware, and Mrs. Barlow was perhaps learning, the careful management of the representation of social character was critical to the successful development of a same-sex relationship in the early nineteenth century. In the next chapter, I examine Anne and Mrs. Barlow’s sexual relationship in Paris as Anne wrote about it.
ENDNOTES

1 Lillian Faderman cited the correspondence between Mme. de Sévigné and her friend Mme. de La Fayette to locate her concept of romantic friendship back into the seventeenth century (Faderman 1981, 68).

2 Elizabeth Wahl argued it is necessary to revisit passionate same-sex friendships of this period, to allow previously neglected women’s writings like Mme. de Sévigné’s to be re-examined for their female intimacy (Wahl 1999).

3 According to Violet Hammersley, a more modern editor and translator of the letters, the authoritative edition of Mme. de Sévigné’s papers was published in 1818-19, only five years before Anne came to Paris in 1824 (de Sévigné 1955, 34). It was probably this edition, in French, that Anne read.

4 For Mr. Franks’ age, see the journal entry of 6 September, where Anne noted Mr. Franks was twenty four (71).

5 The exceptions, all marked ‘Vc’, were Anne’s visit to see Isabella Norcliffe’s newly married brother, Major Norcliffe (1791–1862), who was honeymooning in Paris with his wife on 1 October, a call which they returned on 4 October (91, 94). Mr. Cunliffe (n.d.), the husband of a fellow Place Vendôme guest Mrs. Cunliffe, called on both Anne and Mrs. Barlow, which was marked ‘Vc’ by Anne, see 26 January (230). The other gentlemen who Anne marked ‘Vc’ were all mainly callers upon Mrs. Barlow, although as she was also a resident at Quai Voltaire, Anne was often included. For Mrs. Barlow’s visits from Colonel Gregory (n.d.), see 7 December (178); for the visits of M. de la Marthonie (n.d.), a regular visitor at Place Vendôme pension as well as Quai Voltaire, see 16 and 22 January, and 25 March (222, 226, 265); for the visits of M. de Lancey (n.d.), a son of Major de Lancey (n.d.), see 3 December and 16 January (173, 221); for the visits of Mr. Casey (n.d.), see 22 January (226). The military men were possibly acquaintances of the late Colonel Barlow.

6 For ‘Vc’ as denoting Anne’s receipt of a visiting card with its details, see 12 October and 25 March (100, 265); and for Anne leaving her own card, see 4 and 12 February (236, 240).

7 For Miss MacKenzie’s age, see the journal entry of 7 September and the letter to Aunt Anne dated 8 to 12 September, where Anne noted Miss MacKenzie was sixteen (73; ML/146, 1).

8 For Mme. Carbonier’s age, see the journal entry of 5 November, where Anne noted Mme. Carbonier was aged forty four (131).

9 As Anne reported in her journal entry on 23 September, Mme. Galvani was an Italian countess born in Venice, who was related by marriage to Galvani, the inventor of Galvanism (83). Years before, Mme. Galvani told Anne on 11 September, her husband Count de Galvani had been entrusted with three million francs of public money on a service for Napoleon, had run off with it, and not been heard of since (74). Napoleon had confiscated Mme. Galvani’s estate as remuneration, Anne told Aunt Anne in her letter written from 8 to 12 September (ML/146, 1).
10 According to the *Oxford English Dictionary*, 1989 second edition, s.v. ‘lounge’ meaning a spell or course of lounging, a leisurely walk, saunter or stroll, first came into usage in the nineteenth century.

11 For Sunday services, see 5, 19 and 26 September, and 17 October (70, 79, 86, 108); for lending books and journals, see 18 and 24 September, 25 October, 2 and 6 November, and 18 and 20 December (78, 85, 116, 127, 133, 192, 193); and for swapping tickets, see 13 and 19 September, 13 October, 10 November, 5 and 29 December, 4 January, 5 February and 12 March (75, 79, 101, 138, 175, 205, 211, 237, 255).

12 The Tuileries Gardens for instance, being so close to the Place Vendôme, was a place that Anne and other guests regularly frequented during the day. However, in the late eighteenth century it was a known rendezvous for sodomites, according to Jeffrey Merrick, who has analysed French representations of sexual deviance at this time (Merrick 1996, 32).

13 Anne experimented once with ‘Mrs. M-’ on 5 September (70). It was dropped I suspect, with the arrival on 23 September, of a Mrs. Middleton, another potential Mrs. M- (83).

14 See also the single plain handwritten instance of ‘Miss MacK-’ on 13 September (75).

15 For Tuileries Gardens, see 13, 14 and 18 September, and 3 October (76, 76[sic], 78, 94); for the Luxembourg, see 29 September (89); for the Jardin des Plantes, see 2 October (93); for chess, see 25 September and 8 October (86, 98); and for books and pamphlets, see Anne’s lending ‘“Le Roi est Mort”’, or ‘The King is Dead’, on 18 September (78), and Mrs. MacKenzie’s lending *Essays on Petrarch* borrowed in turn from Mme. Galvani, on 24 September (85). The edition Anne read of *Essays on Petrarch* by Ugo Foscolo (1778–1827) was translated by Lady Barbarina Dacre (1768–1854) and published in 1823, according to the journal entry of 19 October (110).

16 See 22 October, where Anne noted ‘my bowels not open enough & my forehead so spotty I take grapes for physic’ (114).

17 According to the *Dictionnaire Le Robert*, 1972 edition, s.v. ‘baiser’ meaning kissing, first came into French usage in the twelfth century, while the meaning, more vulgarly, for fucking, first came into French usage in the nineteenth century.

18 According to the *Oxford English Dictionary*, 1989 second edition, s.v. ‘giddy’ meaning incapable of serious, thorough or steady attention, easily carried away by excitement, first came into usage in the mid sixteenth century.

19 There was no recorded antecedent for Anne’s use of the phrase ‘black spectacles’. According to the *Oxford English Dictionary*, 1989 second edition, s.v. ‘rose-coloured spectacles’ was a phrase that came into usage from the mid nineteenth century, meaning a person’s view was unduly favourable or optimistic. However, Anne’s use of the phrase ‘black spectacles’ was as an antonym to ‘rose-coloured spectacles’, suggesting the phrase was known earlier in the nineteenth century.

20 According to the *Oxford English Dictionary*, 1989 second edition, s.v. ‘sillily’ meaning in a foolish or absurd manner, first came into usage in the early seventeenth century.

21 For the calls made by the MacKenzies, see 13, 24 and 28 September (75, 85, 89); and for Anne’s visits
in return, see 12 and 13 October (100, 101).

22 For single section ‘§’ marks, see 10 September, and 7 and 12 October (index 7, index 9); and for the double ‘§§’ section mark, see 13 September (index 8).

23 For illness, see 14 September and 5 February (76[sic], 237); for shopping, noted in the journal entries, see 7, 8, 9 and 11 September (72–73, 75), and noted in the letters, see the letter written from 8 to 12 September (ML/146, 3); and for smuggling cloth, see 20 September (80).

24 For days without an index notation, see 3, 9, 12, 16 and 19 October (index 9–10).

25 For observations, see 2 and 11 October (index 9); for the mere note of Melle. de Sans, see 4, 7 and 8 October (index 9); and for calls on Melle. de Sans, see 5, 6 and 14 October (index 9).

26 See also Mariana’s motto ‘a toi pour toujours’, or ‘yours for always’, inscribed on a seal she gave to Anne for her correspondence, noted in the journal entry of 29 October (121).

27 The second double section ‘§§’ marker occurred on 20 March (index 17).

28 An inexplicable marginal mark against 15 October was possibly relevant to Anne’s comments about both Melle. de Sans and Mrs. Barlow. It was a double v mark ‘vv’, repeated once against comments pertinent to Melle. de Sans and once against comments concerning Mrs. Barlow (index 9). The marks might have indicated the vying of the two gentlewomen for Anne’s attention, or the vice versa, thus ‘vv’, of Anne’s opinion about one, and then the other. The marks were very faint even on microfilm and the meaning was unclear, as they appeared nowhere else in the journal volume.

29 According to the Oxford English Dictionary, 1989 second edition, s.v. ‘calomel’ pertaining to a medical preparation of mercury chloride, in the form of a white powder, often given as a purgative, first came into usage in the late seventeenth century.

30 Interestingly, Anne’s remedy for the hysterical attack was according to Melle. de Sans, just like her own doctor’s. Anne wrote, Melle. de Sans ‘afterwards said I rubbed just [l]ike Doctor Double’ (208). It suggested that even as early as 1825, the medical treatment and understanding of hysteria in gentry or middle class women was as a sexual dysfunction of the womb, a line of investigation that was developed further by Sigmund Freud (1856–1939).

31 For Anne and Mrs. Barlow’s marked calls to Place Vendôme, see 4 and 23 February, and 18 March (236, 247, 260); and for the marked visits made by Melle. de Sans in return, accompanied by the Middletones, see 6 and 14 February (238, 242).

32 For concerts, see 31 January (234); and for walking around Paris, see 13 and 22 February (241, 247).

33 See also for instance, Anne’s letter to Mrs. Barlow dated 21 February 1826, requesting that she give Anne’s love to ‘Mme. Droz’ (Green 1992, 93).

34 According to the Oxford English Dictionary, 1989 second edition, s.v. ‘@t’ meaning at the age of, aged, first came into usage from the Latin ‘ætatis’ in the early seventeenth century.

35 According to the Oxford English Dictionary, 1989 second edition, s.v. ‘lantern’ pertaining to an
architectural feature that consisted of a structure on the top of a dome with pierced sides to admit light, first came into usage in the fifteenth century.

36 Anne used the term ‘agreeableized’ as a transitive verb form of the adjective ‘agreeable’. There was no recorded antecedent for Anne’s use. According to the Oxford English Dictionary, 1989 second edition, s.v. ‘to make agreeable’ meaning to make oneself pleasant and to show courteous attentions, was a phrase used from the early to mid nineteenth century, and subsequently obsolete.

37 According to the Oxford English Dictionary, 1989 second edition, s.v. ‘gaiety’ meaning pleasure-seeking, merrymaking or lively entertainment, first came into usage in the early seventeenth century.

38 According to the Oxford English Dictionary, 1989 second edition, s.v. ‘gay’ meaning an addiction to social pleasures and dissipations, a loose and immoral life, first came into usage in the early seventeenth century. As it related to homosexuality, s.v. ‘gay’ was not in usage until the twentieth century.

39 According to the Oxford English Dictionary, 1989 second edition, s.v. ‘incommode’ meaning to trouble, annoy or inconvenience, first came into usage in the late sixteenth century.

40 According to the Oxford English Dictionary, 1989 second edition, s.v. ‘intrigue’ meaning to carry on secret amours, illicit intimacies and liaisons, first came into usage in the mid seventeenth century.

41 The behaviour of Mme. Chenelle might explain why the de Boyve’s pension was visited by police in May 1825. Anne heard the news in a letter from Mrs. Barlow a couple of weeks after she returned to England. Anne wrote in her index note for 7 May, ‘the de B-’s house visited by the police’ (index 20). The number of guests staying at Place Vendôme classified the house as a hôtel garni, or furnished apartments. Anne noted in her journal entry, such a classification necessitated that the de Boyves submit all the names of the guests who came or left their residence (293). The situation suggested that the state was increasingly surveillant of houses such as the Place Vendôme for procurement and prostitution activities like that of Mme. Chenelle.

42 According to the Oxford English Dictionary, 1989 second edition, s.v. ‘scandalize’ meaning to utter false or malicious reports of someone’s conduct, to charge slanderously, first came into usage in the mid sixteenth century.

43 In the margin of the journal entry alongside the statement were double plus ‘++’ marks. The marks were unusual, for they were smaller than most margin marks. The marks most likely referred to the journal entry discussion of ‘two years hence’, and they could connote the highly sexual nature of the reference to the two names (154).

44 There was no recorded antecedent for Anne’s spelling of ‘rowe’, but the use was of ‘row’. According to the Oxford English Dictionary, 1989 second edition, s.v. ‘row’ meaning a violent commotion, noisy dispute or quarrel, first came into usage in the nineteenth century.

45 For Miss Harvey’s age, see the letter to Aunt Anne dated 8 to 12 September, where Anne noted Miss Harvey was about forty (ML/146, 2).

46 According to the Oxford English Dictionary, 1989 second edition, s.v. ‘try’ meaning to ascertain or
find out something doubtful by examination, was a term used from the early fourteenth century until the early nineteenth century, and subsequently obsolete.

47 According to the *Oxford English Dictionary*, 1989 second edition, s.v. ‘tranquillize’ meaning to render tranquil, to calm or soothe, first came into usage in the early seventeenth century.

48 For other instances of Anne reading aloud her journal entries to Mrs. Barlow, noted in the journal entries, see 12 and 15 December, 20 and 27 January, and 7 and 28 February (186–87, 190, 224, 231, 238, 250), and noted in the index, see 27 January, 7 and 28 February, and 3 March (index 15–17). Anne had allowed Mrs. Barlow to read a line of the journal entry she wrote for 15 October (106).
CHAPTER THREE
ANNE’S SEXUALITY:
SEX IN PARIS 1824–25

Anne’s reasons for travelling to Paris in August 1824 were more urgent than the desire to learn French in Paris. The desire to be in the French capital at this time of the year was connected to critical emotional reasons. Autumn was the anniversary of two distressing events that happened to her the year before. On 19 August 1823, there was, as Anne termed it, ‘the three steps’ business at Blackstone Edge and a month later in mid September there was her humiliation at Scarborough (Whitbread 1988, 278–81, 292–99). The ‘three steps’ incident occurred when Anne, in her eagerness to see her lover Mariana, walked along the road from Halifax hoping to meet her in the mail coach along the way. Anne sighted the coach, ran up to it and precipitously climbed the three steps of the coach. She had, she wrote, ‘unluckily seemed to M- to have taken 3 steps at once’ (Whitbread 1988, 278). Anne’s face suddenly appearing from nowhere into the frame of the coach window must have given Mariana a fright. Mariana reacted with ‘shocked astonishment’ (Whitbread 1988, 279). A few weeks later, Anne spent over a week with Mariana at Scarborough from 12 to 21 September (Whitbread 1988, 292–99). During the trip it became apparent to Anne that she was the focus of unwelcome attention; in the journal entry of 15 September, she wrote that ‘all the people stared at me’ (Whitbread 1988, 293).¹ The unwelcome attention Anne drew was a more substantial problem than the passing incident of peoples’ stares – some acquaintances were deliberately uncivil to her. It was difficult for a proud gentlewoman like Anne to acknowledge that these two instances caused Mariana serious social embarrassment.

Anne’s dishevelment, her display of disarrangement, was not only a personal embarrassment, but a concern of social importance. In Scarborough on 15 September, Anne questioned whether the fault lay in ‘my self, my manner, or my situation in life’ (Whitbread 1988, 295). The upset of ‘the three steps’ and Scarborough were more instances, like the recent ‘treadmill business’, of the spectatorial discomfort Anne endured as a result of the social and sartorial display of her dishevelment. However, the public notoriety Anne received over the ‘treadmill business’ was nothing compared to
how she personally suffered from Mariana’s shame in late 1823. On 29 August, she reflected in her journal entry, it was a ‘wound at heart which festers unseen’ (Whitbread 1988, 289). Mariana loved her, but it was, Anne wrote, ‘without that beautiful romance of sentiment that all my soul desires’ (Whitbread 1988, 289). Anne re-evaluated her relationship with Mariana and her feelings towards the marriage commitment they had made on 23 July 1821 (Whitbread 1988, 159). Since Mariana’s marriage to Charles Lawton on 9 March 1816, Anne was forced to realise her own relationship with Mariana had been progressively unhappy. The hope for a future with Mariana substantially changed after autumn 1823. On 15 October, Anne wrote the ‘Blackstone Edge & Scarbro’ business so clings to my memory I can’t shake it off’ (Whitbread 1988, 305). ‘Alas,’ she wrote, ‘they have altered me. How they have revolutionized\textit{sic} my feelings of love & confidence towards her’ (Whitbread 1988, 305). Anne’s emotional and practical response to these incidents informed her decision to seek out relationships in Paris that offered the possibility of affection, intimacy and erotic satisfaction.

Anne signified these profound social and sexual experiences in her own writings through a specific use of language. Events with Mariana a year before, like other complex or difficult instances in Anne’s life, became symbolised through the special construction of linguistic referents. These linguistic referents were an extremely concentrated understanding of these particular episodes and events, deeply embedded with specific sexual and emotional meaning. Anne represented the social notoriety of the Cold Bathfields prison visit in the compact and dense phrase ‘\textit{this treadmill business’}. Similarly, Anne’s experience of Mariana’s shame at Blackstone Edge and Scarborough, as well as her painful reaction to these occurrences, became encapsulated in the intensely charged and multivalent phrase ‘\textit{the three steps’}. When Anne correlated the business of ‘\textit{the three steps’} to ‘\textit{this treadmill business’} through a number of journal entries and indices, the thematic and emotional values of these events were linked, even though the actual events occurred a year and some tens of journal pages apart. The purposeful linkage created a comprehensive narrative of Anne’s social, sexual and emotional experiences, charting out a series of accounts of her sexual and amatory history. The textual marks in the journal entries had marked those matters that she wanted indexed, the content had become arranged in the index, and it was then further editorialised by the metasignage into the autobiographical story of Anne’s sexual progress in Paris. So too, the linguistic accounts relating the stories of events like ‘\textit{the
three steps’ constructed a serialised linguistic history of Anne’s sexual relationships – the sexual practices of her past.

A critical event in Anne’s recent sexual past was the key reason she was in Paris. Anne’s most pressing concern was the ongoing problem with receiving appropriate treatment and specialised medical diagnoses for her ‘venereal taint’, as she termed it on 6 August 1821 (Whitbread 1988, 161). Anne contracted the disease from Mariana in July 1821 and she had unsuccessfully sought treatment from three different doctors during the intervening three years. The treatments at home and in Paris included mercury as an ointment, calomel injection and pills, all commonly used treatments for syphilis according to Philippa Levine’s research into venereal diseases of the British Empire in Prostitution, Race, and Politics (Levine 2003, 76). Anne was also variously prescribed cubebs that were used for syphilis, gonorrhoea and urethritis, and injections of sulphate of zinc often prescribed for gonorrhoea (Levine 2003, 76). There was a great deal of confusion over venereal disease in the nineteenth century (Levine 2003). The medical uncertainty that Anne experienced in the past has become a present indeterminacy about the nature of her condition. Helena Whitbread for instance, twice agreed with Anne that it was a venereal condition, but revised her opinion at some point to trichomoniasis (Whitbread 1988, 158; 1992, 7, 60, 72 n.3). Anne, who was subject to such conflicting diagnoses, different diagnostic processes, and prescriptions for treatment, was aware of these difficulties at first hand. Accessing specialists in the medical establishment in Paris, Anne tried a different management of her condition.

Once Anne considered that it was necessary to travel to Paris for expert help from the French venereal specialists, she set about planning her trip. ‘Determine to be in Paris 1 September’, she wrote in the index on 25 June 1824 (index 1). Paris was considered the medical capital of the industrialised world at this time. Monsieur Dupuytren, the consultant Anne was referred to in Paris, was a celebrated doctor known for his expertise in the treatment of venereal diseases. Philip Mansel stated in his history of Paris in the early to mid nineteenth century, Paris between Empires, that M. Dupuytren was especially famous for his treatment of the French royalty (Mansel 2001, 323). Anne went to Paris for its specialist doctors such as M. Dupuytren. Whilst she was there, she diligently monitored the status and virulence of her venereal condition. Anne tracked her venereal disease daily at the conclusion of her journal entries through the employment of two associated and specific marks. These were the marker ‘E’ and an
auxiliary marker of a circle with a variant number of dots inside. Together these two marks denoted the virulent flow or severity of Anne’s venereal discharge. When there was no virulent discharge Anne marked an ‘E’ in her journal entry as a single symbol. For instance on 23 December, she wrote, ‘E a g[oo]d deal of discharge both yesterday & today but not virulent & no itching’ (196). When there was a great deal of virulent discharge, Anne indicated it with three dots, as for example on 18 December. In the journal entry, Anne noted that, ‘E I have felt a good deal of discharge today at intervals’ (192). It was an extremely significant set of markers, for Anne entered the details about the status and progress of her venereal discharge nearly every day of her stay in Paris.

Tracking the marker through the seven months of Anne’s sojourn in Paris revealed the inherent flexibility she could build in and manipulate with her markers. Towards the end of her stay in Paris, she changed one of her embellishments with these markers to signify a different practice with her venereal condition. On 12 February Anne she in her journal entry, ‘the dots under the E now signify the number of times a day [I] have used the seringue à manivelle’ (240). A cranked or mechanical syringe, a ‘seringue à manivelle’, was used to deliver an injection of medication. To make the new meaning absolutely clear, Anne also marked the ‘E’ in the journal margin – it was the only specific occurrence of the ‘E’ mark in the margins in the entire seven months of the Parisian sojourn. The ‘E’ and circle auxiliary marks were textual signifiers that consistently related to the observance and examination of an infected or virulent embodiment, yet the meaning indicated by these particular marks – severity of discharge or the frequency of medication – could be flexible.

All of these various textual practices – the construction of linguistic referents, stories and flexible markers – were employed by Anne to construct and monitor her sexuality in an experiential and everyday manner. The strategic use of devices of language, story and signification demonstrated the process of sexual identity acquisition that Anna Clark has charted (Clark 1996). Anne created and repeatedly recreated her own homosexual identity in an active negotiation with social ideologies and her material circumstances, contemporary cultural representations and sexual desires (Clark 1996, 27). Anne’s development of a homosexual identity was not outside of discourse or history, but rather profoundly situated within discourses of language, history and early nineteenth culture. On a broader cultural scale, Lisa Moore has analysed the
contemporaneous representations of women’s homosexuality in the novel Belinda (1801) by Maria Edgeworth and the Scottish court case against Jane Pirie and Marianne Woods (1811) in Dangerous Intimacies (Moore 1992; 1997). These cultural examples and imagery of different sexuality could have been actuated by a woman like Anne, Moore suggested, through her own reading and writing practices (Moore 1992, 517). Within Anne’s writing, the strategies she employed enabled her to produce a homosexual agency within early nineteenth century society.

Anne’s sexual and textual practices were not readily apparent in the edited writings in print. Helena Whitbread’s works minimised the materialities of Anne’s sexual relationships and attachments with other women like Mrs. Barlow and focused instead on the romance with Mariana. Jill Liddington attempted to integrate Anne’s sexuality into an overall account of her social history, but the specificities of Anne’s homosexuality were not engaged with in any depth. Muriel Green retained a select few of the stylised letters to close correspondents like Mrs. Barlow, that were suggestive of the intimacy of these relationships and the possibility of a sexual understanding of these sentimental epistles. This chapter analyses Anne’s sexuality in Paris, as she recorded and understood her sexual practices in her writings. I concentrate on the textual practices that Anne created to produce and reproduce her homosexuality in her romances, life and writings. A structural analysis of Anne’s language, story telling and signification can reveal the sophisticated and adaptive processes employed in the journal volume and correspondence to iterate, reiterate and substantiate the production of self and sexuality in her writings. In this chapter, I focus specifically upon the subtle ways that Anne used to represent and mark her sexual experience to herself in her texts, and to others in the stories that she told.

In the first section, I begin by outlining the only other account of Anne’s relationships in Paris, in ‘Anne and Mrs. Barlow No Priest but Love’. Helena Whitbread presented what could be termed ‘a seduction narrative’ in her second volume of the journal entries, No Priest but Love. It remains the story of Anne’s love life in Paris that most readers will be familiar with. However, the development of a trust and negotiation of an intimacy between Anne and Mrs. Barlow will be unknown, for the later months of their relationship were more heavily edited by Whitbread. When Anne and Mrs. Barlow reached a stage of trust in their relationship, Anne began to relate candid and explicit stories of her sexual past to Mrs. Barlow. I analyse these accounts in ‘Anne’s Sexual
Story – ‘Got onto the Subject of Myself’. In the final section, I study Anne’s active negotiation of the romance and courtship of Mrs. Barlow in ‘Anne and Mrs. Barlow – ‘Going to Italy’. The passionate attachment between Anne and Mrs. Barlow was initially conceptualised and finally achieved through the imagining of a homosexual desire in the linguistic phrase ‘going to Italy’. As the two gentlewomen formed an explicitly sexual bond, Anne deployed the triple section ‘§§§’ markers in the index. These markers focused solely upon the most critical period of the relationship with Mrs. Barlow in the last few months in Paris. As Anne and Mrs. Barlow debated the possibility of their ‘going to Italy’ together, Anne used the triple section ‘§§§’ markers to track the decisive interactions between them that promised such an eventuality.

ANNE AND MRS. BARLOW:

No Priest but Love

Helena Whitbread’s second book of journal entries, No Priest but Love: Excerpts from the Diaries of Anne Lister, 1824–1826, provided an edited account of Anne’s sexual relationship with Mrs. Barlow in Paris. The biography for the 1820s period of Anne’s life would be known to most readers, for Whitbread’s work remains the major source for historians of sexuality. As with all the editors that have dealt with the papers, given the massive amount of material, these condensed accounts of Anne’s life were necessarily highly selective. The dominant narrative thread for both of Whitbread’s books was, she wrote, ‘the long-running affair’ between Anne and Mariana (Whitbread 1992, xvi). The first of Whitbread’s books I Know My Own Heart chronicled the story in the journal entries of Anne’s love for Mariana. It began with Anne’s ongoing relationship with Mariana after the latter’s heterosexual marriage, continued with her feelings of betrayal, and concluded with her growing dissatisfaction with the compromise that Mariana’s marriage placed on their relationship. Whitbread produced an account of Anne’s homosexual relationship with Mariana that portrayed the relationship as increasingly thwarted, in relation to Mariana’s successful marriage to Charles. Whitbread’s second book No Priest but Love took up the story after the disillusionment of the relationship with Mariana, documenting Anne’s search for another life companion. The relationship between Anne and Mrs. Barlow in Paris was given only a limited overview, for it remained constrained within the dominating saga of the doomed romance with Mariana.
Helena Whitbread’s first book *I Know My Own Heart* finished with the journal entries just prior to her Paris sojourn in September 1824. In the very brief conclusion, the Paris trip was accurately characterised as ‘a watershed in Anne’s life’ (Whitbread 1988, 364). It was the period in Anne’s life, Whitbread recognised, when she was actively ‘distancing herself from the hurt of her affair with M-’ (Whitbread 1988, 364). For Whitbread however, no relationship could compare to the relationship Anne had with Mariana. Not Anne’s first and passionate eight year love with Eliza Raine, nor the seven month affair with Mrs. Barlow in Paris, nor the eight year cohabitation with her ‘new companion’ Ann Walker in the last years of her life (Whitbread 1988, 365). Whitbread wrote, ‘M- had been the truest love of Anne’s life and never again was Anne able to invest any relationship with the ardour she had felt for M-’ (Whitbread 1988, 364). The lifelong and complicated relationship with Mariana was consistently represented by Whitbread as a romantic saga of grand passion – consuming, enduring and ultimately unfulfilled. The sentimentalised romance of Anne’s apparently unrequited and unachievable relationship with Mariana made the serious choices of her other relationships marginal, irrelevant and anything but romantic.

The options available to Anne for her future relationships were more sympathetically portrayed in Helena Whitbread’s first volume. Whitbread surmised:

> The new woman in her life, reasoned Anne, would have to have both rank and fortune to bring to the partnership and, looking back over her old loves, Anne decided that she could do better for herself. (Whitbread 1988, 364)

By contrast, Whitbread’s characterised Anne’s amatory choices in *No Priest but Love* more generically and cynically. The second book covered the two years starting with the journal entries in Paris, from 2 September 1824 until 13 October 1826. The choice of a future companion was depicted as driven by materialistic concerns rather than as an exercise in Anne’s agency. According to Whitbread:

> Disinterested love was no longer on the agenda. As idealism left by the back door, cynicism entered by the front. In terms of finding a life-partner, Anne became what could be termed a careerist. (Whitbread 1992, 8)

It was Anne’s ‘ambitious nature’, Whitbread claimed, that impelled her search for a rich gentlewoman of status (Whitbread 1992, 8). Anne’s life in *No Priest but Love* was a story of fulfilled desire driven by materialistic gain. It was an exact juxtaposition to *I Know My Own Heart*, of Anne’s unfulfilled love in the romance with Mariana.
As Anne’s romantic ideals gave way to worldly cynicism, so too was her loving suffering transformed into sexual rapaciousness. She had pined for Mariana for the previous seven years in the most maudlin fashion, according to Helena Whitbread:

Anne was no longer the lonely, yearning lover waiting, in the fastness of her Pennine hillside home, for her loved one to be released from the bondage of marriage. (Whitbread 1992, 8)

With Mariana cast as Anne’s paradigmatic and ideal partner, all other loves were represented as inauthentic, disingenuous or manipulated. Mrs. Barlow’s ‘encouraging response’ to flattery was dangerously combined with ‘vulnerability’, presenting an opportunity for Anne’s newly awakened taste for sexual manipulation. Whitbread wrote that these factors ‘offered an opening for Anne’s more predatory advances’ (Whitbread 1992, 31). In such a melodramatic representation, contradictions of character were usual. Using her sexual passivity to control the relationship, Mrs. Barlow was recast by Whitbread into ‘what would have been termed an “adventuress”’ (Whitbread 1992, 38–39). In Whitbread’s ‘adventuress’ scenario Mrs. Barlow used all means to “trap” Anne into a relationship that ‘had more to do with providing security for herself and her daughter than with real, disinterested love for Anne’ (Whitbread 1992, 46). Both seductress and victim, Mrs. Barlow was therefore prey to Anne’s voracious advances.

Once Anne and Mrs. Barlow moved to their new residence at Quai Voltaire, the histrionic dynamic of their relationship developed fully, according to Helena Whitbread. Anne’s calculation over the value of the relationship created uncertainty with Mrs. Barlow, Whitbread claimed, for she ‘lacked any of the material advantages which Anne saw as desirable in the person with whom she chose to spend the rest of her life’ (Whitbread 1992, 74). It made Mrs. Barlow ‘nervous, irritable and tearful’ (Whitbread 1992, 74). Mrs. Barlow suffered, Whitbread supposed, from ‘a deep-seated guilt complex’ arising from her anxieties about being Anne’s mistress, their ‘lesbian sexual activity’ and her own Christian beliefs (Whitbread 1992, 74, 75). However, Mrs. Barlow’s descent into neuroticism, her ‘journey from heterosexism to lesbianism’, would be more recognisable to modern audiences (Whitbread 1992, 75). ‘In choosing lesbian love,’ Whitbread wrote, ‘Maria Barlow may have been following her genuine desires but in the process of doing so she became a neurotically worried woman’ (Whitbread 1992, 75). Not surprisingly, the relationship did not survive after the Paris sojourn of 1824–25. When the two gentlewomen met again in late 1826, a year and a half afterwards, there were ‘jealous scenes’ (Whitbread 1992, 204). In Whitbread’s
Helena Whitbread has portrayed Anne’s love for Mariana as an overly romanticised tale of hopeless adoration. It implied that the search for a companion was romantically valid only when the object was Mariana, who was, by virtue of her increasingly successful marriage, unobtainable. It was a narrative achieved through editing of Anne’s relationship with Mrs. Barlow in Paris. As Anne and Mrs. Barlow’s relationship intensified, the journal entries documenting their amorous and emotional intimacy were subject to considerable excision by Whitbread. Of the first three months that Anne resided in Paris, two thirds of the journal entries recording her courtship of Mrs. Barlow were included for publication in *No Priest but Love* (Whitbread 1992, 12–60). Of the remaining four months of the sojourn in Paris, two thirds of the journal entries detailing her sexual relationship with Mrs. Barlow were excised (Whitbread 1992, 61–89). Whitbread’s restricted focus upon the relationship of Anne with Mariana consequentially requires some revision: Anne’s love for Mariana needs to be placed within a context – not a hierarchy – of her other sexual, affective and intimate relationships throughout her life and writings. To understand the choices Anne could make for her future relationships, the consideration of her amatory attachment to Mrs. Barlow needs to go beyond the question of whether Mariana’s position in Anne’s heart could be displaced. The lessons Anne learnt in Paris from her relationship with Mrs. Barlow need to be considered as equally worthy of our serious critical attention.

**ANNE’S SEXUAL STORY:**

*‘Got onto the Subject of Myself’*

Anne’s writings are critical textual and historical sources for theorists choosing to study female homosexuality in the early nineteenth century. As the examples of her textual practices before revealed, Anne’s writings were a key location for the production and negotiation of her sexual identity. Yet, a sense of her own sexual identity existed in time as well as in her texts. Anne’s understanding of her own sexuality could be produced through textual practices, but she adapted them over time to reflect a contemporary conception of her sexuality and self. Part of the temporal and textual process of constructing a sense of identity was necessarily bound up with understanding past experiences and previous states of selfhood. Thus Anne’s perception of her
homosexuality and the narrative she created and recreated about her sexual past was a reflexive process – an ongoing historicisation of sexual experience. The record in the journal entries documented her story telling to Mrs. Barlow about her sexual past and made apparent some of these understandings of herself, sexuality and sexual history. However, Anne’s confidences to Mrs. Barlow were mainly absent from Helena Whitbread’s edited publication, No Priest but Love. The focus of this section is upon the sexual stories that Anne told to Mrs. Barlow in Paris, analysing in more depth the significant relationships and events of her amorous and adventurous past.

Many of Anne’s accounts of her sexual past to Mrs. Barlow were heralded by the use of the ritualistic phrase, ‘told the story’. The usage of the phrase indicated that telling Mrs. Barlow a story was not the fictional enterprise it would mean today. A ‘story’, as Anne considered it, was an event or an actuality. On 22 December, for instance, Anne told Mrs. Barlow, the ‘whole story’ of how she became acquainted with Miss Vallance (195). This conceptualisation of story telling did not include fictionalisation; rather there were degrees of truthfulness and veracity. Anne wrote at the end of January, she told Mrs. Barlow ‘nearly the real story’ of the argument with Mariana’s husband, Charles (231). A ‘story’ ranged from the absolute truth of the matter, like the ‘whole story’ with Miss Vallance, to the finely edited account, such as ‘nearly the real story’ of Anne’s social estrangement from Charles. Mrs. Barlow in her turn related the story of her affair with Mr. Hancock on 21 November (155–56). Anne said to Mme. de Boyve on 7 December, Mrs. Barlow told ‘all the story of Mr. Hancock the morning after Madame de B-’s mention of the name’ (178). The fact that Anne knew ‘all the story’ was the means that she could negate Mme. de Boyve’s ‘history’ of Mrs. Barlow. The many stories Anne told Mrs. Barlow, or vice versa, were etymologically closer to the Greek root of the word history, ‘ίστορία’, for knowing or learning by inquiry and narrative. Relating stories to each other was structured by the expression of the story; or in other words, the imperative to narrate, to tell.

Some of the stories that Anne told were new to Mrs. Barlow. Some stories were too private a history for her to have confided them before they were courting, or ‘going to Italy’ together. This included histories of Anne’s relations with Miss Vallance, ‘Miss V’ on 25 October, or familial sexual histories that she was privy to, such as those of her ‘Aunt Lister’ on 27 October (115, 118). Other stories from her past were known in some form to Mrs. Barlow. Previously, Anne told some of her stories to Mrs. Barlow in
general or anonymous detail which she embellished progressively through late October. Anne included more details regarding two of her ‘three favorite[sic]’, as she called her dearest lovers on 25 October (116). Undoubtedly Mariana was one of her favourites. Anne wrote on 29 October, that when ‘speaking of my friend’ to Mrs. Barlow, she was ‘(always meaning M-)’ (121). Mrs. Barlow learnt that Anne regularly slept with these two of her favourites. ‘I alway[sic]’, she told Mrs. Barlow on 27 October, ‘sleep with the only two that sleep with me’ (119). Anne’s lover Isabella Norcliffe was most likely another favourite. The following day on 28 October, Anne even revealed that her favourite who was to live with her, Mariana, was married (119). Anne added titbits of information piece by piece, gradually forming a more complete and private romantic, if not completely candid, sexual history.

Anne began to relate her sexual past in mid October, concurrent with other significant changes in Anne and Mrs. Barlow’s relationship. The first story she revealed to Mrs. Barlow, and classified as such, was ‘the story of the treadmill business’ on 18 October (109). Thankfully for Anne, Mrs. Barlow ‘does not seem to think much of it or that I need mind it’ (109). Mrs. Barlow’s attitude perhaps lessened the social mortification Anne felt about the whole business. The following day, on 19 October, Mrs. Barlow acknowledged that Anne was formally courting her (111). Anne started to relate to Mrs. Barlow more revealing stories of her passionate, romantic and sexual history. Story telling was the most delicate and even confessional of interactions. When Anne told Mrs. Barlow about ‘my gaieties’ on 29 October, she worried she had ‘told Mrs. B- too much of my story’ (index 10). The doubt Mme. de Boyve cast on Mrs. Barlow’s past flirtations caused Anne to restrict the narration of her sexual history for the next few weeks. Instead, the discussions between Anne and Mrs. Barlow generally revolved around the confiding, or secreting, of Mrs. Barlow’s sexual and romantic past. Anne gradually resumed telling Mrs. Barlow the more clandestine stories after mid November, when Mrs. Barlow had told her the real state of the ‘intrigues’ in the Place Vendôme. Anne withheld her full confidences when she was anxious about Mrs. Barlow’s trustworthiness. Anne’s increasing certainty about Mrs. Barlow’s virtue was demonstrated with the increasingly detailed revelations of her private histories.

Many of the confidences Anne shared with Mrs. Barlow in Paris were extremely personal. These histories can be startling reading – by turns frank, erotic, confronting and touching. The story on 16 November, where Anne wrote of her discussion with
Mrs. Barlow about ‘poor Eliza’, was especially touching (148). Anne met Eliza Raine when she was sent to school in York in her mid teens.\textsuperscript{14} Anne attended the school for a year or so from 1805. It was to have an enormous impact on her life, for it was where she first fell in love with her friend, Eliza.\textsuperscript{15} Mrs. Barlow asked ‘if it was she who was my first & best & dearest love’ (148). ‘I said yes’, Anne wrote, ‘none would ever love me as she did nor could I so love again’ (148). She gave an account of her earliest love affair and attachment in the discussion with Mrs. Barlow on 29 October. Anne said she had ‘become attached at fourteen’, and she ‘described poor Eliza Raine’ to Mrs. Barlow (121). As Anne told Mrs. Barlow, ‘I had had no theory till of late years it was all practice’ (121). Anne’s attachment to Eliza moved beyond the ‘practice’ of their intense relationship, into an explanation of Anne’s self, a ‘theory’ of her sexuality. Anne’s later theorisation of her homosexuality was compelled by her earlier sexual practices with Eliza. The relationship with Eliza was significant in its own right as Anne’s first passionate attachment, but it was also formative of her homosexuality.

Anne revealed a great deal to Mrs. Barlow about her relationship with Eliza. The relationship lasted for eight years, through their correspondence and frequent visits together. Anne and Eliza, Anne said on 13 November, ‘once agreed to go off together when of age but my conduct first delayed it’ (143). Anne flirted with other girls despite being attached to Eliza. Perhaps one the first problems of the relationship with Eliza was Anne’s ‘conduct’ with a Miss Alexander (n.d.). The ‘acquaintance with Miss Alexander’ was related to Mrs. Barlow on 29 October (121). Anne told Mrs. Barlow about her conduct, ‘my being very giddy’, and its consequences, ‘Eliza’s getting to know it & the break up of all but friendship’ (121). Eliza was jealous, as Anne elaborated: ‘none knew what it was to have a jealous disposition to deal with but those who had tried it’ (121). Anne’s conduct plainly created difficulties: it delayed the going off with Eliza, caused her affair with Miss Alexander to be broken, and created a great deal of jealousy with Eliza. It was a situation with the potential to parallel the current relationship between Anne and Mariana, and what was developing with Mrs. Barlow. However, Anne was not confiding her past to Mrs. Barlow to make her jealous. Anne wanted to declare her ability to change. To Mrs. Barlow, she ‘owned my faults but said how different I should be if I had someone with me whom I could really be attached to’ (121). Anne’s ‘giddy’ history was the object lesson; her attachment in the future could be faithful and serious with a gentlewoman she could live with and love.
Eliza was probably one ‘favorite’ of the unnamed three Anne discussed on 25 October (116). Eliza was less likely to be a current favourite as she was diagnosed and institutionalised for insanity in 1814 (Liddington 1994, 30; Whitbread 1992, 4). It was a history Anne related to Mrs. Barlow on 13 November, and it had prevented Anne and Eliza going off together. As Anne told Mrs. Barlow, ‘then circumstances luckily put an end to it[a]lto’ge’ther’ (143). ‘I never mentioned this to any human being’, she said, ‘but herself’ (143). After midnight, writing up the journal entry for the day, Anne recalled this might be incorrect. As she wrote, ‘at this moment I half fancy I long since told it to M-’ (143). On 15 December, Mrs. Barlow told Anne she would give up their relationship for Eliza. Mrs. Barlow said, ‘i[f] Eliza could be restored to reason ’&’ if it could be prudent for us to come together again she would give me [u]p to her’ (190). Mrs. Barlow would do it for Eliza, ‘for she believed she really loved me she was sorry for her’ (190). Eliza’s life, Mrs. Barlow said, ‘had been a hard fate but it was too common an [o]ne’ (190). A literary parallel was Rochester’s first wife, Bertha, a woman of mixed race, unconstrained sexuality and madness in Charlotte Brontë’s novel Jane Eyre (1847). Archetypes like Bertha were representations of the creative struggle of nineteenth century female writers, according to Sandra Gilbert and Susan Gubar in The Madwoman in the Attic (Gilbert and Gubar 1979). Eliza’s history was not an unusual one to Mrs. Barlow, or to other women in nineteenth century society.

It was through Eliza that Mariana might have first come to know of Anne. A discussion with Mrs. Barlow on 17 November suggested this conclusion. Anne told Mrs. Barlow:

M- knew me from having learnt the story of Miss Raine which she had ’been led to’ investigate from hearing some of the things she said when first insane but nobody else attended to them she said also so many things of other people. (149)

Eliza was institutionalised in York; the local specialist in mental illness was Mariana’s brother Dr. Steph Belcombe (1790–1856) (Liddington 1995, 267; Ramsden 1970, 5). If Eliza was treated by these doctors, Mariana could have ‘learnt the story’ of Anne and Eliza through her family. The situation with the three young gentlewomen was complex. The conversation with Mrs. Barlow on 15 December detailed the difficult triangle. Anne and Mrs. Barlow ‘ta[l]ked of Eliza Raine her giving me up her dislike to M- [h]er good conduct altog[e]ther’ (190). Eliza disliked Mariana, but it appeared she gave up her primary position in Anne’s life to Mariana. Another discussion with Mrs. Barlow on 22 January elaborated the details of the matter further. The two gentlewomen ‘talked a little of E[I]iza’, Anne wrote, ‘& of ’her dislike to’ M- & my engagement’ (226). The
journal entry suggested that Eliza gave Anne up so that she could engage Mariana. It was the reverse of what Mrs. Barlow stated she would do for Anne and Eliza.

Mrs. Barlow did not like Mariana, from the stories Anne told her. ‘I see plainly’, Anne wrote on 15 December, ‘she d’o’es not much like M-’ (190). Anne and Mariana probably first met in 1810 and became lovers around 1814 (Green 1992, 9; Liddington 1998, 16; Whitbread 1992, 5). The engagement Anne mentioned on 22 January most likely dated from around this time. However, Anne could not have offered an alternative to heterosexual marriage to Mariana, for she could not support her. ‘If I could have allowed her twenty or thirty pounds a year in addition to what she had, she certainly would not have married’, Anne wrote on 17 February 1820 (Whitbread 1988, 117).

Anne’s circumstances changed during her early twenties, but her economic position did not. When Samuel died in 1813, as discussed with Mr. Franks, the future hopes of the Lister family were invested in Anne. Had Samuel not died, she would have had to marry with for her family. Anne told Mrs. Barlow on 5 November, ‘that circumstanced as I should have b[ee]n I must have married well for my family’s prosperity &c.’ (132). However, her new status as heir cast a different light on her engagement to Mariana. In retrospect, Anne told Mrs. Barlow, ‘[I] c[o]uld not have married M-’ (132). Mrs. Barlow ‘guessed her family was not good enough’, she wrote (132). Being the heir to Shibden Hall freed Anne from marrying a gentleman for her family’s sake, but her lack of funds and not so good social connections of the Belcombe family prevented Anne from offering Mariana a future together.

There was another reason that Anne and Mariana could not have married. Anne did not reveal the details of that particular history until after she was convinced of Mrs. Barlow’s virtue in early December. It concerned the events of Mariana’s marriage to her husband Charles Lawton. Charles was the wealthy landowner of Lawton Hall in Cheshire. He was a widower without a legitimate heir, for his first wife, Anne told Mrs. Barlow on 15 November, ‘had died in childbed’ (146). Charles was in his mid forties and nineteen years older than Mariana (Whitbread 1992, xxi, 5). He made a proposal to Mariana, probably in early 1815. Anne and Mariana discussed Charles’s offer and later Mariana accepted it. Initially, Anne and Mariana agreed upon a different response, Anne told Mrs. Barlow on 12 December. To Mrs. Barlow, she ‘explained how her m[a]rriage had so surprised me I knew of Mrs. Lawton she had behaved ill to me we had had a blow up all was settled to my satisfaction’ (185). From what Anne told Mrs.
Barlow, she and Mariana had an argument, a ‘blow up’, about Charles’ offer. Anne thought that Mariana would refuse him; the issue was resolved to Anne’s ‘satisfaction’. However, Mariana ‘behaved ill’ to Anne, accepting Charles without her knowledge. Thus, Mariana and Charles’ marriage ‘had so surprised’ Anne. Although a hard situation for the lovers, there was probably little choice for either Mariana or Anne. There was no prospect of any fortune for Mariana from her family and Anne also had a limited financial capacity to offer a different future.

Anne continued relating the whole sorry story to Mrs. Barlow. The journal entry is the only extant available account of this period in her life.17 Following their argument, Anne carried on telling Mrs. Barlow, Mariana ‘came & staid with me a long while & I staid with her’ (185). Anne left Mariana and York, thinking that everything was agreed between them about their future. ‘I left her father’s house for ten days to pay another visit’, she told Mrs. Barlow, ‘supposing all was so far determined that she would never marry & that the thing was going [o]n decidedly to all I wished’ (185). The situation radically altered whilst Anne was away. As she told Mrs. Barlow, ‘what then was my surprise to find on my return she had heard from & written to C-’ (185). It was all arranged very swiftly between Mariana and Charles. Charles, Anne said, ‘was coming over at Christmas & it was then November & the match [w]ould be soon’ (185). Therefore, this was how Mariana treated Anne badly. Mariana accepted Charles’ offer of marriage unbeknownst to Anne and betrayed their own separate agreement. On 21 November, in reference to Mr. Hancock, Anne said to Mrs. Barlow, ‘I could forgive anything if candidly told but very little perhaps nothing that [w]as concealed from me’ (155). The allegory of Anne’s stories with Mariana was plain. If Mrs Barlow were to be involved, or even accept Mr. Hancock, she must not conceal it from Anne.

These stories provided a context for Mrs. Barlow to understand Anne’s relationship choices in Paris. On 5 November, Anne said to Mrs. Barlow, if they could not be together, it was better Mrs. Barlow marry. ‘I said the best thing for me would be her marrying then’ (132). It was only days after Mme. de Boyve’s ‘history’ – Anne preferred to be certain about Mrs. Barlow’s attachment to Mr. Hancock. When Mrs. Barlow ‘answered I will hasten it’, she replied, ‘no no’ (132). It would, Anne said, ‘give me more pain than I like to th[i]nk of’ (132). Anne made it clear how she had reacted to a similar circumstance with Charles and Mariana’s match. ‘I had scarce uttered [o]n first hearing all this’, she said to Mrs. Barlow on 12 December (185). Anne had read to
Mariana years afterwards, her true feelings about Mariana’s acceptance. ‘I had once read her some of the observations I made at the time’, Anne told Mrs. Barlow, ‘on her conduct to me her marriage &c.’ (186). Anne may not have said what these observations were, but Mrs. Barlow was left in no doubt about their impact, for it was described to her. Anne had read the journal reflections to Mariana and, ‘not looking for a moment or two’, she said, ‘found she had dropt at my feet half fainting’ (186). Mariana had asked Anne ‘to burn these papers’ (186). However, as Anne told Mrs. Barlow, ‘I had refused hitherto’ (186). Anne could not forget the bitterness of her uncertain relationship with a married woman. With the stories, she explicitly communicated to Mrs. Barlow her need for an undivided heart and loyalty.

Mariana and Charles were wed on 9 March 1816 (Green 1992, 9; Whitbread 1992, xxi). Mrs. Barlow perceptively asked Anne on 29 October, ‘if she was happily married yes was it a love match’ (121). ‘I seemed to doubt it’, Anne wrote at the time (121). Months later when her relationship with Mrs. Barlow was more intimate, Anne could afford to omit less with her stories of Mariana. It was, she told Mrs. Barlow on 17 March, ‘a match of convenience but she did her duty &c. &c.’ (260). That it was a match of convenience did not lessen the emotional distress of the marriage date for Anne, who kept it as a negative anniversary. She noted in the index whilst in Paris, ‘anniversary of M’s marriage’ (index 17). Anne had the painful task of preparing Mariana for the wedding night. ‘I arranged the time of getting of[sic] to bed the first night’, she told Mrs. Barlow on 10 December (182). Anne ‘left Mrs. B- [to] judge what I felt’, she wrote in the journal entry, ‘for I had liked her much’ (182). Anne knew too much for her own peace of mind about Mariana’s marriage. Whilst these stories were cautionary tales for Mrs. Barlow, at the same time they demonstrated the strength of Anne’s attachments to those she chose to love.

Anne resided at Lawton Hall with the newly married couple for six months, leaving around September 1816. The departure was most likely related to her quarrel with Charles about his extramarital infidelities. Anne knew of ‘some of his amours’, she told Mrs. Barlow on 29 October (121). Charles was known to intrigue with his servants, such as the housemaid and the lodgekeeper’s wife. ‘I was not on speaking terms with C-’, Anne told Mrs. Barlow on 9 December, ‘it began on account of a gallantry of his’ (181). On 28 January, Anne suggested to Mrs. Barlow that ‘nearly the real story of my quarrel with C-’ was ‘his intriguing’ (231). She told Mrs. Barlow, Charles ‘got hold of
a letter of mine no[t] in his favour certain[ly] which finished the matter’ (181). Anne elaborated to Mrs. Barlow, but not in the journal entry, Charles’ ‘‘ungentlemanly’ letter to m[e] on [th]e s[ujj]e[ct][sic] & my answer’ (231). The exchange of letters severed their social relationship, for Anne did not visit Lawton Hall for many years. Anne and Mariana arranged to visit in the future together at York. Anne told Mrs. Barlow on 3 November, they met ‘regularly once in two years but generally oftener’ (128). On one of these visits years later, Anne was infected by Mariana with a venereal disease. In her journal entry of 28 November, she wrote, ‘I am convinced C- is at the bottom of it’ (165). Anne traced the source of the infection through the path of sexual connection with Mariana, to Charles and his philandering. It would be some time before Mrs. Barlow was told most of the complicated history of Anne, Mariana and Charles.

Anne was sometimes uneasy with the deceit and criminality of her connection to Mariana, a married gentlewoman. In Paris, she wrote of the difference between Mrs. Barlow and Mariana’s behaviour. On 9 December, Anne ‘contrasted her conduct with M-‘s’ much to Mrs. B-‘s’ advantage’ (181). Mrs. Barlow, she considered, ‘would not have marr[i]ed as M- did thus intriguing with me all the while’ (181). Anne was worried that Mariana’s love was not disinterested. Anne told Mrs. Barlow her doubts about Mariana’s worldly marriage. On 9 December, she said, ‘M-‘s’ marriage had come upon me like a thunderbolt’ (181). ‘I could never understand’, she said to Mrs. Barlow, ‘if she married for love she could not love me ‘& why engage me’ if not for love then it was too worldly not romantic enough for me’ (181).22 Again Anne stated ungrammatically on 12 December, ‘M- [sic] worldly indeed’ (186). ‘I could not help sometimes thinking she was not so disinterested as I’, she told Mrs. Barlow (185). Similarly, she wondered a few weeks later on 29 December about Mrs. Barlow’s interest in their relationship. As Anne wrote, ‘is she really as disinterested as she wishes me to believe & really as m[a]ch attached’ (205)? At the heart of these anxieties was Anne’s desire to have a relationship that was not ‘disinterested’, that was ‘attached’ and ‘romantic enough’. By her own account, Anne continued to hope for a romantic, and even Romantic, love with a future companion.

Anne once made a suggestion to Mariana of a Romantic promise for their future. Early in their own courtship, she told Mrs. Barlow a little about the two gold rings she wore. On 23 October, she said, they were gifts from her ‘most particular friend’ (114). The rings and their wedded significance concerned Mrs. Barlow. At first Anne claimed they
symbolised only ‘pure friendship’, as she told Mrs. Barlow on 20 October (111). However, the rings bound Anne to Mariana beyond friendship. A few weeks later, after much questioning from Mrs. Barlow, Anne replied more fully. On 6 November, she said, ‘M- did give them’, a revelation that was reiterated and single ‘§’ section marked in the index: ‘said Mary did give the rings’ (134; index 11). The rings were symbolic of a ‘binding’ between Anne and Mariana, she said on 6 November (134). The rings bound them ‘if M- was [a] widow’, Anne admitted, ‘our living together would be judicious & convenient to all parties & in a foolish moment as one often does we had so agreed’ (134). It was probably at the time of their engagement, before Mariana’s marriage, that they exchanged rings upon their Romantic hope. Anne might hope and plan for the day that Mariana would live with her at Shibden, but equally she worried that the binding was ‘foolish’. Anne’s attitude towards her future with Mariana, especially as she communicated to Mrs. Barlow, was equivocal.

Anne regarded Mariana’s marriage as a betrayal. As she wrote on 9 December, ‘there was many a note in my journal to her disadvantage’ (181). Nonetheless, she and Mariana remained engaged, something Mrs. Barlow guessed for herself. Yet, the Romantic hope of a future with Mariana was not enough to support Anne eight years after Mariana’s marriage to Charles. She said to Mrs. Barlow on 9 November, ‘I was at present waiting for what would be a shadow even if I had got it’ (138). It was a narrative theme Anne used in these years without Mariana, in her late twenties and early thirties. As Anne wrote on 27 March 1819, ‘If I should, by & by, meet with anyone who would quite suit me, could I refuse & still lose a substance to expect a shadow?’ (Whitbread 1988, 85). Anne was torn between having Mariana, which was increasingly unlikely, or being able to meet someone who would suit her better. The dilemma of Anne’s Romantic search was whether to choose the ‘substance’ of another gentlewoman or the ‘shadow’ of Mariana. In seeking a resolution perhaps, she had a number of romantic affairs and flirtations with other gentlewomen during these years. Some of these affairs were told to Mrs. Barlow as other stories of Anne’s sexual past.

One of the affairs Anne briefly mentioned to Mrs. Barlow was that with Anne Belcombe (1785–1847), Mariana’s sister. The relationship probably began a few months after Mariana’s marriage in March 1816. Anne and Mariana’s sister spent half a year with Mariana after her marriage, at Lawton Hall. As Anne told Mrs. Barlow on 10 December, ‘her oldest sister & I were wi[th] her the first six months after her
There was only a single discussion in Paris about Anne’s relationship with Mariana’s sister. In a conversation on 6 November, she briefly covered their affair:

\[
I \text{ had begun by disliking but her assiduity had worn this off she used to come to my room had staid till three in the morning & I should have been tired if I could not have amused myself said ladies sometimes made curious presents said no more but hinted at the hair of their privy parts. (134)}
\]

Anne, like Byron, was a collector of her lovers’ privy hair. Despite Anne’s initial dislike of Anne Belcombe, Mariana’s sister had diligently pursued her. The initial relationship with Mariana’s sister was situated within an emotional context that included Anne’s deep hurt over Mariana’s marriage. For a few months from around 5 December 1820 until sometime about 18 February 1821, the affair between Anne and Anne Belcombe revived (Whitbread 1988, 139–47). It was not an affair that Anne valued as a serious relationship perhaps, given the solitary recollection to Mrs. Barlow.

Anne’s stories of her sexual past became more confidential, as she and Mrs. Barlow became more intimate. She discussed one of the most serious of her relationships with Mrs. Barlow in late November, her romance with Miss Browne. It lasted from 21 April 1818 until 30 December 1819, although Anne and Miss Browne first met some time around 27 August 1817 (Whitbread 1988, 40–111, 13–14). It was a very serious and intense relationship for Anne. On 14 June 1818 she gave Miss Browne her own sweetheart name of ‘Kallista’, signifying the ‘fair one’ (Whitbread 1988, 46). As well, Anne allocated Miss Browne her own crypt hand symbol. Miss Browne’s social position was not good, but Anne still made an offer to her. Anne wrote on 24 November, she ‘mentioned also without name Miss Brown[sic]’ to Mrs. Barlow:

\[
\text{how well she had behaved [I] had made a proposal to her of her [l]iving with me but she said her rank in life did not suit mine my friends would object & she refused engaged herself almost immediately afterwards tho’ she owned she liked my disp[o]sition the better of the two married & lives at Glasgow I said she had no tales[sic] to tell of me I had [o]nly kissed her once before she married. (160)}
\]

The relationship ended with Miss Browne’s refusal. Anne mentioned the affair only once in Paris. It had been an intense relationship, but it had no Romantic future.

Anne revealed much of the intriguing history of her affair with Miss Vallance to Mrs Barlow. She became acquainted with Miss Vallance around 18 September 1818 (Whitbread 1988, 65). Anne described her to Mrs. Barlow as ‘[l]adylike’ on 25 October (115). Miss Vallance was ‘[q]uite proper in her manners’, she said (115). One day, she
told Mrs. Barlow, Miss Vallance ‘would have a good fortune had refused many offers’ (115). The amatory interest between Anne and Miss Vallance was initially unreturned. Miss Vallance ‘admired me more than I admired her’, Anne told Mrs. Barlow (115). The evidence of Miss Vallance’s admiration was the lengths she went to, to see Anne. Miss Vallance once took ‘all pains to meet me in visits’, Anne said, ‘had gone a long journey two hundred miles to meet me this summer’ (115). In Paris, Anne declared to Mrs. Barlow, that if they were not to be attached, she would re-evaluate the affair with Miss Vallance. ‘I might conduct myself differently towards her in future’, Anne said (115). If, she told Mrs. Barlow, ‘I met this girl abroad in the same house perhaps I should go & sit with her at night & would not answer for myself’ (115). Anne was clearly pleased by Miss Vallance’s admiration. The revelations about Miss Vallance in the early stage of the romance with Mrs. Barlow were possibly intended to make her jealous. Mrs. Barlow was already concerned over Anne’s ability to be fickle or flirtatious with Melle. de Sans. Anne wrote, Mrs. Barlow ‘advised me to be careful not to be volage’ (115).27 Mrs. Barlow was perhaps a little jealous.

Despite Anne’s intentions with Mrs. Barlow, the attraction to Miss Vallance was strong. ‘I told her’, Anne wrote on 22 December, ‘the whole story of my becoming acquainted with Miss V’ (195). Miss Vallance’s ‘liking me astonished me’, she said to Mrs. Barlow (195). Especially perhaps, because Miss Vallance had been engaged twice. As Anne wrote, Miss Vallance ‘had lost her first & was from gratitude engaged to a second when I met her’ (195). Like many of Anne’s other lovers, the liaison with Miss Vallance was in progress. The affair became more serious when on 7 January 1821, Anne gave Miss Vallance a copy of the solution to the crypt (Whitbread 1988, 142). It was possibly during that visit to Langton, their relations became sexual, a history Anne implied to Mrs. Barlow. Anne ‘did not absolutely say’, she wrote, ‘I had been connected with her but Mrs. B- might think it’ (195). The affair was striking in the intensity and passion of the response Miss Vallance elicited from Anne. It was a rousing and exciting affair, for on at least three occasions in Paris, Anne thought of Miss Vallance whilst she ‘incurred a cross’.28 After Anne and Mrs. Barlow’s relationship was more decided, she changed her mind about Miss Vallance. ‘I should not now’, Anne said to Mrs. Barlow on 24 November, ‘pay a visit in Kent as I returned alluding in my mind to Miss V.’ (160). The journal entries in Paris revealed that initially Anne considered the relationship with Miss Vallance to be a serious concern. However, Anne was right when she claimed she would reassess the relationship after Mrs. Barlow.
Anne did not conceal the sexual nature of these relationships from Mrs. Barlow. On 29 November, Anne noted in the index, the ‘curious tales I told Mrs. B-’ (index 12). In the related journal entry, she told Mrs. Barlow ‘several stories of things I had done all true’ (167). However, Anne was discreet and disguised the names of the gentlewomen. The stories included ‘being asked to retire after dinner to amuse a person’ (167). Mrs. Barlow, Anne wrote, ‘might understand from my manner I meant grubbling’ (167). Once Anne left the drawing room for ‘intriguing’, she said, ‘but it was all fright & hurry’ (167). Another time she went ‘from the drawing room & back again in [s]even minutes’ (167). In the last story Anne told, the grubbling was ‘managed in five minutes after breakfast’ in the cabinet d’eau (167). The latter history involved ‘a married woman’, clearly a story of Mariana (167). Overall, Anne told Mrs. Barlow on 6 November, she ‘preferred the society of married ladies’ (134). The reason was, she said, ‘one could take more liberties with them their conversation was more lax’ (134). It applied particularly and revealingly to ‘Mrs. La’, or Mariana. Anne appreciated what married ladies revealed to her. After relating these ‘curious tales’, she told Mrs. Barlow that ‘married ladies told me strange things sometimes even without knowing me very much’ (167). Married ladies like Mariana or Mrs. Barlow were the most plentiful sources of direct sexual information. It was through the exchange of such sexual information with Mrs. Barlow, that she and Anne developed their relationship.

Mrs. Barlow was often anxious about Anne’s stories of her sexual past. ‘I had led a curious life’, Anne told her on 4 December (174). Anne was ‘sometimes much tried (alludin[g] to my first intercourse with Isabella)’ (174). Isabella and Anne were acquainted in York in 1810 and became lovers shortly after. The first time they had sex, Anne told Mrs. Barlow, ‘that one connection had been accomplished by my having been made tipsy’ (174). Mrs. Barlow enquired, as Anne wrote it, ‘can you wonder said Mrs. B- that [I] shall have much anxiety about you’ (174)? Still, Mrs. Barlow was curious about Isabella. On 17 November, Mrs. Barlow asked Anne, ‘if Miss Norcliffe knew me’ (150). Mrs. Barlow meant perhaps was Isabella aware of Anne’s homosexuality. Isabella, Anne replied, was ‘a rattle’ (150). Isabella ‘often joked me’, she told Mrs. Barlow, ‘about how many flames I had had &c. &c.’ (150). Isabella’s flippancy about Anne’s passionate love affairs, or carelessness in making them public, was not appreciated. Sometimes what Isabella said could be entirely inappropriate. Once, Anne said, Isabella ‘asked my Uncle for Ovid’s Art of Love’, a classic that was explicitly erotic (150). To do Isabella justice, Anne remarked, ‘quite a gentlewoman clever a
character rather masculine but a capital companion most amiable’ (150). In a discussion with Mrs. Barlow on 25 October, Anne referred to ‘my three favorite[sic]’ – Isabella was undoubtedly a favourite. Isabella’s importance as Anne’s lover, friend and correspondent should not be underestimated.

Of the ‘three favorite[sic]’ women in Anne’s life, the relationship with Isabella was of the longest standing and most enduring. Why did Anne not settle on her after Mariana married? The growing distance between Anne and Isabella can be seen in the journal entries in Paris. Isabella was referred to by Anne through the receipt, extracts and writing of letters in Paris. The correspondence formed a substantial part of the journal references to Isabella. Whilst Isabella’s news in her letters provided some rich detail of their epistolary relationship, it constituted Anne’s principal discussion about Isabella in Paris. There were very few significant crypted comments relating to Isabella, nor did Anne discuss their relationship with Mrs. Barlow in any detail. The status of Anne and Isabella’s relationship, whilst it continued to be sexual and affectionate, was not necessarily passionate or Romantic. The plain hand extracts of Isabella’s letters, and lack of crypted detail about her, suggested that the relationship was becoming defined by their long history of friendship, affection and love. Isabella would not be chosen as a future Romantic companion to settle with at Shibden Hall.

Yet, Isabella pointed out that Anne could settle on someone other than Mariana. Anne told Mrs. Barlow on 12 December, ‘Miss Norcliffe had joked me & said she thought I should have been caught but I was no worse at liberty again’ (185). Isabella thought Mariana’s marriage nullified the engagement, setting Anne once more ‘at liberty’ to choose. Anne told Mariana what Isabella said on 18 November 1819 (Whitbread 1988, 105). It precipitated a crisis with Mariana. As Anne said to Mrs. Barlow, ‘from that moment she wished to have me bound’ (185–86). Mariana wanted another binding commitment from Anne. However, any promise would be in light of Mariana’s marriage, for it could not reiterate their earlier engagement since Mariana’s marriage. ‘I had resisted a long time’, Anne told Mrs. Barlow (186). Anne’s resistance acted specifically to affirm her sexual practices. The initial engagement was the primary commitment. Their initial promise did not need to incorporate, nor could it be superseded by, Mariana’s marriage. It affirmed that Anne’s tie to Mariana was the first of all of such ties and could not be surpassed by her love for Isabella, Miss Browne or Miss Vallance. Their promise encompassed the exigencies of both Mariana’s marital
situation and Anne’s amatory relations, and the significance of the engagement in its own right. Their original promise was still binding to Anne and it did not need restating.

Anne resisted Mariana’s pressure for over a year and a half. On 12 December, she told Mrs. Barlow, ‘at last promised three years ago’ (186). The promise to Mariana was made on 23 July 1821, when they visited together in Newcastle (Whitbread 1988, 159). Anne and Mariana enacted their own rituals to bind themselves in marriage on 23 and 28 July (Whitbread 1988, 159–60). It may have been when Anne received the second of the two gold rings from Mariana, which were, as she noted on 25 October, both worn on her little finger (116). The visit together to Newcastle was a short visit of ten days, but it would have a lasting effect on Anne’s life. As she said to Mrs. Barlow, it was a promise that she ‘had at times repented ever since’ (186). Prior to the visit, Mariana evidenced symptoms of a sexually transmitted disease. The anonymous husband, Charles, was, Anne told Mrs Barlow on 28 November, ‘the origin of the thing’ (164). In Newcastle on 4 August, Mariana’s brother told Anne he was already treating Mariana for a venereal condition (Whitbread 1988, 160–61). From 3 August, Anne recorded the symptoms she was experiencing (Whitbread 1988, 160). \( I \text{ had not got it quite fairly}, \text{ she told Mrs. Barlow, } (\text{meaning that she knew of it & ought not to have admitted me}) \) (164). Mariana was aware of her complaint and its nature, before she transmitted the disease to Anne. During the brief period of their marriage commitment Anne also became infected.

It was not until late November, that Anne at last confided in Mrs. Barlow the bare truth about her venereal disease. On 26 November, as she noted and double section ‘§§’ marked in her index, she ‘absolutely told Mrs. B- of being venerealized[sty]’ (index 12). \( I \text{ had told her nothing new or that she did not know before} \) (162). Attentive to the stories Anne told her, Mrs. Barlow ‘declared she had made it out from my manner & what I had said before’ (162). Anne’s revelation about her condition explicitly informed Mrs. Barlow about her sexual past and it explained her purpose in coming to Paris, to seek expert help. It was also one of only two of Anne’s stories that Helena Whitbread included for publication (Whitbread 1992, 57–58). Anne’s honesty about her condition had a remarkable benefit, for the next day, Mrs. Barlow ‘mentioned a famous man [h]ere who had made some great cures’ (163). Before she left for Paris, Anne’s knowledge of the medical establishment was general, gained perhaps through her autodidactic reading. With the initial contraction of the venereal disease, she included medical journals in her reading, like the Critical
Review on 3 August (Whitbread 1988, 160). However, it was when Anne confided in Mrs. Barlow regarding her state of health in late November, that she came to know of the ‘famous’ venereal doctor, M. Dupuytren. ‘I felt happy’, Anne wrote in her journal entry of 27 November, ‘tho’ a little strange at the thought of the confidence I had placed in her’ (163). The story of Anne’s venereal condition was to be the definitive story she revealed to Mrs. Barlow on the subject of herself.

Anne’s admission to venereal illness intersected categories of sexuality, culpability, gender and class. ‘I hoped that if possible’, Anne said on 28 November, ‘it would make the matter some little better to say I had not got it from anyone in low life’ (164). Anne admitted the source of her infection was ‘a married woman’ (164). Were the married woman ‘nearer on a par with myself’, Anne said, ‘I mig[h] have fared better’ (164). Anne’s implication was clear. The venal conduct of a married man with ‘low’ women exposed them all to the risk of venery. Mrs. Barlow understood it was the consequence of sexual promiscuity: ‘oh yes said Mrs. B- it was fair enough if people will run the risk’ (164). However, Anne did not reveal that Mariana was the ‘married woman’. On 17 March, two weeks before her departure, Anne finally ‘t[o]ld the [w]hole s[to]ry of M-’s marriag[e]’ (260). It was the second story retained by Helena Whitbread for publication (Whitbread 1992, 84–85). As Anne wrote, she told Mrs. Barlow ‘[e]very[thi]n[gl] corr[ec]y’ (260). Everything, except for the crucial detail of the relationship with Mariana after her marriage. Mariana’s reputation was protected by disguising her name. Anne ‘[o]nly w[ou]ld not allow’ to Mrs. Barlow, ‘that is disgu[i]sed that I had had any connection [w]ith [h]er since [her] marriage’ (260). The story Anne told with an unspecified married woman could lead Mrs. Barlow to believe that a connection had only, and unfortunately, occurred once. Undoubtedly, Anne also protected her own reputation from accusations from Mrs. Barlow, of ongoing impropriety and knowing immorality with Mariana.

Since the second engagement, when Anne and Mariana were apart, Anne was unhappy with their situation. On 16 December 1822, she considered writing of her relationship with Mariana and ‘calling myself, ‘Constant Durer’, from the very dure, to endure’ (Whitbread 1988, 232). However, when Anne and Mariana were together, Anne’s concerns about their relationship were resolved. As she said to Mrs. Barlow on 12 December, they ‘had almost always something to explain whenever we met yet when together she always satisfied & reconciled me’ (186). Yet, Anne was not reconciled
with ‘the three steps’ business at Blackstone Edge, or the trip to Scarborough in August and September 1823. On 6 November, she indexed and single section ‘§’ marked, how she ‘told the Blackstone Edge business’ (index 11). In the related journal entry, she told Mrs. Barlow, ‘had promised to forget it but could not’ (133). Anne said on 12 December, the trip to Scarborough was ‘one of the [t]hings we were always having to explain’ (186). During the trip, Mariana said ‘she would willingly have me different to have me different figure & [a]pearance more like other people’ (186). ‘I had remonstrated’, Anne told Mrs. Barlow, ‘saying then I should be different altogether’ (186). For Anne, the difference was not in her figure, nor in her appearance, but was constitutive of her difference ‘altogether’, or more categorically, of her homosexuality. Anne’s remonstration was in its way, a profound statement of the way she understood her figure, appearance and sexuality to be intricately entwined.

Before she came to Paris, Anne found out Isabella was also infected with the venereal disease on 2 November 1823 (Whitbread 1988, 310). Mrs. Barlow must have been told the story of how Anne unwittingly came to infect Isabella. It was not marked by Anne as a story; rather it was Mrs. Barlow who indicated her knowledge. On 28 November, Mrs. Barlow asked her, ‘how [sic] the person I had infected’ (164). Isabella’s condition made Anne ‘very uneasy’, she told Mrs. Barlow (164). Anne said, ‘the case was mistaken for some female complaint & tonics &c. prescribed’ (164). Like Anne’s medical difficulties with diagnosing the disease, Isabella’s condition was also considered a women’s problem (Whitbread 1988, 310). Anne shared her prescription with Isabella and she said to Mrs. Barlow, ‘it had done her good’ (164). ‘I was in hope’, she told Mrs. Barlow, ‘the thing was so taken in time & so mild’ (164). If Anne could be cured in Paris, she could give both Mariana and Isabella the details of her successful treatment. Anne told Mariana of Isabella’s condition. ‘I had told the lady who gave it [sic] me’, Anne said to Mrs. Barlow, ‘& she only laughed’ (164). Anne was shocked. ‘I had never been more shocked’, she told Mrs. Barlow, ‘than by such an instance of levity’ (164). It was not a situation Anne treated lightly in the past, or would in the present regarding their relationship. On 27 November, she said so to Mrs. Barlow: ‘I would never have done anything dishonourable to her’ (163). Anne made it known to Mrs. Barlow, she would take great care with her lovers in the future.

The year before her departure for Paris was an extremely important time for Anne. She evaluated the events of ‘the three steps’ and Scarborough. A month before she left for
Paris, Anne tried to communicate how she felt to Mariana and the effects of ‘the three steps’ and Scarborough business (Whitbread 1988, 350–51). The impression was indelible. As she said to Mariana on 20 July 1824, ‘I could not shake it off’ (Whitbread 1988, 351). In Paris, Anne read the journal entry recording the meeting with Mariana to Mrs. Barlow on 15 December. As she wrote, ‘read Mrs. B- my journal of the first day of my last meeting with M- vide (Tuesday 20 July page 27)’ (190). Mrs. Barlow ‘merely said’, Anne wrote, ‘it is what you have told me before’ (190). The week before on 9 December, she told Mrs. Barlow about Mariana’s marriage. Anne could not forget that experience either. ‘I found I cou[ld] never forget it’, she told Mrs. Barlow (181). In Paris, Anne continually expressed to Mrs. Barlow the importance of her attachment to Mariana. ‘I was much attached’, she explained (181). However, with these last stories, Anne brought the history of her sexual past up to date, to the current state of her affections. ‘I loved her once’, she said to Mrs. Barlow of Mariana, ‘but this last was passe[sic] the charm was broken’ (181). The primary place in Anne’s plans for her Romantic future was no longer held by Mariana; that was passed and gone, in French or miscrip[ted] English. It would be some months yet before Anne and Mrs. Barlow would decide whether that Romantic future included Mrs. Barlow.

In the textual space of the journal volume and in the sexual space of the relationship with Mrs. Barlow in Paris in 1824–25, it was these particular sexual experiences Anne chose to remember. These were all significant stories to her, but they remain largely unknown from the edited publication of the journal entries by Helena Whitbread. On 29 October, after telling some of the stories of her gaieties, Anne asked Mrs. Barlow ‘if she liked me’ the worse’ (121). Mrs. Barlow replied, ‘she liked me better for my candour’ (121). Anne wrote, ‘ah thought I to myself ladies never dislike men f[o]r gaieties well avowed’ (121). It was through the frankness and affirmation of such sexual stories that the sensibility of a person, or the nature of their character, could be known. The interpretive and analytical work that Anne did to produce these stories for Mrs. Barlow was in itself critical work. These narratives illuminated Anne’s past, and also her constructions and even silences regarding her own subjectivity and history. In telling these stories to Mrs. Barlow, Anne traced a history of Mariana’s marriage and the possibility of a connection with Mariana before her marriage. Anne also told the story behind her two gold rings and her understanding of how she contracted the venereal condition from Mariana. To Mrs. Barlow and us, Anne gave all the separate pieces of information to comprehend nearly the whole story of her sexual past and the
significance of her relationship with Mariana. In the very act of relating her sexual past as a part of her newer attachment to Mrs. Barlow, Anne was moving beyond her connections to Mariana.

**ANNE AND MRS. BARLOW:**

*‘Going to Italy’*

The way that Anne embedded her language with intense meaning could be seen in the examples of *the three steps* and *this treadmill business*. A richer source of emotion and experience for Anne’s lexicon was not distress, but desire. Anne’s deployment of linguistic and imaginary concepts of friendship and love between women was particularly evident in the relationship with Mrs. Barlow. This section focuses upon the development of an intimate bond between Anne and Mrs. Barlow through the figurative use of the deeply symbolic phrase *‘going to Italy’*. According to Helena Whitbread, Anne used the phrase *‘going to Italy’* as a ‘euphemism for having a full sexual relationship’ (Whitbread 1992, 65)\(^3\) However, such a meaning was difficult to confirm from the edited traces of the two gentlewomen’s discussions in *No Priest but Love*. When the sexual relationship with Mrs. Barlow was realised, Anne began tracing out the textual record of their amatory affairs with the most significant metasignage in her index – the triple section ‘§§§’ marks. These markers indicated the most noteworthy interactions between them, editorialising these events as the most momentous occurrences in Anne’s autobiographical account of her sojourn in Paris. Analysing the material practices of their sexual relationship allows for a more detailed study of the development of, and a historical insight into, the homosexual romance between Anne and Mrs. Barlow in the early nineteenth century.

From the time Anne first arrived at the Place Vendôme, her attraction to Mrs. Barlow appeared to be reciprocated. On 11 September, Mrs. Barlow told Anne, she was *‘a fine woman’* (75). Mrs. Barlow, Anne wrote, *‘tells me I am certainly not plain’* (75). All the house guests agreed, Mrs. Barlow said, that Anne was *‘very sensible & agreeable’* (75). Mrs. Barlow’s flattery did not go astray. Both comments, the particular and the universal, were noted in the index and double section ‘§§’ marked (index 7). It was the first time Anne metasigned an interaction with Mrs. Barlow as significant within her autobiographical account of Paris. From mid September, Mrs. Barlow was troubled by her wisdom teeth and confined to bed. The relationship shifted into more confidential
territory, as Anne visited her every day in her room. At first, she went only for ten
minutes, but soon sat with Mrs. Barlow for half an hour or more at a time. For three
days in a row, Anne visited Mrs. Barlow for above an hour, as well as calling upon her
more than once most days from 18 September (78–81). On the third day, Mrs.
Barlow’s ‘eyes sparkle when she saw me’ (80). ‘I begin to rather flirt with her’, Anne wrote (81). However, in late September, she became involved in the household
entertainments and in early October with Melle. de Sans, and her attentions to Mrs.
Barlow became cursory. The journal entries noted shorter visits to Mrs. Barlow with
less detail. The relationship between Mrs. Barlow and Anne was congenial, but an
attraction did not eventuate immediately into a more meaningful relationship.

Mrs. Barlow was aware that Melle. de Sans distracted Anne’s attentions in early
October. Mrs. Barlow made her first reappearance at the dinner on 6 October. On 8
October, Mrs. Barlow said to Anne, she ‘was not constant’ (98). Mrs. Barlow was hurt,
for she pursued Anne banteringly on the subject. Two days later, Anne recorded, Mrs.
Barlow ‘rallies me about being inconstant’ (99). ‘I believe’, she wrote, ‘Mrs. Barlow
would better like to have all my attentions herself’ (99). Two days later, this supposition
was confirmed with the MacKenzies as witnesses. On 12 October, Mrs. Barlow told
Anne, ‘I am volage that is inconstant & she is jealous’ (100). Anne’s capacity to be
fickle with her romantic attachments caused Mrs. Barlow to be jealous. That it was
about Anne’s amatory attachments, rather than companionate ones, was indicated by the
manner of the conversation. Anne was talking ‘flattering nonsense’ to Mrs. Barlow
(100). Miss MacKenzie observed, Anne talked to Mrs. Barlow ‘just as she had heard
gentlemen talk to her’ (100). It was a statement that conflated the notion of gendered
sociability with the sexual implications of such relations. Anne conversed in a
gentlemanly fashion, and the interaction proposed an erotic engagement between her
and Mrs. Barlow. Anne understood Mrs. Barlow’s jealousy to be part of the amatory
dynamic, for she recorded it within the context of the discussion. Mrs. Barlow’s jealous
response implied her cognisance of the romantic import of Anne’s special gentlemanly
attentions. It also signalled Mrs. Barlow’s particular willingness for these attentions.

The conversation marked a change in Anne’s relations with Mrs. Barlow. She
responded to Mrs. Barlow in a more engaged and attentive fashion from 12 October. In
stating herself in such a public manner, Mrs. Barlow openly declared her regard. It was
witnessed, and to some extent recognised, by their mutual gentlewomen friends,
especially by Miss MacKenzie. Anne noticed and she consciously and expressly began a lively flirtation with Mrs. Barlow. Later that evening, again in front of the MacKenzie, Anne wrote that she ‘rattled away so & flirted with Mrs. Barlow’ (101). It was an amatory state of affairs that was correlated in the index for the first time. Anne noted, ‘flirted with Mrs. B-’ (index 9). However, the most unabashed statement of Mrs. Barlow’s attachment to Anne happened the next day. The MacKenzie again proved to be critical witnesses to the emergent romance. On the morning of 13 October, Anne wrote, ‘in shewing[sic] the MacK-’s my greatcoat putting it on & my hat Mrs. B-joked & called me her beau’ (102). Mrs. Barlow’s comments were significant; they suggested an established and accepted courting practice for flirtation from a suitor or ‘beau’ in early nineteenth century society. As Anne noted in her index for the day, it represented ‘progress with Mrs. B-’ (index 9). Anne interpreted these passionate exchanges with Mrs. Barlow as constitutive of a real shift towards intimacy.

Once the MacKenzie left, without witnesses to hinder their flirtation, Anne and Mrs. Barlow began to seriously converse on the topic of women’s friendships, relationships and sexuality. The day after the MacKenzie departed on 13 October, Mrs. Barlow broached the subject of Marie Antoinette. Anne wrote, ‘somehow she began talking of “that one of the things of which” Marie Antoinette was accused was being too fond of women’ (104). The journal account of the conversation, written in the crypt handwriting, took a page to record (104–05). In the index, Anne noted and double section ‘§§’ marked her ‘conversation with Mrs. B- about the late Queen of France being too fond of women’ (index 9). The conversation about Marie Antoinette, rich with veiled meanings, was the precursor to months of such absorbing conversations between the two gentlewomen. These conversations were frequently instigated by Mrs. Barlow, as she did with Marie Antoinette. The evidence of the journal entries was that developed reading practices were not restricted to more sexually marginalised gentlewomen like Anne, who were highly educated with a particular interest in sexual histories. Gentlewomen like Mrs. Barlow, of more normative social positions as widows, mothers, ostensibly heterosexual and feminine, could also develop sophisticated cultural methods of interpretation in early nineteenth century society.

Anne and Mrs. Barlow’s conversations about same-sex desire began within an understanding of women’s friendships. From Marie Antoinette, the two gentlewomen discussed the boundaries that constrained women’s relations. ‘I could go as far in
friendship’, Anne told Mrs. Barlow the same day, ‘love as warmly as most but could not go beyond [sic] a certain degree’ (105). ‘I read of women being too fond of each other’, Anne said to Mrs. Barlow, ‘in the “Latin part of the” works of Sir William Jones’ (105).41 As Anne’s opening foray into the subject, Helena Whitbread included it in the edited journal entries (Whitbread 1992, 32). ‘I went to the [u]most extent of friendship’, Anne reiterated on 15 October, ‘but this was enough’ (106). Anne hinted to Mrs. Barlow, she ‘should like to be instructed in the other (between two [w]omen) & would learn when I could’ (106). Mrs. Barlow brought some poems for Anne ‘from the Latin of Joachim C[a]merarius’ (106).42 Anne especially noted the Voyage à Plombières, which had ‘the story in verse of [o]ne woman intriguing with another’ (106). In her index, she double sectioned ‘§§’ marked her reference to the poem, ‘vid. women’s fondness for each other’ (index 9). Mrs. Barlow ‘drew her chair close to mine’, Anne wrote in the journal entry, ‘& sat on my shoulder while we read it together’ (106–07). Anne and Mrs. Barlow’s imagining of a same-sex desire was articulated within a concept of women’s friendships, partly sourced from contemporary sexual scandal, and authorised by classical works on female homosexuality.

Anne and Mrs. Barlow were intent upon taking their salacious discussions further than indefinite suppositions. After reading the erotic poetry together, Anne gave voice to her longings. She told Mrs. Barlow, she ‘should like to have a person always at my elbow to share my bedroom & even bed & to go as far as friendship can go’ (106). ‘I was on the look out for somebody to live with me’, Anne told Mrs. Barlow plainly during their walk the next day on 16 October (108). ‘I was amoureuse in love with her’, she declared to Mrs. Barlow (108). Anne made it clear she was in search of a companion and implied it could be Mrs. Barlow. On 17 October, Anne ‘talked rationally’, she wrote, ‘of my great want of a companion & how much stronger my friendships were than those of people in general’ (109). Not for her, the elevated purity of platonic friendships; her strong friendships, Anne implied, were ardent. Anne began ‘speaking of the dullness of my own room’ on 18 October (109). Troubling their confidential relationship with passion, Anne ‘said I should like to stay with her’ (109). Mrs. Barlow seemed receptive, indicating ‘she would have no objection to my sleeping with her’ (109). It signalled a shift in their companionate discourse. From the generalities of friendships and strong emotions, Anne focused specifically on the relationship with Mrs. Barlow and the possibility of passion.
Anne’s amorous passion for Mrs. Barlow intensified with these declarations. She desired to kiss Mrs. Barlow, but hesitated to act upon it. When they sat up very late on 17 October, Mrs. Barlow put her arm around Anne. ‘I might have kissed her’, Anne wrote, a desire she reiterated in her index (109, index 10). It was a desire strengthened by Anne’s purchase of a book of poetry by Joannes Secundus, tantalisingly titled Basia, or Kisses in English.43 The heightened state of excitement became noteworthy material for the journal entries. ‘I really felt’, Anne wrote on 19 October, ‘considerably excited at one time & shut my eyes because the sight of hers made[sic] have carried me too far’ (110). The pitch of the attraction between the two gentlewomen was publicly evident. Mrs. Barlow ‘hinted gently we must not sit with hold of each other’s hands &c. when Miss Harvey & the rest came’ (110). It opened up a space for a distinction between the two gentlewomen’s public and private actions. To Mrs. Barlow, Anne ‘promised to behave very well’ (110). However, appropriate behaviour in front of the house guests necessitated a reward. ‘I will have my recompense in proportion’, Anne said to Mrs. Barlow, ‘as I am more careful downstairs I shall be less so up’ (110). The recompense was a kiss. The first kiss Anne gave Mrs. Barlow was ‘a little too loul[sic]’; the second was ‘to do it better’; and the third was elicited by Mrs. Barlow’s shyness, ‘because she said she was not fond of kissing & pretended to be a little shy’ (110).44 Yet, Anne’s desire to kiss Mrs. Barlow was fulfilled.

Liberties between lovers needed to be cemented, and in doing so authorised, by a recognition of the amatory relationship. It occurred later that same evening of 19 October, when Mrs. Barlow came to Anne’s room and stayed till near midnight. During their ‘cozy chit-chat’, the two gentlewomen agreed they were properly courting (111). ‘I am paying regular court to her’, Anne wrote, ‘& she admits it’ (111). Through their acknowledgement, Anne and Mrs. Barlow signified the changed status of their relationship. The interest Melle. de Sans held for Anne was relegated to a secondary status, compared to the excitement and official courtship with Mrs. Barlow. It was most clearly demonstrated in the flurry of section marking that appeared in the index from 14 to 18 October (index 9–10). From the significant competition of double section ‘§§’ markers against 14 and 15 October for both gentlewomen, the metasignage shifted after 18 October to a more select focus of single ‘§’ and double ‘§§’ section marks to those interactions with Mrs. Barlow. The index was rarely to reach such a concentration of signification again in the whole Paris period. It was a crucial period in the determination of Anne’s relationship with Mrs Barlow. The tête à tête with Mrs. Barlow on 19
October produced kisses and declarations of courtship. It opened up the imminent possibility of exploring same-sex desire and intimacy.

The declaration of Anne and Mrs. Barlow’s courtship did not resolve the ambiguity between their friendship and embodied relationship. After the declaration on 19 October, the metasignage in the index immediately dropped away. The sudden cessation of Anne’s autobiographical editorialising was revealing, illuminating the complex textual and sexual processes of the metasignage. The week of the index from 19 to 24 October was completely unsigned in any respect, yet it followed the abundant and muddled density of signs of the previous week (index 10). The interval of apparent quietude was paralleled by the brevity of the indices. None of the index notes for the same week were more than three lines long for any one day. The metasignage recommenced on 25 October, when Anne and Mrs. Barlow had discussed their ‘going to Italy’ together (index 10). From 25 October, the autobiographical account of Anne’s sexual adventures in Paris was focused exclusively and solely upon the amatory progress of the relationship with Mrs. Barlow. Thus, the hiatus in signification had begun with Anne’s decision to court Mrs. Barlow, and ended with the dénouement with Mrs. Barlow over their ‘going to Italy’ together. The temporary suspension of metasignage can be understood as the space created by the representational difficulties of an incipient courtship determined, but not yet defined within Anne’s autobiographical project of her sexual adventures in Paris.

In the lull from courtship to conclusion, the central issue for Anne and Mrs. Barlow was the nature their relationship. From 19 October the expression ‘going to Italy’ was incorporated into the two gentlewomen’s tête à têtes about same-sex desire. Earlier in the evening of the courtship declaration, Mrs. Barlow raised the topic of Italy, telling Anne, ‘Italy wouldn’t do for me’ (110). Mrs. Barlow probably referred to the classic Latin works on homosexuality they had discussed on 14 October (105). However, more recent references to Italy and sexual licentiousness abounded. The invocation of ‘old Rome’ was commonly used to scandalise female same-sex desire, according to Ros Ballaster’s analysis of satirical literature of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries (Ballaster 1994). There was for instance, the story of the Italian woman, Catherine Vizzani (d.1743?), who cross-dressed and married a woman in the seventeenth century, detailed in the pamphlet, Historical and Physical Dissertation on the Case of Catherine Vizzani (Bianchi 1751). The rumour of an affair between Queen Caroline (1768–1821)
and her male servant whilst she was living in Italy had provided the grounds for divorce proceedings by King George IV (1762–1830) in 1820 (Clark 1995, 164). Lord Byron had been a resident in Italy from 1816 to 1823, where his many affairs with women were notorious (MacCarthy 2002). When Mrs. Barlow and Anne invoked the phrase ‘going to Italy’, they referred to a rich ancient and modern tradition that represented Italy as a society indulgent of sexual appetites.

Prior to their courtship, the conversation about ‘going to Italy’ had been hypothetical. The two gentlewomen had begun talking of Italy on 19 October, when, Anne wrote, ‘we joked about the climate’ (110). Mrs. Barlow said of herself, ‘she was more calm than I’, and it was in this context that ‘Italy wou[ld] not do’ for Anne (110). Calmness was, in Mrs. Barlow’s sense, the ability to temper passionate folly with virtue. Nancy Cott has analysed the ideology of women’s passionlessness as it developed in late eighteenth and early nineteenth America (Cott 1978). Passionless, Cott noted, was the ‘ideal of sexual self-control’, an explicit opposition to the libertine sexual values of the British aristocracy (Cott 1978, 223). Thus ‘Italy’, or same-sex relations, would do Anne no good, for she was not calm like Mrs. Barlow. Anne was too heated for Italy’s climate, where homosexuality was practised. Anne concluded triumphantly, ‘oh oh she knows all about it well enough’ (110). No longer engaging in a theoretical discussion about same-sex love, Mrs. Barlow shifted their imaginary of homosexual desire into the personal and particular. ‘I would go to Italy & try the experiment’, Anne said to Mrs. Barlow on 20 October, ‘that is get a woman there’ (112). It was a comment Helena Whitbread retained for the edited publication (Whitbread 1992, 34–35). Positing the situation with an Italian woman allowed Anne to test Mrs. Barlow for her response. Anne wrote, ‘she knew what I meant tho’ wrapt up it was plain enough’ (112). It was plain enough, yet a relationship beyond a courtship was still to be decided upon.

The indeterminate intimacy between Anne and Mrs. Barlow highlighted the slippage between platonic and passionate relationships between women. Mrs. Barlow seemed aware of it. On 20 October, Mrs. Barlow questioned Anne regarding her sexual practices and close friendships. Mrs. Barlow, Anne wrote, ‘would have the thing was not new to me’ (111). Anne ‘ref[a]sed to explain’, she wrote, ‘because she would even despise me if I did’ (111). Mrs. Barlow was not informed of the history of Anne’s sexual past, but she was able to draw her own conclusions. As Anne wrote, Mrs. Barlow then ‘observed my wedding ring’ (111). Mrs. Barlow suspected there was a connection
between Anne’s friendships and the rings she wore. The rings, Anne initially qualified to Mrs Barlow, ‘ought to bind me but this was pure friendship’ (111). Mrs. Barlow was not convinced Anne’s friends were platonic relations; it was the same query, discussed earlier, that Anne had raised in the past about the Ladies of Llangollen. Two days later, on 22 October, Anne wrote, ‘she has evidently suspected me of all this towards them’ (113). Mrs. Barlow was concerned the rings tied Anne to another, as indeed they did. Anne finally acknowledged it the next day. On 23 October, she told Mrs. Barlow ‘they were both given by my most particular friend whom I never named & one contained her hair’ (114). Two days later, she wrote, Mrs. Barlow ‘thinks me engaged’ (116). It was a critical issue for Mrs. Barlow. Anne’s close friendship, cemented by rings, was a tie that bound her before the attachment to Mrs. Barlow.

These amatory concerns resulted in Anne’s ‘dénouement with Mrs. B.-’, as she indexed and double section ‘§§’ marked it on 25 October (index 10). The dénouement articulated the ultimate questions about the status and commitment of their courtship. Anne told Mrs. Barlow, that ‘if she went to Italy with me & shared my room she could make me do any[thing]’ (115). It was reiterated concisely in the index with ‘Italy’ (index 10). However, Mrs. Barlow replied, ‘if I [a]dored you I would not marry you live w’[i]th you in this way I wo[u]ld rather marry you’ (116). It was Anne’s rings and that attachment which possessed the legitimation and fidelity of a marriage, rather than the courtship between Anne and Mrs Barlow. Mrs. Barlow would not live with Anne as a mistress, but required the relationship to have the security and faithfulness of a marriage. Anne was piqued. Two days later on 27 October, she said to Mrs. Barlow, ‘she was the first who had ever refused me’ (118). It was significant enough to be reiterated in the index with double section ‘§§’ markers (index 10). Mrs. Barlow’s concrete statements about her own expectations in the ‘dénouement’ signalled a change in the romance. As their interactions once again became metasigned, the courtship with Mrs. Barlow became Anne’s primary amatory and autobiographical concern in Paris.

Anne was not sure about committing herself only to Mrs. Barlow. Anne decided upon a compromise: if she wanted to ‘go to Italy’ in two or three years, Mrs. Barlow might choose to accept her. ‘I a[l]most think’, Anne wrote on 27 October, ‘she would make a good wife & if I chose to persevere properly ’&’ if she saw me constant for two or three years I think her scruples would wear off’ (119). Mrs. Barlow told Anne, ‘pure friendship is best for I shall return to my ofl[sic] affections & turn to this friend at
last’ (119). A platonic friendship, Mrs. Barlow indicated, was all that was possible without a marriage, for Anne might return to her previous attachment. In debating these choices for their relationship, Anne and Mrs. Barlow worked through the practicalities and expectations of their relationship. The metaphor of ‘going to Italy’ served to elaborate some of the materialities of such a commitment between the two gentlewomen. However, such conceptualisation ceased entirely in late October when Mme. de Boyve intervened. After Mme. de Boyve’s ‘history of the flirtations of Mrs. B-’ on 29 October, Anne drew back on the intensity of their romance intentionally (index 10). On 4 November, she noted, she was ‘making distant love’ to Mrs. Barlow (130). Anne was not trying to withdraw from the relationship with Mrs. Barlow. Rather, she was attempting to determine the current and future nature of the social association and sexual relationship she should have with Mrs. Barlow.

The notion of ‘going to Italy’ did not re-enter Anne and Mrs. Barlow’s interactions until mid November. Yet, in the period from late October to mid November the praxis of ‘going to Italy’, of developing a sexually embodied relationship, measurably advanced. Anne continued to experience and write about the amorous rapport between herself and Mrs. Barlow, even in the midst of the domestic drama with Mme. de Boyve. ‘I still flirt with her’, Anne wrote on 3 November, ‘she keeps me rather excited’ (128). The sexual tension intensified, despite her doubts about Mrs. Barlow. When the two gentlewomen said good night later that same evening, Anne wrote:

in wishing her good night she “quite” let my arms round her waist & gently press her & very gently kiss her she stood too with her right thigh a little within my left in contact which she has never permitted before (129)

Other sexual permissions were also sought. ‘I had kissed’, Anne wrote on 5 November, ‘the left side of her throat in the morning & asked to have that for my own place’ (132). Anne slowly began to reveal details about her relationship with Mariana, culminating in some of the most significant stories, such as ‘the three steps’ business and the binding significance of her wedding rings on 6 November (133–34). The correlation between Anne and Mrs. Barlow’s corporeal and confidential intimacy indicated Anne placed some measure of trust in Mrs. Barlow.

The romance escalated into a compelling intimacy. On 6 November, Anne wrote, miscrypting, she stood with ‘my thigh touching[ sic] hers all its length’ (133). She wondered on 7 November, ‘if I had a penis tho’ off[ sic] but small length I should surely
break the ice some of these times before I go’ (135).47 The rare underlining suggested her amatory intent with Mrs. Barlow. Anne desired to break through any reservations Mrs. Barlow might have towards their relationship. On 8 November, Mrs. Barlow agreed to sit on Anne’s knee, a practice that was distinctly sexual.48 ‘Mrs. B-’, Anne noted and double section ‘§§’ marked in her index, ‘did sit on my knee’ (index 11). On 11 November, Anne ‘proceeded great [l]engths outside her petticoats’, as she double section ‘§§’ marked in her index (index 11). ‘I had kissed & pressed Mrs. B- on my knee’, she wrote in the journal entry, ‘till I had had a complete fit of passion’ (140).

Mrs. Barlow ‘so crossed her legs & leaned against me’ that I put my hand over & grubbled her [o]n the outside of her petticoats till she was evidently a little excited’ (140). Anne concluded, ‘the ice is a little broken’ (141). Mrs. Barlow was ‘a little excited’, she wrote on 14 November (145). ‘I felt her grow warm’, Anne elaborated, ‘& she let me “grubble &” press her tightly with my left hand while I held her against the door with the other’ (145). Mrs. Barlow ‘looked hot’, she wrote, ‘her hair out of curl & herself languid exactly as if after a connection had taken place’ (145). Anne was close to breaking the ice with Mrs. Barlow with such erotic liberties.

Until Mme. de Boyve intervened, Anne and Mrs. Barlow’s discussions were concerned with friendship. Mrs. Barlow’s frankness about the intrigues of the house on 15 November, perhaps persuaded Anne to re-invoke their notion of ‘going to Italy’. ‘I contrived to ask’, she wrote that afternoon, ‘if I had no hope of making her dearer to me before I went’ (146). Mrs. Barlow ‘said no’, Anne wrote, ‘never till we are married’ (146). ‘I wished we had to go to England together’, she told Mrs. Barlow, ‘that we must be [f]ive or six nights on the road & must share our room & bed’ (146). In that situation, Anne asked Mrs. Barlow, ‘would you not relax’ (146)? Mrs. Barlow was firm, ‘said she hoped not’ (146). Anne wondered if Mrs. Barlow would reconsider if they were tied. ‘I asked’, she wrote, ‘if we were married or if we went to Italy together it would be a different thing (146)? Mrs. Barlow ‘made no objection’ (146). The notion of ‘going to Italy’ was transformed again. Anne’s doubts about Mrs. Barlow had been partially resolved and it was noticeably ‘we’ who would go to Italy ‘together’. It was a shift Helena Whitbread was possibly aware of, for she included the conversation in her edited publication (Whitbread 1992, 52). Anne admitted in her journal entry on 23 November, ‘I th[o]ught at first [sic] succeed on my own terms letting her know that I was engaged’ (159). However, as Anne acknowledged, ‘I have no chance of succeeding farther’ (159). Mrs. Barlow, she wrote, ‘says I never shall till I have the [r]ight to do
so’ (159). The future of the romance was not to be a casual affair. Anne must commit to marriage, or the same-sex equivalent of ‘going to Italy’. It was within the discourse of marriage that the relationship proceeded to be conceptualised.

Anne and Mrs. Barlow’s discussions about marriage incorporated the ties that bound them in the past, and in the present. However, revealing these ties was a protracted process. Anne confided her engagement with Mariana to Mrs. Barlow in a succession of stories in late October. Following their discussion of ‘going to Italy’, Mrs. Barlow related stories of her marriage to the late Colonel Barlow. On 15 November, Mrs. Barlow ‘began talking of Colonel B.-’, Anne wrote, ‘in a manner which proved they had been happy’ (146). At first, Anne did not appreciate these heterosexual stories. ‘I used to think’, she told Mrs. Barlow, ‘I could not choose a woman who had had any experience & at first I could not bear to hear her name Colonel B.-’ (147). Information about marital intercourse may have been unwelcome from Mariana, for it testified to a connection that made Anne unhappy. It was not the case with Mrs. Barlow. Anne said, ‘now I rather liked both these things’ (147). The ‘history’ of Mrs. Barlow’s relationship with Mr. Hancock was also a prime focus of Anne’s attention, after Mme. de Boyve’s accusations in late October. The scheme on 20 November to force the ‘dénouement respecting Mr. Hancock’ elicited the entire story of the affair from Mrs. Barlow (154–55). The day after, Anne told Mrs. Barlow, ‘if I had been going to be marrie[d] to you & had heard this I should have put off the match’ (156). Articulating the ties that bound them was the way the two gentlewomen talked about their options, within the complex relations of their other past, current or future attachments.

Neither Anne nor Mrs. Barlow were sufficiently informed to make decisions about their relationship or future. Anne’s revelations about her engagement were discretely anonymous. ‘I could not acknow[l]edge that M- loved me’, she wrote on 23 November (159). Anne dare not tell Mrs. Barlow, for it would expose the sexual relationship with Mariana after her marriage. It was a discretion that extended into the future. ‘I durst[sic] not say’, Anne wrote, ‘I was engaged to anyone else lest she should hereafter see me living with M- for M-’s fake’ (159). On Mrs. Barlow’s part, she admitted to the attachment with Mr. Hancock, but she concealed Mr. Hancock’s letters. The first time Mrs. Barlow let Anne read one of Mr. Hancock’s letters was the morning of the same day. ‘I told her’, Anne wrote, ‘he was ev[i]dently attached to her & in love whether sh[e] was or not’ (157). The letter clearly revealed Mr. Hancock’s romantic interest in
Mrs. Barlow, if not Mrs. Barlow’s affections in return. Like Anne, Mrs. Barlow was wary of allowing too much of her attachments to be known. Both gentlewomen’s reputations were implicated by their other amatory connections: Anne’s due to Mariana’s marriage, and Mrs. Barlow’s owing to Mr. Hancock’s criminal conversation case. In withholding the crucial information from each other, the two gentlewomen succeeded in separately managing the representation of their sexuality, as well as controlling the management of their reputations.

There remained the complex issue of Anne’s sexual connection with Mariana. ‘I could not let her suspect anything’, she wrote of Mrs. Barlow on 23 November, ‘& thus have I gone from little to more into thus deceiving’ (159). There was also the matter of the venereal consequences of her connection to Mariana. Three days later, Anne unthinkingly confessed her venereal condition to Mrs. Barlow. It happened by accident. On 26 November, reading aloud a letter from Aunt Anne, ‘on reading the glad I was better’, Anne wrote, ‘rattled off with I came to Paris for my health & afterwards faid something of suffering for one’s folly’ (162). ‘I saw’, she wrote in the journal entry, ‘Mrs. B- understood me to allude to something venere[a]l’ (162). Anne was concerned about Mrs. Barlow’s response to the latest revelation of her sexual history. Anne ‘asked’ Mrs. Barlow ‘if she forgave me’ (162). Mrs. Barlow replied ‘yes’, Anne wrote, ‘as much as she forgave everyone else’ (162). When Anne asked, ‘did she love me less’, Mrs. Barlow replied, ‘no she had no reason to do so’ (162). Finally, Anne asked, ‘would she still take me’ (162)? Mrs. Barlow ‘said’, Anne wrote, ‘I was not at liberty’ (162).

Anne’s truthfulness was the most persuasive factor in convincing Mrs. Barlow of the honesty of their relations with each other. ‘I was foolish to name it’, Anne said to Mrs. Barlow (162). Mrs. Barlow stated, ‘not if I had had any guile in me’ (162). With the admission to Mrs. Barlow, Anne confided the nature of her medical condition and one of the compelling reasons for the sojourn to Paris.

Anne’s ultimate revelation occurred without planning. ‘Accident yesterday made my friend Mrs. Barlow acquainted with the real cause of my being here’, she wrote in her letter to Aunt Anne backdated to 29 November (ML/155, 1). Anne had intended to tell Mrs. Barlow at a future stage in their relationship. ‘I should certainly have told her’, Anne said to Mrs. Barlow on 27 November, ‘before we had come together had there been any near pospect[sic] of it’ (163). Confiding the most private of sexual secrets to Mrs. Barlow was a new experience for Anne. ‘I was happy to have told’, she said to
Mrs. Barlow, ‘th[o]’ astonished how I ha[d d]one it’ (163). It was not a situation that had arisen before. Mariana failed to inform Anne, as Anne did in turn with Isabella. In informing Mrs. Barlow of her venereal condition, Anne enabled consensual and safe sexual practices to be established. As well, taking Mrs. Barlow into her confidence displayed the level of trust in their relationship. Anne’s confidence was well rewarded. On 28 November, Mrs. Barlow ‘found me the address of M. Dupuytren the surgeon’ (165). Monsieur Dupuytren’s speciality was the treatment of venereal conditions. It was Mrs. Barlow’s knowledge about the real state of the Place Vendôme affairs which provided the information regarding a good doctor in Paris. Anne wrote the day before, ‘it seems [Mr.] Robinson was here on that account & was cu[r]ed’ (163). Anne consulted M. Dupuytren on 29 November (165–67). It was through her trust and confidence in Mrs. Barlow that such an outcome was effected.

Anne and Mrs. Barlow’s relations were subtly negotiated within social discourses that proscribed behaviour between courting couples. The two gentlewomen negotiated these discourses separately and together, to maintain their own agency and reputation. From Anne’s revelation about her venereal condition on 26 November, Mrs. Barlow’s behaviour was ‘fect[adily] particular’ (162). On 29 November, Mrs. Barlow was ‘more particular with me than ever’, and that evening was ‘mor[e] & mor[e] particular’ (167, 168). ‘I had almost half a mind’, Anne told Mrs. Barlow, ‘to give her my promise now & never mind other eng[ag]ements’ (168). Mrs. Barlow wanted a considered promise, telling Anne ‘you must not’ (168). What, Anne asked Mrs. Barlow, ‘will you do when we go to Italy’ (168)? Mrs. Barlow ‘looked as if there would be no diffy[sic] then’, Anne wrote (168). It was a question now of when, not whether, their relationship would encompass ‘going to Italy’. Thus began the delicate negotiations about what was to be permitted on what terms. On 4 December, Anne put on her stays in front of Mrs. Barlow for the first time. ‘I could not dress [b]efore any[o]ne else’, she told Mrs. Barlow (174). It was an unusual occurrence, not congruent perhaps with Anne’s image of herself as the gentlemanly lover. She exclaimed to Mrs. Barlow, ‘what a liaison it was thus to say & do everything before her’ (174). It was, as Anne said, ‘a preparation to our going to Italy’ (174). The progression of such familiarities between them was all preliminary, in Anne’s conception, towards such a prospect.

The most intensely sexual and significant autobiographical accounting of Anne and Mrs. Barlow’s romance began in early December, with triple section ‘§§§’ marks in the
index. It started on 8 December, when Mrs. Barlow learnt the scandalous Place Vendôme gossip about herself from Melle. de Sans. In the face of Mme. de Boyve’s ruinous claims, Mrs. Barlow decided to protect her reputation and leave the guesthouse. In Anne’s opinion, Mrs. Barlow proved after all to be ‘a virtuous woman’ (index 13). Anne employed the triple section ‘§§§’ markings to distinguish the note for the first time in the index. It was a vitally significant revelation for her. Mrs. Barlow ‘loves me evidently’, she elaborated in the journal entry, ‘but she is a virtuous woman & teach[sic] me to love her as fuch’ (180). Anne wrote, Mrs. Barlow ‘would accept me if I were at liberty but will listen to me [of]no of[her te]rms’ (180). Mrs. Barlow would not accept the position of Anne’s mistress, ancillary to the engagement and commitment between Anne and Mariana. Mrs. Barlow told Anne, ‘were she my own she would be all I wished if not I have no chance bey[ond her friendship’ (180). Mrs. Barlow’s display of virtuous character impressed Anne. Mrs. Barlow, she wrote, ‘often speaks & acts far better than M-‘ (180). It was not only Mrs. Barlow’s virtue in the domestic drama that was important, although Anne’s defence of Mrs. Barlow’s reputation publicly was an example of her courtly behaviour. Anne was concerned with the significance of Mrs. Barlow’s virtue in terms of their relationship.

Anne’s relationship with Mrs. Barlow was an incentive for remaining in Paris. The date of her departure had not yet been set. On 13 December, the two gentlewomen spent their first day looking at new lodgings for Mrs Barlow. In the evening, Anne ‘talked with pleasure [o]f our being so near each other & that I should go & sleep with h[e]r’ (188–89). Mrs. Barlow ‘made no objection’, Anne wrote (189). Anne ‘should go & sleep with her no objection’, she indexed and triple section ‘§§§’ marked (index 13). Anne made it clear to Mrs. Barlow that ‘going to Italy’ together would only increase their amorous attachment. On 18 December, Mrs. Barlow remarked that Anne ‘had now got so used to my own place (her left breast)’ (192). Mrs. Barlow said, ‘she was forry I had used it so much’ (192). Anne told her, ‘it [i]s too late to refuse me now’ (192). There was no retreat to friendship for either of the gentlewomen. How would Mrs. Barlow behave ‘when we go to Italy’, Anne asked (192)? ‘I shall be quite a nuisance [t]o [y]ou’, she told Mrs. Barlow, ‘I shall be much worse then’ (192). It was too late for Mrs. Barlow to refuse her attentions, as it was too late for either to bear the restraint of a platonic friendship. Mrs. Barlow ‘tied me by the strongest of all ties’, Anne told her, ‘& you are & must be my own’ (192). What bound the two lovers was not the lesser tie of friendship, but that most compelling of attachments, romantic love.
Anne hoped she and Mrs. Barlow would become more intimate. Mrs. Barlow ‘will never let me attempt to kiss her breast’, Anne wrote on 18 December (192). ‘I [sh]all attain[stic] this’, she hoped, ‘in our new abode when she lets me sleep with her’ (192). Two days later Anne partly succeeded, as she wrote, ‘by dint of management’ (193). On 20 December, she recorded, ‘finally got the nipple into my mouth & sucked it for perhaps as much as ten minutes’ (193). ‘I certainly’, she wrote, ‘never dreampt[stic] of succeeding tonight’ (194). It was ‘the thought that I have no right makes her fi’g’ht shy’, Anne considered (194). ‘I said she must take me’, she wrote, perhaps meaning as she was, without the right to such intimacies (194). Anne was not in a position make such offers, according to Mrs. Barlow. ‘I w[a]/s not my own’, Mrs. Barlow said of Anne, ‘I could not g[i]/ve myself I was tied & in slavery’ (194). Anne declared there was a stronger tie between them than right, for Mrs. Barlow ‘tied me by love & that might prove the strongest tie after all’ (194). When the two gentlewomen discussed it the following day, Mrs. Barlow ‘owned that if we were certainly going to I[t]aly together in six m[o]nths she should not be angry at me’ (194). Mrs. Barlow was hesitant about the sexual liberties she allowed Anne, if they were not ‘going to Italy’. Mrs. Barlow ‘seemed’, Anne wrote, ‘to speak as if she should be satisfied if I really loved [h]e[rrr] but perhaps she could not be sure of this’ (194). In Mrs. Barlow’s view, Anne’s right to take liberties would be established by a promise, the surety of ‘going to Italy’.

Anne’s venereal condition made more serious any decision about ‘going to Italy’ together. On 22 December, Mrs. Barlow ‘let me gr[u]bb[l]e her over her petticoats’, Anne wrote (195). ‘I he[l]d m[y] hand st[i]ll & felt her pulsation’, she recorded, ‘felt her rise towards my hand two or three times’ (195). Afterwards, Mrs. Barlow said, ‘I [th]ink I [c]ou[l]d do anyth[ing] for you’ (195). Anne repeated Mrs. Barlow’s sentiment in the index with triple section ‘§§§’ marks, ‘I think I could do anything for you’ (index 13). ‘I once thought I could s[leep] with [y]ou’, Mrs. Barlow told Anne, ‘now [I] find I could not’ (195). Before Mrs. Barlow learnt of Anne’s venereal condition she would have slept with her. ‘I ’knew she’ could do it’, Anne said to Mrs. Barlow, ‘were we gone to Italy it would be diffe[r]ent but in m[y] present state we were both quite safe’ (195). Anne was aware of the need to manage her sexual practices with her partners to lower the risk of infection. In their present relationship, there was no risk of infection, nor the need to contain the possibility of transmission. Anne assured Mrs. Barlow, ‘[I] loved her far too well not [t]o be quite sure we were both sec[u]re’ (195). Including part of the conversation in her edited publication, Helena Whitbread
headlined it with ‘Anne is surprised by Mrs. Barlow’s advances’ (Whitbread 1992, 64–65, 64). However, in Anne’s understanding, the relationship with Mrs. Barlow had crossed the boundary that demarcated flirtation and romance from the more profound ties and responsibilities of love, sex and ‘going to Italy’.

The two threads of ‘going to Italy’ and Anne’s editorial structuring of her index did not usually occur concurrently in the journal volume. The exception was the day Mrs. Barlow informally leased the Quai Voltaire apartment on 28 December. That evening, Anne ‘so managed my left’, she wrote, ‘as to get her petticoaat[sic] sufficiently up to feel her naked queer with one finger’ (202). Mrs. Barlow told Anne, ‘I indulge you too much’ (202). Mrs. Barlow indulged her further. ‘I pushed up my middle finger halfway’, Anne wrote (203). She noted in the index, ‘I pushed up my middle finger “for the first time”’ (index 14). It was the first time Anne intimately touched Mrs. Barlow. The great significance of the event was recognised by triple section ‘§§§’ markings. Perhaps because of the many important events of the day, Anne felt the need to edit her journal entry. It was in a footnote addition that ‘going to Italy’ appeared. The footnote was marked by a single section ‘§’ mark, following Mrs. Barlow’s comment that she indulged Anne too much. Anne marked it and wrote at the bottom of the page, ‘& I had replied oh you will not think so you will find no fault when we go to Italy’ (202). It was a promisingly lewd and certainly audacious reply. Anne went to some textual lengths to record her sexual experiences with veracity. It revealed the great importance that she placed on such conceptual and sexual events with Mrs. Barlow.

It was undecided whether Anne would reside with Mrs. Barlow. After signing the Quai Voltaire lease, their own negotiations became critical. The topic of ‘going to Italy’ was raised nearly every day, and even twice a day, in early January. Mrs. Barlow was anxious to have a more secure commitment. Mrs. Barlow ‘has hopes of gaining me I see’, Anne wrote on 1 January, ‘since she has allowed me so much indulgence’ (207). ‘I talk of nothing but increased[sic] attachment & going to [I]tal[ya]’, she wrote (207). The following day Anne nursed or, rather, flirted with Melle. de Sans. Mrs. Barlow did not like it and Anne took note. Mrs. Barlow’s feelings, Anne said to her, ‘turned on so fine a pivot a circumstance like this would be n[a]ught to destroy them’ (208). In early nineteenth society, such sexual exclusivity as Mrs. Barlow wanted would have been exceptional. ‘I am best single’, Mrs. Barlow admitted (209). Anne asked, ‘then will you not go with me to Italy’ (209)? Mrs. Barlow ‘smiled a yes’ (209). ‘I almost think’,
Anne wrote, ‘she could make me constant’ (209). On 3 January, Anne shared her new circumstances, that she was to reside with Mrs. Barlow, in her letters. Unusually, it was only the outcome, not the decision process, that was recorded. ‘I should go with Mrs. B-’, Anne extracted from her letter to Mariana (209).\(^3\) Mariana had once been the only lover who could make her constant. Mariana, she wrote in the journal entry the same day, ‘has not the nack\(sic\) of m[a]king me constant the charm is indeed broken’ (210).\(^4\) Mrs. Barlow’s ability to make Anne constant was the deciding factor.

Anne and Mrs. Barlow had two weeks before ‘going to Italy’ could become an eventuality. Interspersed amongst the purchases of household items for 15 Quai Voltaire, were the salacious particulars Anne recorded of their sex. From 3 January, she grumbled Mrs. Barlow ‘[o]nger & better than ever’, or as she corrected in the index, ‘longer & better than usual ever’ (209, index 14). These grumbles, Anne did ‘well’ and ‘long’, often for more than an hour.\(^5\) On 7 January, she recorded that ‘all shew\(sic\) o’f\(sic\) reluctance is over now & I may say & do as I like’ (214). Now that all show of, or, reluctance was gone, their sexual relations made Anne more certain she could be constant. ‘I am now sure’, Anne told Mrs. Barlow on 5 January, ‘I cou[l]d b[e] constant to her’ (212). ‘I can even now’, she assured Mrs. Barlow, ‘when I am absent’ (212).

Unlike Mariana, Anne thought Mrs. Barlow could make her constant even in absence, until she returned two years hence. It was a significant claim, one that Anne did not make often in her sexual history. She said to Mrs. Barlow, “I shall be much more after we have been to Italy” (212). The tie between the two gentlewomen would only be made stronger by ‘going to Italy’. Anne would be more constant with an established connection between herself and Mrs. Barlow.

Anne and Mrs. Barlow moved out of 24 Place Vendôme, to take up their new abode at 15 Quai Voltaire on 15 January. Their first night was an event, as Anne described:

\(\text{last night grumbled for near an hour but not finding myself enough excited no flow of urine or otherwise[f]}e \text{faid I was not quite right should be better by & by rested perhaps half [sic] hour then at her again feeling myself wet enough (tho’ I put my queer near her she knows how far I am excited) grumbled her above an hour with the exertion I had not a dry thread on me she had flannel & besides this her night shift & day ditto she got up & went to the [c]abinet in the meantime I put on a dry night chemise & we slept a little in each other’s arms. (221)\)

These activities on their first night left Anne no time to write her journal entry the same evening. Instead, she entered the details as the first item the following day. ‘Left M. de
B’s with Mrs. B’, she simply noted in her index (index 15). It was the first triple section ‘§§§’ marked event for over two weeks. Considered within the explicit and embodied sexuality of Anne’s autobiographical account of Paris, the significance of the itemisation revealed a deeper meaning. The triple section ‘§§§’ markers were not only in reference to the departure from the Place Vendôme. The metasignage suggested Anne’s anticipation of further intimacies with Mrs. Barlow at Quai Voltaire.

Anne satisfied one particular desire almost immediately at Quai Voltaire, her longing to glimpse Mrs. Barlow’s queer. Anne expressed her wish as early as 7 January, when after grumbling Mrs. Barlow, she offered ‘to kiss her queer’ (214). Mrs. Barlow ‘prevented me’, she wrote (214). Anne hoped once Mrs. Barlow was familiar with her, she would consent to such liberties. As she wrote two days later on 9 January, ‘whenever once accustomed to this she will refuse nothing’ (216). The day after they moved into Quai Voltaire, Anne tried again. ‘I wanted to look at her just before getting up’, she wrote on 16 January (221). Mrs. Barlow refused. ‘I shall gain the point another time’, Anne hoped (221). Two days later on 18 January, Mrs. Barlow permitted her wish. As Anne recorded in her journal entry, ‘just before getting up finally she let me put my head under the clothes kiss the top of her queer & look at her’ (223). Anne described Mrs. Barlow’s queer in flattering detail on 21 January. She wrote, ‘there it was the prettiest part about her, really is very pretty quite black & round & fat & very nicely formed’ (225). ‘I have told her since’, she wrote, ‘that the prettiest part of her is quite hid’ (225). Anne embarked on her next effort, to persuade Mrs. Barlow to give her some queer hair for ‘a talisman to keep me constant’ (225). A keepsake would remind Anne of their tie and bind her to Mrs. Barlow.

Mrs. Barlow proved to be an indulgent lover. On 18 January, Anne reflected in her journal entry, ‘I think I might understand the probability that whatever might happen she would not refuse to indulge me’ (223). That day, Mrs. Barlow indulged her desire to see her queer. In the index, Anne reiterated, Mrs. Barlow ‘would never perhaps refuse to indulge me’ (index 15). Anne designated the insight with triple section ‘§§§’ marks. The sense of Mrs. Barlow’s indulgence excited her. It inspired a shift in the journal entries. Into the descriptions of her sexual relations with Mrs. Barlow, Anne regularly began to record their ‘kisses’ in her journal accounts of their sexual intimacy. Recording ‘kisses’ in her journal entries was a textual practice that she used likewise with her sexual relationships with Mariana and Isabella. ‘All her kisses are good ones’,
Anne said of Mariana on 22 July 1824 (Whitbread 1988, 351). ‘Better kiss last night than Tib has given me for long’, Anne wrote on 25 November 1822 (Whitbread 1988, 229). On 19 January, she recorded the ‘kiss’ she shared with Mrs. Barlow for the first time in Paris. ‘I [a]t her again’, she wrote, ‘& had [a] goodish kiss’ (223). Three days later, Anne again recorded their kisses. ‘I had three or four kisses’, she wrote on 22 January, ‘or rather e[x]citements’ (226). Mrs. Barlow’s sexual indulgence of Anne’s erotic desire affected her deeply. Incorporating the significant experiences of their embodied excitation into the journal entries, suggested the intensity of the intimate tie that bound Anne to Mrs. Barlow.

Anne’s historic and passionate understanding of ‘kisses’ or ‘excitements’ could parallel what we understand as orgasm. However, analysing the last three months of journal entries, there were more ‘excitements’ than ‘kisses’. There were also distinct gradations in each category. The superlative description Anne used was a variation on ‘capital’ experiences. There were ‘most capital’ excitements, like on 4 February when ‘we had three most capita[l] excitements’ (sic) (236). There could also be a ‘very capital’ experience of excitement, as when Mrs. Barlow had ‘two very good capital excitements’ on 1 February (234). Or there were simply ‘capital’ excitements. As Anne wrote on 10 February, they were interrupted by the seamstress, after ‘having just had a capital excitement’ (239). Perhaps the sensation of strong desire was also included in the mode of high excitement. On 19 March, she and Mrs. Barlow had ‘a strong excit[e]ment last nig[h]t’ (261). The pinnacle of excitement, seen only once in the journal entries for Paris, was the definitive state of ‘the excitement’. On 14 March, Anne and Mrs. Barlow went to visit Marie Antoinette’s prison cell. Afterwards, Mrs. Barlow ‘put my hand to queer’ (258). Anne grubbled Mrs. Barlow and ‘after a little har[sic] working I gave her the excitement’ (258). This was perhaps the exquisite excitement which Anne once recorded by its absence. On 9 February, she noted that Mrs. Barlow’s ‘excitation was not quite exquisite’ (239). The tragic Sapphic figure of the late Queen of France powerfully aroused the two gentlewomen’s desire.

There were two other gradations of ‘excitement’. Anne’s comparative state of ‘excitement’ ranged through variations on ‘good’ excitements. There were a number of ‘very good’ excitements, a few ‘goodish’ ones, frequent ‘good’ excitements and one instance of a ‘pretty good’ excitement. There were excitements that Anne immediately discerned as better than others. On 2 February, she qualified that there were ‘four or five
good excitements during the ‘two or three’ latter ones’ (235). Occasionally, she had difficulty enumerating them. Anne wrote and corrected on 29 January, ‘we had three or four ‘or five’ very good excitements’ (232). At other times, she easily kept track, counting up to ‘five or six’ excitements on 27 January (230). Some of her ‘excitements’ were merely noteworthy and the journal entries only testified to their occurrence.57 However, there were some rare instances which Anne reported in more average terms.

Mrs. Barlow had, ‘as is generally the case’, she wrote on 12 March, ‘a pretty tolerable excitement’ (256). On 13 February, Anne experienced ‘a tolerable excitement or two’, followed later by ‘two or three little excitments’ (241).58 Lastly, there was the evening of 1 March, when Mrs. Barlow worried they would be disturbed by the servant during sex. It was then ‘too late’, Anne wrote, ‘for more than common excitements’ (250). Both the special and ordinary ‘excitements’ were unusual in the journal entries. Anne’s commendation was generally reserved for the consistently ‘good’ excitements and its variations.

Anne and Mrs. Barlow’s ‘kisses’ occurred half as many times at Quai Voltaire. Anne described their ‘kisses’ in a variety of subtly nuanced phrases. The highest praise appeared to be reserved for the emphatic state of ‘the kiss’. The two gentlewomen experienced ‘the kiss’ only once in Paris. On 24 February, Anne wrote, ‘after grubbling well last night had the kiss’ (247). The categorical kiss was close to, or possibly equivalent to, the ‘kiss par excellence’. Almost as rare, the ‘kiss par excellence’ was a little more frequent than the ‘the kiss’ in the journal entries. On 11 February, Anne ‘might have given the kiss par excellence’, she wrote, ‘but Cordingley came to the door in the midst of it’ (240). Two days later, Anne gave Mrs. Barlow, the ‘kiss par excellence’ not once, but twice. As she wrote on 13 February, ‘after this waited ten minutes & then gave her another one par excellence’ (241). These ‘two kisses par excellence’ were registered in the index (index 16). Slightly more regular was the unemphatic form of ‘the kiss’ that was without notable excellence. It was perhaps this kiss Anne referred to when she described having ‘the real one’ with Mrs. Barlow on 27 February (250). She recorded ‘the kiss’ six times at Quai Voltaire.59 Compared to the more definitive versions, the less categorical variation of ‘the kiss’ held a penultimate status in Anne’s phraseology. She also noted when kisses did not happen. There was one kiss for instance, that was ‘all but the kiss par excellence’, and three that were ‘very nearly’ the unadorned form of ‘the kiss’.60 All of these sorts of kisses were so excellent that nearly to achieve them also warranted Anne’s textual attention.
The experience of a ‘kiss’ could be a capital occurrence for Anne, and also Mrs Barlow. On 8 February, ‘it was capital to us both’ (238). Anne ‘had & gave to her another capit[al] kiss’ on 10 February (239). Like the excitations, there were similar variations of ‘good’ kisses. There was one ‘very good’ kiss, some that were ‘very good’, a single ‘goodish’ kiss, a number of ‘good’ ones and an ‘almost as good’ kiss.61 The instance of a ‘kiss’ without adjectives was rare; it occurred only four times in the journal entries in Paris.62 There were kisses that Anne considered less significant, like the ‘little one’ on 23 March, which she noted also in her index (262, index 17). Twice towards the end of her sojourn, she dutifully recorded the non-existence of kisses. On 29 March, Anne and Mrs. Barlow ‘lay qu[i]et no kiss last night’, a non-event repeated again the next day, ‘lay quiet no kiss [l]ast night’ (267). Anne’s accounting for her ‘kisses’ was dominated by superlative qualifications and plainer descriptions were rarely used. In her consideration, a ‘kiss’ was different to an ‘excitement’. On 30 March, they had ‘a very g[o]od excitement almost the re[a]l kiss’ (267). The next day, the two gentlewomen again ‘had a good excitement but not not[sic] [ u]ite the kiss’ (267).63 The ‘excitements’ were an experience of excitation that acted as a prelude to the grander state of ‘kisses’. Anne regarded ‘kisses’, not ‘excitements’, as having the higher significance in her sexual practices with Mrs. Barlow.

Anne conceptualised ‘kisses’ and ‘excitements’ as ranked states of sexual desire and excitation. However, there was some suggestion from her usage, that ‘kisses’ were connected with a specific position in sexual intercourse. Months before in late November, Anne indicated such an understanding to Mrs. Barlow. On 26 November, she related the sexual story of Mariana’s newly married brother and his bride, telling Mrs. Barlow that ‘they had one hundred & fifty nine kisses that is connections’ (163). Kisses could be a sexual and embodied connection, but the question remained, what was a kiss specifically? As a modern lesbian reader, I find the term ‘kisses’ to be suggestive of oral sex, of cunnilingus. However, in the journal entries, Anne’s accounts of her oral sexual practices were distinct from those of her ‘kisses’. Cunnilingus, for instance, was indicated when Anne recorded she ‘kissed the top of her [q]ueer’ on 20 January (224).64 ‘I put my f[a]ce to her, Anne related on 24 February, ‘& twice’ got [sic] queer into my mouth & just sucked the tip of it’ (248).65 Sometimes, as Anne did two days later, in licking Mrs. Barlow she wet her with saliva, or ‘slavered[sic] into her’ (249).66 These were the only instances Anne specified of oral sex with Mrs. Barlow. Oral sex involved an object like Mrs. Barlow’s queer or Anne’s face, as well as actions like kissing,
Anne had her own distinct and discrete terminology for oral sex; her ‘kisses’ were not oral sex.

Anne’s ‘kisses’ and ‘excitements’ were of a different historical and semantic understanding. Unlike the exceptional instances of Anne and Mrs. Barlow’s oral sex, kisses and excitements occurred on a regular and almost daily basis. Anne’s use of ‘excitements’ specified excitation, where ‘kisses’ inferred a state of desire with an embodied correlation. In a semantic sense, ‘kisses’ were certainly ‘fucks’ as Terry Castle has argued, related to the French ‘baiser’ and Latin ‘basia’ (Castle 1993, 100). These were all terms Anne was familiar with and used in the journal entries in Paris. However, ‘kisses’ also implied Anne and Mrs. Barlow being connected to each other.

On 23 March, Anne got close to Mrs. Barlow, although it was not close enough. As she wrote, ‘began playing this morning [sic] close to her but not [en]ough so for a regular kiss’ (262). Yet, the two gentlewomen could not get too close to each other, for Anne was cognisant, although perhaps Mrs. Barlow was not, that their proximity could transmit the venereal infection. On 21 January, Mrs. Barlow ‘bade me put her in the position I liked best’ (224). Anne did so. Mrs. Barlow ‘lay all her length upon me’, she wrote, ‘the tops of our two queers in c[o]n[t]act’ (224). Anne ‘got as near to her as I durst[sic] not to be in danger of infecting her with my complaint’ (225). Preventing close contact was one strategy Anne employed to manage her venereal condition safely. However, it may have affected the experience of a complete ‘kiss’.

Anne’s ‘kisses’ incorporated the notion of an embodied proximity. The converse, of preventing contact, was one method of safely having sex. Another method was a barrier, like nightshifts. On 26 February, Mrs. Barlow had ‘lain on me’, Anne wrote, ‘& tried to see how I co[u]ld get myself near her’ (249). ‘I played some time with only my shift parting me from her’ (249). It was, Anne continued, ‘as I should do for a kiss’ (249). At first, using a barrier with Mrs. Barlow proved to be an impediment. On 4 January, Anne ‘intertwined our naked thighs & with my right [a]rm round got my left [t]o queer & grubbled her well’ (211). ‘I dare not put my[self] near you’, Anne said to Mrs. Barlow (211). ‘I could have had th[r]ee or four kisses in this time’, she explained (211). Anne wrote, ‘now that I am not near you myself I have not quite the same perception of your feelings’ (211). Anne could not discern Mrs. Barlow’s excitement due to the distance between them. The difficulty Anne experienced was opposite to the praxis of ‘kisses’. There was ‘nothing so tiresome as when these are not
mutual at the sam[e] instant’, Anne proclaimed (211). The lack of mutual kisses was a necessary effect of protecting Mrs. Barlow from infection. However, it added to an understanding of what Anne considered a ‘kiss’. An intense state of desire combined with intimate contact and mutual orgasms were all elements of ‘kisses’.

Anne’s interest in science may have assisted her in correlating sexual positions and the contagious spread of a venereal disease. She most likely also deduced such conclusions from her own experience of ‘kisses’ and the venereal transmission from Mariana, and to Isabella. The doctors she consulted did not appear to know a great deal about venereal diseases. Since that time, Anne had developed sexual practices that incorporated her awareness of the communicable nature of the venereal contagion. Ingeniously, she also devised preventative methods to enable safe sexual practices. The two gentlewomen persisted with the barrier method. Anne may have developed some proficiency with it, or at least she considered so. On 1 March, she wrote, ‘in laying just right for a kiss I got quite near her for the first time in my life’ (250). Mrs. Barlow, ‘tho’ being a good deal excited’, she wrote, ‘she fancied there was a [ ]ittle linen between us’ (250). Anne did not agree; it was not an obstacle to their pleasure. As she wrote, ‘but there was none to signify’ (250). That Anne refined her safe sexual methods to achieve some level of enjoyment for Mrs Barlow, displayed the care she took to satisfy Mrs. Barlow. Towards the end of the sojourn in Paris, Anne wrote on 22 March, it was ‘foolish to be really connected now for fear of the possibility of doing her any harm’ (262). Such caution concerning her sexual practices with Mrs Barlow in Paris appeared to have been effective. Mrs. Barlow did not seem to have contracted the venereal condition.

Mrs. Barlow worried that her virtue was compromised by their sexual activity. Anne was not only engaged to another, but she was not married to Mrs. Barlow. A week after they moved into Quai Voltaire, the two gentlewomen ‘agreed’, Anne wrote on 22 January, ‘we should forgive each other in Italy’ (226). If the two gentlewomen were in due course ‘going to Italy’, the future eventuality would excuse Mrs. Barlow’s previous indulgence of Anne. However, as Anne said, ‘circumstances alter’ (226). The engagement to Mariana and Mrs. Barlow’s relationship with Mr. Hancock limited the choices available to them. What other options did they have, ‘as we cannot go & be married’, Anne asked, ‘what could we do’ (226)? Ultimately, Mrs. Barlow decided their relationship was correct, if considered as a preparation for marriage. As Anne wrote, ‘oh
said she telling me she quoted from Cowper it is [P]airing Time Anticipated’ (226). The moral of William Cowper’s (1731–1800) fable poem *Pairing Time Anticipated*, stated:

> Misses! the tale that I relate
> This lesson seems to carry –
> Choose not alone a proper mate,
> But proper time to marry. (Cowper 190–?, 1:237)

Anne and Mrs. Barlow’s current sexual relationship was in expectation of their eventual match. The later legitimation of their attachment permitted certain leniencies with their present behaviour. It was a fine distinction. Without the justification of their commitment at a later date, Anne or Mrs. Barlow’s current sexual relationship could be construed as unsanctioned and licentious.

Mrs. Barlow’s concern about an unsanctioned relationship was a profoundly social anxiety. On 26 January, Mrs. Barlow said, ‘she only wished I cou[l]d be her acknowledged protector’ (230). ‘I [f]ound’, Anne wrote, ‘she mean[d] we call “really” going to It[al]y’ (230). That was, she elaborated, ‘if I coul[d] acknowledge her as my [o]wn & gi[v]e [h]er my promise f[or] l[ife]’ (230). Thus, ‘going to Italy’ involved a sexual acknowledgement and, as well, entailed a public recognition of their relationship. It was the clearest definition Anne recorded, and one which Helena Whitbread included in her edited publication of the journal entries (Whitbread 1992, 78). ‘I had’, Anne wrote, ‘recommende[d] York as a g[oo]d place to settle in’ (230). Settling at York would give Mrs. Barlow recognised status as Anne’s companion. However, there was not an exact equivalence between Mrs. Barlow’s ‘acknowledged protector’ and Anne’s ‘going to Italy’. Both concepts implied a secure commitment, but ‘going to Italy’ for Anne was a markedly sexual attachment. Mrs. Barlow’s ‘acknowledged protector’ suggested instead a classed and dependant relationship with Anne. As Susan Lanser argued about the ‘befriended’ woman’s body, female intimacy in the nineteenth century was as stratified by politics of class and status, as it was by discourses of sexuality and gender (Lanser 1998–99). Mrs. Barlow’s notion was a dangerous, if a more secure, concept of female friendship. It implied a homosocial companionship not commensurate with heterosexual marriage but, as Anne’s acknowledged companion, Mrs. Barlow would have more protection.

Discussions like these were increasingly distressing to both gentlewomen, ending without the relief of a resolution or a declaration. During February and March, these
upsetting conversations were more frequent. Anne’s emotional distress was reflected in the decreased space she dedicated to her journal writing. She wrote substantially less for these months, at a rate of half a page per day. The conversations only restated the positions that Anne and Mrs. Barlow were entrenched in with regards to each other, and to Mariana and Mr. Hancock. Anne had Mariana to return to after Paris. That love might prove stronger than her relationship with Mrs Barlow. ‘I might not [l]ike [h]er a few years hence’, Mrs. Barlow told Anne in the same discussion of 26 January, ‘she knew I should take M-’ (230). Mrs. Barlow could encourage the relationship with her suitor, Mr. Hancock. The epistolary courtship had the potential, with Mrs. Barlow’s encouragement, to elicit a proposal of marriage. After reading Mr. Hancock’s latest letter to Anne, she wrote, ‘tis evident he [you]ld have her if she encouraged him’ (230). Alternatively, in two year’s time Anne and Mrs. Barlow could meet again to ascertain if their love could become a more permanent attachment. Mrs. Barlow ‘cried a good deal & seemed very low’ (230). Anne had the ‘the tears trickling silently down my face half the night’, she wrote the next day (230). On 27 January, she asked Mrs. Barlow ‘why make ourselves unhappy by anticipation’ (230)? Trying to determine if the two gentlewomen were or were not ‘going to Italy’ made them unhappy.

Mrs. Barlow was disquieted by the thought that Anne was deceiving her. Without a commitment, Mrs. Barlow’s faith in their relationship was based on her ability to attach Anne. On 3 February, Mrs. Barlow said to Anne, ‘have I too much vanity to believe she can love me so much now if you should [b]e gulling me’ (236). It troubled Mrs. Barlow that she might be so vain as to believe any duplicity from Anne. Anne indexed, miscretyped and triple section ‘§§§’ marked Mrs. Barlow’s sentiments, ‘Mr.[sic] B-’s doubt if I gulled her’ (index 16). The miscrepting illustrated her conflicting emotions of attachment, pity and remorse regarding Mrs. Barlow. In the journal entry, ‘p[oo]r darling though[t I t]o myself’, Anne wrote, ‘[n]o [n]o I cannot have the heart to do that’ (236). She was honest with Mrs. Barlow about their uncertain future; she was not deceiving her. Anne told Mrs. Barlow from the first of her engagement with Mariana, a fact Mrs. Barlow acknowledged. On 30 January, Mrs. Barlow said Anne ‘had from the first told her my circumstances & had nothing to blame myself for’ (233). Anne was sensible of all Mrs. Barlow had done for her. ‘I should not make a bad ret[u]rn’, she said, ‘but that perhaps neither of us could be happy till we went to Italy’ (233). Mrs. Barlow’s choices were hard ones. Mrs. Barlow could choose a relationship with Anne that might not eventuate two years hence, or finish it to pursue one with Mr. Hancock.
What made Mrs. Barlow’s choice difficult was their sexual relation. On 30 January, Mrs. Barlow worried, Mariana ‘knows you so well she would know all about us’ (233). ‘I think it would kill me’, Mrs. Barlow told Anne (233). For Mariana to know of Mrs. Barlow’s unauthorised relationship with Anne would irreparably damage her character. Anne triple section ‘§§§’ marked Mrs. Barlow’s demand for silence in the index. There she wrote, apparently quoting Mrs. Barlow verbatim, ‘M- never should know it if she did I think it would kill me’ (index 16). ‘I gave her my honour’, Anne wrote in her journal entry, ‘M- n[ever] shou[l]d know’ (233). It worried Mrs. Barlow that their sexual relationship was not substantiated by a promise. Mrs. Barlow told Anne on 9 February, ‘she has [o]ved me too soon’ (239). There was ‘nothing she loved better’, Mrs. Barlow said to Anne, ‘than to live chastely I did not teaze[sic] her body it was her mind’ (239). Mrs. Barlow ‘feels we do not belong of right to each other’, Anne wrote, ‘& doubtless she sometimes feels a little in the light of my mistress’ (239). It was what tormented Mrs. Barlow. ‘I asked if this would be the case if we were gone to Italy’, Anne wrote (239). Mrs. Barlow replied, ‘no not then’ (239). Were Mrs. Barlow to be acknowledged by Anne’s promise, her choices would be clearer and legitimate. ‘I really begin’, Anne recorded, ‘to feel daily more attached to her’ (239). It did not bring her closer, anymore than it did Mrs. Barlow, to a decision. It was the last mention of ‘going to Italy’ in the journal entries for the remainder of the Paris sojourn.

The triple section ‘§§§’ marked autobiographical account persisted almost until Anne departed from Paris. She ceased writing about ‘going to Italy’ with Mrs. Barlow in her journal entries, but continued to trace out extremely significant matters in the index. On 20 February, Anne retrospectively amended in her journal entry, ‘I have always thought M- would suit me [b]etter’ (245). Unfortunately, Mrs. Barlow was ‘a more imprudent connection than with M-’ (245). Mrs. Barlow recognised that Anne might never be free to ‘go to Italy’. Mrs. Barlow said to her, ‘it was time to lay aside all vain delusions to the contrary’, Anne wrote, ‘the [f]ears rolled down her cheeks’ (245). Mrs. Barlow said, ‘my marrying would settle all this’ (245). For Mrs. Barlow to choose Mr. Hancock would settle the difficult decisions before her. Mrs. Barlow would not make the same choices after marriage as Mariana; she would not continue a relationship with Anne once she was married. As Mrs. Barlow said, ‘the worst of it was she should not not[sic] like to be incorrect herself’ (245). The alternative, that Anne remained with Mariana, was just as unpleasant to Mrs. Barlow. Mrs. Barlow ‘could not bear to see me another’s’, Anne wrote in her journal entry, and triple section ‘§§§’ marked in the index
Mrs. Barlow would not be reconciled if Anne returned to Mariana once she was home at Shibden. There would be no possibility of Anne negotiating a relationship with Mrs. Barlow in that future.

Mrs. Barlow’s admission that there was no likelihood of a future did not ease her difficulties. It created more problems, for it firmly located Mrs. Barlow as Anne’s mistress. On 24 February, Anne told Mrs. Barlow, ‘I knew what always made her moust[sic] uneasy’, she wrote, ‘it was that supposing a woman must be either wife or mistress she felt herself most ’like’ the latter to me’ (247). Mrs. Barlow ‘said I was right’, she continued (247). If there was no ‘going to Italy’ in the future, there was no moral position to protect Mrs. Barlow’s virtue. It would have satisfied Mrs. Barlow, ‘if in fact I could really claim her as my own’ (247). Alternatively, Mrs. Barlow said to Anne, ‘if I only wore breeches it would be enough’ (247). Mrs. Barlow said of Anne, ‘I had nothing to give meaning I had no penis’, a remark that was indexed and triple section ‘§§§’ marked (247, index 16). Mrs. Barlow’s virtue would have been endangered in that case, a contradiction Mrs. Barlow seemed to recognise. As Anne wrote, Mrs. Barlow ‘then declared she was the last to care for my hav[low]sic one’ (247). However, Mrs. Barlow’s concern was a material, as well as sexual, one in early nineteenth century society. Mrs. Barlow had a child, a small income and some independence. On her own cognisance and resources, Mrs. Barlow had a life in Paris for her and her child. As a gentlewoman companion to Anne, she would have fewer rights and entitlements for herself and Jane, than if Anne were, or dressed as, a gentleman.

Mrs. Barlow’s allusions to the different material and sexual advantages offered by Anne and Mr. Hancock closed the matter for Anne. The future of ‘going to Italy’ with Mrs. Barlow appeared more like the difficult triangle that already existed with Anne, Mariana and Charles. Anne had a sexual relationship with Mrs. Barlow that was satisfactory as it was. As she told Mrs. Barlow on 26 February, Mrs. Barlow was ‘mine by usage & custom according to Scotch marriages & she was half Scotch & therefore this would do’ (249). It was an acknowledgement that did not even rate an index note. From the start of March, the level of crypt handwriting in her journal entries decreased. If Anne needed confirmation she made the right decision it came on 16 March, when she read Mr. Hancock’s letter. He wrote to Mrs. Barlow, ‘as if she had given him no discouragement at Place Vendôme’ (259). It was, as Anne recognised, ‘a love letter’ (259). The future, as Anne expressed it, was in different terms to what it once
was between Anne and Mrs. Barlow. On 17 March, she wrote, ‘we som[e]how got better reconciled & both seemed after all to have resumed the hope of b[ei]n[ga]lly ‘ff’ together’ (260). There were no longer the short-lived discussions of offering Mrs. Barlow ‘protection’ or a ‘promise’, making an ‘acknowledgement’ of their relationship, or ‘claims’ of love and commitment. What remained for Anne in her relationship with Mrs. Barlow was a ‘hope’ to be tested two years hence, a potential for a dissimilar and changed future for the two gentlewomen.

Anne wanted to be chosen outright, without compromise or comparison. Mrs. Barlow was no longer the most suitable partner for her. On 19 March, Mrs. Barlow intimately touched her. Mrs. Barlow had, ‘on getting out of [b]ed’, Anne wrote ungrammatically, ‘she s[udd]enly touching my queer’ (261). Anne’s shock, or perhaps dislike, was revealed by her lack of grammar. ‘I started back’, she recorded (261). Mrs. Barlow said, ‘[I] c[a]n give you [re ]ief I must [d]o to you as you do to me’ (261). ‘[I l]ike[d] not this’, Anne wrote (261). Mrs. Barlow misunderstood her reaction, attributing it, Anne wrote, to her virginity, ‘beca[u]se you are a pucelle’ (261). Anne indexed and triple section ‘§§§’ marked Mrs. Barlow’s misunderstanding, ‘you are a pucelle’ (index 17).

The situation highlighted the current difficulties Anne had with Mrs. Barlow and heightened the comparisons to Mariana. As she wrote:

\[M-\text{would not make such a speech this is womanizing[sic] me too much M- will suit me [b]etter I cannot do m[a]ch for Mrs. B- except with my finge[r] I am more sure of going on well with M- who is contented with 'having' myself next to [h]er.}\]

(261)

There were difficulties in the relationship with Mariana, but Mariana did not require a part of Anne, nor did Mariana engender her too much, ‘womanizing[sic] her’. The key factor was Mariana’s satisfaction with having Anne, as she was, as ‘myself’. It was a profound statement of what Anne required in a sexual partner for life.

At the end of her Parisian sojourn, Anne was undecided about her romantic future. ‘I thought I could live abroad very well’, she wrote on 31 March, ‘with someone I loved but who should this be’ (267[sic])? In the past, Anne’s ‘someone’ was Mariana. In going to Paris, she hoped to find an alternative to the compromised future with Mariana. Whilst in Paris she became attached to Mrs. Barlow. During their romance, she considered it was possible to form a future with Mrs. Barlow as a companion and lover. Mrs. Barlow became that ‘someone’ Anne could commit to be with and love for life. To
test the future potential of their relationship, Anne and Mrs. Barlow agreed to meet in two years time. At that time ‘two years hence’ the two gentlewomen would determine their prospective future and whether they were ‘going to Italy’ together. Giving each other their promise for life was dependant upon two things. The decision would be affected by their suitability to each other after the lengthy time apart. It would also matter whether Anne and Mrs. Barlow chose each other above the other ties that bound them. In the meantime, Anne planned to return home to England, to absorb and reflect on her new experiences and choices. The intervening two years would give her time to assess her relationships – past, current and unknown future ones – in light of her material and sexual experiences of living in another city, Paris, and loving another gentlewoman, Mrs. Barlow.

The relationship with Mrs. Barlow continued after Anne left Paris. She wrote in her first letter to Mrs. Barlow, “the bitter moment of parting with you is over; but I know not as yet, my love, whether itself or its consequences are the bitterest” (ML/166, 1). As she travelled from Paris to London, she had begun her first letter to Mrs. Barlow. The copy of the letter Anne made on 8 April was in the papers (ML/166, 3; 279). It was one of the most sentimentally styled of the letters for the Paris period. It included an account of her anonymous visit to Mr. Hancock and his mother in London (ML/166, 1). “‘I told you I would see Mr. H- & his family – I have done so’”, she wrote and copied to Mrs. Barlow (ML/166, 1). Anne wished to assess what Mr. Hancock could offer Mrs. Barlow. As indicated by the letter, Anne was in the process of shifting Mrs. Barlow from the direct and personal engagement of their intimate romance into an epistolary relationship. It was the first letter of many in the gentlewomen’s correspondence, which continued for a recorded three more years. As indicated by the copy, the correspondence with Mrs. Barlow was significant enough to be retained amongst Anne’s writings. The relationship with Mrs. Barlow was not a simplified hierarchy of competing affections between Anne, Mrs. Barlow and Mariana. The commencement and development of a sentimental correspondence with Mrs. Barlow indicated the importance of their relationship, for Mrs. Barlow joined a select group of lovers who had an epistolary relation with Anne.

Anne had come to Paris to be cured. What she had encountered in the French capital was something different. Paris became her home for the period that she lived there. Anne wrote in her last journal entry of 31 March, as she left Paris:
I leave Paris, said I to myself, with sentiments how different from those with which I arrived – my [] was accustomed to all it saw – it was no longer a stranger, nor [f]ound it fault, as before with all [tha]t differed [from] that it left [a]t home – *impe’re’ctly as [I] sp[ea]k the language I felt almost at home in Pari[s]. (267[sic])

Anne was not the last of an expatriate tradition of English women to have sought out the liberating sexual experiences available in Paris. The feminist literary theorist Shari Benstock has analysed a later generation of English and American women of the early twentieth century in Paris in *Women of the Left Bank* (Benstock 1986). Like Anne, Mrs. Barlow had also taken advantage of the wealth of cultural and amatory activity a limited income could afford in the French capital. Living in this urbane culture, Anne was able to take pleasure in the intense romance with Mrs. Barlow. ‘This sojourn in Paris, has enlightened me not a little’, she reflected in a letter to Aunt Anne dated 10 to 14 February (ML/163, 4). The Parisian sojourn was a first in many ways for Anne for, in Paris, she had the chance to develop a relationship that could be better suited to her own sexual and emotional needs for the present and future. Anne’s sexual experiences in Paris were to be formative and decisive ones for her future.

Without Helena Whitbread’s published account, most researchers would not be familiar with Anne’s homosexuality. Beginning with that account, I gave an outline of her representation of the sojourn in Paris, particularly its emphasis on the romance with Mariana. It has been difficult in the past to consider the significance of other relationships in Anne’s life, when one relationship of failed but grand homosexual love has been narratively and editorially privileged. Yet, from the evidence in Anne’s writings, the relationship with Mrs. Barlow in Paris became as significant as that with Mariana to Anne’s sexual future. The emotional issues at stake in her relationship with Mrs. Barlow were most visible in the confidences or silences in the stories Anne related of her sexual past. It was the revelation of Anne’s stories that subtly indicated the developing intimacy between the two gentlewomen, confided by Anne as expressions of a growing trust in Mrs. Barlow’s discretion and discontinued when such sexual and social prudence came into question. However, the shifts in Anne’s thinking about her lover Mrs. Barlow were more clearly visible in the intense pattern of the triple section ‘§§§’ marked metasignage. Anne’s passionate lovemaking and desire for Mrs. Barlow were discernible from her marking those most significant events in their relationship in the index. Tracing the combined practices of Anne’s story telling in the journal entries
and metasignage in the index provided a deeper understanding of her sexual practices of romance in the relationship with Mrs Barlow.

Anne’s sexual language was rich; cultural concepts of romance, affection, friendship, flirting, courting and kissing formed an abundant vocabulary of love, passion and desire in her writings in Paris. The progress of the relationship between the two gentlewomen revealed their adept mobilisations of language and contemporaneous cultural models of platonic friendship, the scandalous figure of Marie Antoinette, and of the homosexual literature of the classics. From these models, Anne and Mrs. Barlow initially imagined with their phrase ‘going to Italy’, and later enacted a homosexual and embodied desire between women. Anne was influenced by cultural concepts about Romantic friendship, rakish sexual libertinism and modern, as well as ancient, traditions of homosexuality. However, in her embodied and intimate practices of desire with Mrs. Barlow, Anne displayed sexual practices that were influenced by science and rationality. The relationship with Mrs. Barlow clarified for Anne that it was practicable to have an intimate sexual relationship with another gentlewoman, even with a venereal condition. Anne had adapted the lessons from her past, to be relevant in the present concerning her sexual practices with Mrs Barlow. If she was cured of her venereal condition, she knew that the amatory relationship with Marianna might have to be given up altogether. Reconstructing Anne’s autobiographical account of Paris, I focused upon the content of her editorial practices, analysing her textual reflection on her life. Paris presented Anne with choices that she had previously been unable to explore for her future relationships.
ENDNOTES

1 See also 16 September 1823 (Whitbread 1988, 295).

2 According to the *Oxford English Dictionary*, 1989 second edition, s.v. ‘venereal’ pertaining to that which resulted from or was communicated by sexual intercourse with an infected person, or was symptomatic of a disease caused in this manner, first came into usage in the mid seventeenth century.

3 On 4 August 1821, Anne ‘asked Steph for the prescription he gave M-’, then on 10 and 11 December 1822 whilst at Langton, she consulted Dr. Simpson (n.d.), and finally went to Manchester on 28 August 1823 to consult Mr. Simmons (n.d.) (Whitbread 1988, 161, 229–30, 288).

4 For Anne’s regular use of mercury ointment, see the period from 7 December to 26 January (179–230); for the injection of mercurial calomel with a uterine syringe, see 10 August 1821 (Whitbread 1988, 162–63), and for M. Dupuytren’s new prescription for a mercury injection, see 2 February (235), which Anne began using on 11 February (240); and for pills, see 11 December 1822 (Whitbread 1988, 230).

5 For cubebs, see 10 December 1822 (Whitbread 1988, 230); and for injections of sulphate of zinc, see 27, 28 and 29 September, 27 and 29 November, and 4 December (88, 89, 90, 163, 166, 174). Anne noted on 10 December 1822, that she was also using a corrosive sublimate and opium wash, as well as an alum lotion (Whitbread 1988, 230). In Paris, on 6 December Anne noted that she went in disguise to Planche, the apothecary Mrs. Barlow recommended, for a preparation of ‘pearl barley & nitre for the tisan’ (176). According to the *Oxford English Dictionary*, 1989 second edition, s.v. ‘tisan’ or ‘ptisan’ pertaining to a medicinal decoction made of barley, first came into usage in the late fourteenth century.

6 Anne used the ‘E’ by itself in a few isolated cases. For a single ‘E’, see 24, 26, 27 and 28 October, 17 November, and 12 and 23 December (114, 117, 119–20, 150, 187, 196).

7 I have not been able to textually represent the dotted symbol, see the journal entry page for 7 and 8 December for an example [Appendix 6, fig. 1A, 179].

8 For missed days, see 24 September, 15 and 25 October, 8 and 29 November, 22 and 26 December, 2 January, and 16 and 26 March (85, 107, 116, 137, 168, 195, 200, 209, 259, 266). Anne failed to make notations sometimes not just for days, but for periods of intense emotional tension, see Anne and Mme. de Boyve’s scheme, from 18 to 22 November (150–57); just after the grand discussion, from 13 to 17 December (188–91); the week preceding the shift to 15 Quai Voltaire, from 7 to 15 January (214–21); and the days before Anne’s departure from Paris, from 28 to 31 March (266–67). The scant journal entry coverage of February and March was likewise seen in periods of neglect of recording from 5 to 10 February and from 3 to 9 March (236–39, 252–54).

9 There was another occurrence of Anne’s venereal marks in the margin, which was an overlap from a cramped journal entry, see 30 December (205).

10 Helena Whitbread excised twenty nine days of the journal entries for the months of September (ten days), October (ten days) and November (nine days). These figures account only for total expurgation of
a day’s journal entry, not for internal editing of the journal entries, which could be more extensive still.

11 Helena Whitbread excised a total of sixty three days of the journal entries from December (thirteen days), and in 1825, from the months of January (fifteen days), February (twenty three days) and March (twelve days). However, as stated previously, the internal editing of individual journal entries was not included in these figures.

12 According to the *Oxford English Dictionary*, 1989 second edition, s.v. ‘history’ meaning a relation of incidents, a narrative, tale, story, was a term used from the late fourteenth century until the early nineteenth century, and subsequently obsolete.

13 Anne’s Aunt Lister was Mary Fawcett, second wife to Anne’s Uncle Joseph of Northgate House (Liddington 1998, 5).

14 There was little biographical information about Eliza, and most of it was contradictory. Eliza Raine was possibly the wealthy daughter of William Raine, a surgeon with the East India Company (Green 1992, 8; Liddington 1998, 15). However according to Anna Clark, Eliza’s father was a West Indian planter and Muriel Green nationalised Eliza as ‘West Indian’ (Clark 1996, 28; Green 1992, 33). A fellow surgeon Mr. William Duffin (1747–1839) was Eliza’s legal guardian and he was responsible for having brought Eliza to England (Whitbread 1992, 4). Green wrote that Eliza was a ‘beautiful coloured girl’ and Jill Liddington was consistent, representing Eliza as a ‘girl of colour’ (Green 1992, 8; Liddington 1994, 26).

15 For girls’ adolescent crushes in English boarding schools of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, see Martha Vicinus’ lesbian history work (Vicinus 1984).

16 For January 1815 as a unhappy time for Anne, see 5 March and 20 August 1823 (Whitbread 1988, 239, 282).

17 The commencement of Helena Whitbread’s first book *I Know My Own Heart* was 1817, several years after these events. The only remaining journal volumes for the period were the journal volumes SH:7/ML/E/26/2 and SH:7/ML/E/26/3, which covered the years from 1816 to 1817. Both have many missing pages. It was likely Anne destroyed the earlier relevant journal volume [Appendix 2].


19 The registration of their marriage was held at the Borthwick Institute of Historical Research in York. My thanks to Helen Hopper for the information.

20 See also 9 March 1821 (Whitbread 1988, 148).

21 For the intrigue with the housemaid Sarah (n.d.), see 1 October 1821; and for the lodgekeeper’s wife, Mrs. Grantham (n.d.), see 7 August 1826 (Whitbread 1988, 167; 1992, 188–89).

22 According to the *Oxford English Dictionary*, 1989 second edition, s.v. ‘worldly’ meaning a devotion to the world and its pursuits, first came into usage from the early fourteenth century.

23 Anne wrote on 18 June 1824, her journal volume 3 contained ‘the account of my intrigue with Anne Belcombe’ (Whitbread 1988, 346). Volume 3, or SH:7/ML/E/26/3, covered November 1816 to March
24 In Fiona MacCarthy’s biography of Byron, she included a letter Lady Caroline Lamb (1785–1828) sent with a snippet of her pubic hair, in which she asked for his in return in 1812 (MacCarthy 2002, 176).

25 For Anne’s use of the ‘fair one’, see 16 August and 13 September 1818 (Whitbread 1988, 54, 61).

26 Miss Browne was ‘θ’, or theta. Anne noted in her index for 13 September 1818, that ‘θ to stand for Miss B- in future’ (SH:7/ML/E/2, index 8).

27 According to the Oxford English Dictionary, 1989 second edition, s.v. ‘volage’ meaning to be giddy, foolish, fickle or inconstant, first came into usage in the mid fourteenth century.

28 For Miss V’ as the subject of Anne’s crosses, see 25 November, 17 December and 10 January (161, 191, 216).

29 According to the Oxford English Dictionary, 1989 second edition, s.v. ‘rattle’ meaning a constant chatterer, someone who talked incessantly in a thoughtless or lively manner, first came into usage in the early eighteenth century.

30 According to the Oxford English Dictionary, 1989 second edition, s.v. ‘flame’ meaning poetically the object of one’s love, first came into usage in the mid seventeenth century.

31 See also the following day’s journal entries of 4 and 6 August 1821 (Whitbread 1988, 161).

32 Anne used the term ‘venerealized’ as an intransitive verb form of the noun ‘venereal’. There was no recorded antecedent for Anne’s use. According to the Oxford English Dictionary, 1989 second edition, s.v. ‘venereal’ pertaining to people infected with venereal disease, first came into usage in the late seventeenth century.

33 See also Helena Whitbread’s comment, where she noted Anne ‘used the phrase “going to Italy” as having a full sexual relationship with a woman’ (Whitbread 1992, 56 n.6).

34 For Anne’s ten minute visit, see 15 September (76[ sic]); and for visits of half an hour or more, see 16 and 17 September (77[ sic]–78).

35 For more than once a day visits, see 18 and 20 September (78, 80).

36 Anne failed to note it in her journal entry until the following day, see 7 October (97).

37 According to the Oxford English Dictionary, 1989 second edition, s.v. ‘rally’ meaning to assail with pleasantry or ridicule, first came into usage in the late seventeenth century.

38 According to the Oxford English Dictionary, 1989 second edition, s.v. ‘rattle away’ meaning to talk rapidly in a thoughtless, lively or chatty manner, first came into usage in the late eighteenth century.

39 According to the Oxford English Dictionary, 1989 second edition, s.v. ‘beau’ meaning the suitor, lover or sweetheart of a lady, first came into usage in the early eighteenth century.

40 Anne and Mrs. Barlow’s contemporary, and friend to the Ladies of Llangollen, Mrs. Hester Lynch Thrale wrote in her diary entry for 1 April 1789, that the ‘Queen of France is at the Head of a Set of
Monsters call’d by each other Sapphists, who boast her Example’ (Thrale 1942, 2:740).

41 Sir William Jones (1746–94) was a scholar whose Oriental studies on the literature and languages of Sanskrit, Latin and Greek pioneered the discipline of comparative linguistics.

42 Joachim Camerarius (1500–74) was a German scholar who translated many classical texts. The poem Anne read, Voyage a Plombières, was in Camerarius’ Latin correspondence which was first published in Venice in 1553 and reprinted in Paris in 1823, according to the journal entry of 15 October (106–07).

43 The edition Anne purchased, according to the journal entry for 16 October, was published in 1757 (108). However, an English edition from 1809 was titled in translation as Kisses: A Poetical Translation of the Basia of Johannes Secundus (Secundus 1809). Anne’s use of the word ‘kiss’ for sex was possibly derived from classical sources such as Secundus. See for instance, the first poem titled ‘Kiss 1’, which read in part:

Thus, by her lips unnumber’d roses press’d,
Kisses, unfolding in sweet bloom, confess’d,
And flush’d with rapture at each new-born Kiss,
She felt her swelling soul o’erwhelm’d in bliss. (Secundus 1809, 14)

On the night of 16 October, Anne wrote in her journal entry, she ‘sat up reading Johannes[sic] fe’c’undus & incurred a cross ’sitting on my chair’ just before getting into bed’ (108). Secundus’ poetry was certainly erotic reading material.

44 Anne possibly meant ‘loud’ in the first instance. I have correctly transcribed the word (‘d56d’ – loul), but there was no direct English or French meaning. It was probably a slip between the crypt and plain handwriting. In this instance, where the first three characters ‘lou’ were crypted – ‘d56’, and the last ‘d’ was uncrypted – ‘d’, giving ‘loul’ in crypt/plain, or the confusing ‘loul’ if entirely decrypted.

45 See also Arnold Harvey’s Sex in Georgian England for a detailed historical analysis on the conceptual shift regarding women’s desire during this period from lustiness to virtuousness (Harvey 1994).

46 For Anne’s ‘proper’ behaviour, see 1, 2 (thrice), 3, 4 and 5 November (125–28, 130–31).

47 According to the Oxford English Dictionary, 1989 second edition, s.v. ‘break the ice’ meaning to break through a cold reserve or stiffness, first came into usage in the mid eighteenth century.

48 In other circumstances, a pain in Anne’s knees was a figurative way of expressing her sexual desire for a lover. It was true for her affair with Mariana’s sister, Anne Belcombe. Anne wrote on 20 December 1820, how she kissed her and ‘told her I had a pain in my knees – my expression to her for desire’ (Whitbread 1988, 140–41).

49 According to the Oxford English Dictionary, 1989 second edition, s.v. ‘rattle off’ meaning to make haste with a rattling noise, first came into usage in the eighteenth century.

50 The crypted word ‘diffy’ was possibly an abbreviation for ‘difficulty’, as this would have been the way Anne would write it in plain hand. There was no recorded antecedent for Anne’s particular use.
According to the Oxford English Dictionary, 1989 second edition, s.v. ‘tie’ meaning a bond of union, a secure link or connection, first came into usage in the early seventeenth century.

For once a day, see 1, 3 and 5 January (207, 209, 212); for twice, see 2 January (208–09). Helena Whitbread included a substantial proportion of Anne and Mrs. Barlow’s ‘going to Italy’ conversation of 3 January in No Priest but Love (Whitbread 1992, 68–70).

Aunt Anne was informed in the letter misdated to 5 December, written on 5 January (ML/190, 2).

According to the Oxford English Dictionary, 1989 second edition, s.v. ‘nack’ or ‘knack’ meaning a trick of dexterous, adroit or successful performance, first came into usage in the late sixteenth century.

For grubbles Anne did ‘well’ noted in the journal entries, see 4 (twice), 5 and 7 (twice) January (210–11, 212, 214), and noted in the index, see 4 January (index 14); for grubbles that were ‘long & well’ and ‘well & long’, see 5 January (212); for a grubble that was ‘long’, see 13 January (219); for a grubble that was ‘too long’, see 12 January (219); and for grubbles lasting an hour or more, see 7, 9, 11, 12 and 13 January (214, 216, 218, 219).

For ‘very good’ excitements, see 28, 29 and 30 January, and 19 and 30 March (231, 232, 233, 261, 267); for ‘goodish’ excitements, see 2, 9 and 19 February (235, 238, 244); for ‘good’ excitements, see 31 January (twice), 1, 2, 10, 17, 20 and 26 February, and 1, 8, 13, 15 and 31 March (234, 235, 239, 243, 244, 249, 250, 254, 256, 259, 267); for a ‘good excitation’, see 20 March (261); and for the ‘pretty good’ excitement, see 3 February (235).

For Anne’s noteworthy excitements, see 22, 26, 27 and 28 January, and 4 (twice), 15, 20, 24, 26 and 27 February (226, 230, 231, 236, 243, 244, 247, 249, 250).

See also 11 February (240).

For the unemphatic form of ‘the kiss’, see 24 February, and 10, 12, 22, 23, 24 (thrice) and 31 March (248, 255, 262, 263, 265, 267).

For the near misses of the ‘kiss par excellence’, see 11 February and 7 March (240, 254); and for ‘very nearly’ kisses, see 27 February, and 1 and 12 March (250, 255).

For the ‘very good’ kiss, see 24 February (248); for ‘very good’ kisses, see 8 February, and 24 and 27 March (238, 265, 266); for the ‘goodish’ kiss, see 19 January (223); for ‘good’ kisses, as noted in the journal entries, see 21 January, and 10 and 24 March (224, 255, 265), and in the index, see 21 January and 7 March (index 15, index 17); and for the ‘almost as good’ kiss, see 10 March (255).

For a ‘kiss’ without adjectives, as noted in the journal entries, see 21 and 22 (twice) January, and 4 and 10 February (224, 225–26, 236, 239), and in the index, see 22 January and 24 March (index 15, index 17).

Other less specific comparisons could be included. On 9 February, Anne wrote, they experienced ‘two or three ’goodish’ excitements but not the thing’ (238). Mrs. Barlow felt, on 15 February, ‘two or three excitements but she had not the right one’ (243). Two days later, again Anne recorded, they were ‘two or three good excitement[s] but not able to get the right [sic] ‘ (243).
See also 18 January (223).

See also, as noted in the journal entries, 25 February (248), and in the index for 24 February (index 16).

See also, as noted in the journal entries, 25 and 26 February (248, 249), and in the index for 26 February (index 17). According to the *Oxford English Dictionary*, 1989 second edition, s.v. ‘slaver’ meaning to wet with saliva, first came into usage in the late sixteenth century.

For ‘fuck’, see Anne’s discussion of the French ‘jean foutre’, or ‘old fuckers’ on 24 December (197); for the French ‘baiser’, and even ‘baiser un François’, see the language forfeit game with Capt. St. Auban on 3 and 4 September (69, 70); and for the Latin ‘basia’, see Anne’s reading the book *Basia* by Joannes Secundus, on 9 and 16 October (98, 108).

Anne’s drawers could also be included in the practice. Part of Anne’s venereal treatment required she rub mercury into her thighs and genital area. Anne wrote on 24 January, that Mrs. Barlow ‘sat by the fire watching me wash the mercury from my thighs’ (228). When Anne used her mercury prescription, she would wear her drawers when sleeping with Mrs. Barlow. ‘I had my drawers on’, Anne wrote on 4 January, ‘on account of last night’s mercury’ (210). For other instances of Anne sleeping in her drawers, see also 5 and 7 February, and 4 and 15 March (237, 238, 252, 259).

February totalled fifteen pages and March sixteen pages.

According to the *Oxford English Dictionary*, 1989 second edition, s.v. ‘gull’ meaning to dupe, befool or deceive, first came into usage in the mid sixteenth century.

According to the *Oxford English Dictionary*, 1989 second edition, s.v. ‘teaze’ meaning to worry and vex by persistent action, first came into usage in the early seventeenth century.

Anne’s reference to a ‘Scotch marriage’ referred to the lax marriage market that existed in Scotland after Lord Hardwicke’s Marriage Act, passed in 1753, placed many restrictions on conditions of legal marriages amongst the upper classes, according to Lawrence Stone’s research (Stone 1977, 32). Anne’s comment suggested that the older marital practice of verbal spousals was still an accepted form of marriage contract in Scotland (Stone 1977, 30). According to Stone, verbal spousal was an oral promise made in front of witnesses and in some cases, sexual consummation acted as consent (Stone 1977, 31).

Joan of Arc was also known in French as ‘Jeanne la Pucelle’ (Warner 1981).

According to the *Oxford English Dictionary*, 1989 second edition, s.v. ‘womanize’ meaning to make a woman of (a man), to render effeminate, first came into usage in the late sixteenth century.

In the papers, the last letter in the collection from Mrs. Barlow was dated 18 December 1828 (SH:7/ML/294). In the summary of her 1828–29 journal volume, Anne recorded another letter from Mrs. Barlow on 24 December, which she replied to on 6 January 1829 (SH:7/ML/E/11, summary 2–3). There were no more letters for the remainder of the journal volume, which finished 15 April 1829. The cessation of the correspondence between Anne and Mrs. Barlow was not necessarily of the same date as the letter in the papers or summary list.
CONCLUSION

The journal volume written during the sojourn in Paris detailed Anne’s search for a life partner, following the re-evaluation of her Romantic hope for a future with Mariana. The purpose of the journal volume, as I contended, was to be a mimetic record of Anne’s experiences. This textual space was presupposed on the notion of the authorial process as an accurate, and certainly faithful, account of her daily life. The correspondence from, and immediately following Paris described Anne’s emotional and physical being, especially her efforts to be cured of the venereal condition resulting from her relationship with Mariana. The purpose for letter writing, I argued, was the establishment and maintenance of a network of connections between family members, friends and intimates that had, after Paris, expanded to include Mrs. Barlow. Past representations of Anne’s textual sources or spaces as entirely sexual, emotional and sentimental, or as entirely social, rational and detached were not a workable solution. In her writings from Paris, Anne sought to relate her lived experience with textual veracity, but it did not preclude the inclusion of sensate or emotional content. On an intertextual level, the different formats of Anne’s writings worked towards, and can be regarded as, an autobiographical text. Whilst the letters and journal volume were articulated item by item or day by day, in their entirety the many journal volumes and thousands of letters established and constituted what can be considered a lifelong autobiographical project.

Modern conceptualisations of journals as uncanonical forms of texts, certainly not literature, have forced a categorical division between autobiographical and literary genres that was not necessarily valid in the early nineteenth century. An interdisciplinary feminist approach to women’s history, writings and sexuality has allowed me to bridge this divide, to analyse Anne’s autobiographical project within her journal volume and correspondence. The journal volume had a temporality that was episodic rather than continuous, and the dramatic tension in retelling a life was chronological, as it happened, rather than structured as a novel or narrative, with a discrete beginning, development and dénouement. Similarly, the correspondence was motivated by other imperatives. The letters were responsive and centripetal in interaction, rather than contemplative and centrifugal, and the mode of communication and language was descriptive rather than narrative. Anne’s writings from her Paris
sojourn did not construct a plot or life trajectory; they did not develop a drama or life imperative, or describe a set of characters or people in the conventional ways seen in published literature or autobiography. Significant people vanished from the journal entries, or did not appear in the letters; narrative potentials of intimacy or conflict did not always materialise, thwarting the anticipations of an active reader. Yet, Anne’s writings were structured and determined by autobiographical imperatives, relating herself in production in the journal volume and in interaction with the letters. Thus, I could read these writings as Anne’s story of her sexual and sociable sojourn in Paris.

Anne’s writings were not only for an audience of one. The iteration and reiteration of her sexuality was an enterprise that was both public and private. Anne wrote, as I considered, for four different audiences, from the possibility of a published readership, to the general audience of family, to the closeness of lovers and ultimately for herself. The letters were the most sociable of her writings, but the audience could be a common one amongst her network of correspondents, like the letters from acquaintances such as Mrs. Norcliffe; or the audience could be an intimate one, as in the correspondence with Mariana and Isabella. The journal entries in Paris showed that letters, even those written and intended for one correspondent, could be utilised to facilitate a sociable or sexual purpose with another. On 3 November for instance, as I discussed, Anne had used her letters from Mariana and Miss Maclean to demonstrate her respectability to Mrs. Barlow (128). Further into their courtship, Anne read from the correspondence with Mariana to prove to Mrs. Barlow, and sometimes to disprove, the relationship with her married lover. At one time, Anne had contemplated writing about the endurance of her love for Mariana in an epistolary novel, as I previously mentioned, styling herself as the character ‘Constant Durer’ (Whitbread 1988, 232). ‘I would write’, she recorded on 16 December 1822, ‘an account of my acquaintance with M-, surely in a series of letters to a friend’ (Whitbread 1988, 232). Whether extracting letters for herself, circulating information through a circle of correspondents, reading letters to her lovers, or considering the publication of an intimate relationship as letters, Anne negotiated the division between public and private forms of sexual knowledge, communication and literature with her correspondence.

The journal volumes, like the letters, also crossed the boundaries between public and private audiences. The regular audience for Anne’s writings was her family. Many of the daily matters of her life in Paris, like the treatment of her venereal disease, were
drafted from the journal entries to become contents of her correspondence to Aunt Anne. Select intimates were also an audience for her journal musings. Anne permitted Mrs. Barlow to read the plain handwritten ‘line eleven of this page’ on 15 October (106). Mrs. Barlow had attempted to read the journal volume on 12 December (187). As well, Anne read aloud to Mrs. Barlow on 3 March, part of the crypted journal entry for 29 October which recounted Mme. de Boyve’s ‘history of the flirtations of Mrs. B.-’ (252). The crypted journal entries had the implicit possibility of being read by other lovers, for both Mariana and Miss Vallance had copies of the crypt. At the most public level, Anne considered publishing the material from her journal volumes. The thorough organisation of the journal volume and emphasis on the veracity of the autobiographical account, Anne’s ‘habit of patient reference & correction’, could assist with her publishing ambitions, as she noted on 22 December 1819 (Whitbread 1988, 111). However, the primary audience for the journal volumes or letters was Anne herself, as the author, editor, extractor, copier and reader of her own autobiographical project. The wider audience included lovers, family and the possibility of publication – although not the eventuality during her lifetime – yet at their most fundamental level, Anne’s writings were for herself as the principal audience.

My project on Anne’s sojourn in Paris has focused upon her sociable and sexual practices as written in the journal volume and correspondence from this seven month period in 1824–25. In Chapter One ‘Anne’s Text: Writing the Paris Sojourn 1824–25’, I examined Anne’s material processes with her journal volume and correspondence – the physical form, length of journal and index text, marks, symbols, indices, summary lists, journal entries, letters, extracts, copies, rough drafts, plain and crypt handwritings, ratios of handwritings, patterns of writing up, memoranda, sorting, burning, keeping, content, sensibility and stylistic practices associated with her writings. There were discrete formats within the entirety of Anne’s writings, such as the journal entries, records and letters. Each of these formats was further characterised by the application of her particular style of writing. There was the highly stylised sentimental writing, or ‘epistolizing[sic]’, of the correspondence distinct from the mimetic recording of the journal entries, or the index and summary records where Anne employed a categorical and concise style of ordering information. Most of these elements had not ever been examined before and would have been unknown to readers of the representations of the writings of ‘Anne Lister’ by Muriel Green, Jill Liddington and Helena Whitbread (Green 1938; 1992; Liddington 1994; 1995; 1996; 1998; 2001; 2003; Whitbread 1988;
Yet, Anne’s writing practices interconnected these textual components in highly ritualistic and developed ways, each elucidating a part of a more complete account of what we can understand as an autobiographical project.

The edited publications of the papers have focused upon presenting selections from isolated elements like the journal entries or the letters, without inclusion of the other textual elements or formats of Anne’s writings. The published representations of ‘Anne Lister’ do not incorporate what Anne considered significant, as there has been little consideration of the structuring of her journal writings or stylising of her correspondence. Analyses of Anne’s sexuality have thus typically centred upon one aspect in one format of her writings, the crypt handwriting in the journal entries. The handwritings, the plain and crypt hand, created mechanically differentiated spaces within Anne’s writings. However, as I demonstrated with the example of ‘this treadmill business’, the division between these handwritings was complex. The crypt handwriting was used not only in the journal volumes, but also in the letters. These handwritings were both forms of encoded writing that traversed the boundaries of Anne’s sociable and sexual life. In the journal volume, as the aid to memory, Anne recorded subjects that were emotional yet social in the crypt handwriting. In the plain handwritten space of the sentimental and Romantic letters to her family and lovers, Anne recorded topics that were the factual yet self-reflexive. We need to extend our understanding of Anne’s writings, especially considering the strategic role the handwritings had in the past suppression and denial of her homosexuality. Even in the familiar territory of the journal entries, there were no simple distinctions between Anne’s experience of her sociability or sexuality.

Highly wrought and elaborate as they were, the plain and crypt hand were just one element of the variety of intricate textual practices Anne created, encoded, signified and utilised in her writings. Other textual signification practices were employed in her writings such as marks and symbols. Some of the marks were rarely seen in the journal volume in Paris period. There were the referential editing marks, such as the hash ‘#’ footnote mostly used in the journal entries, or the use in the index of ‘vide’ to refer to specific pages or passages. Another was the single example of the asterisk ‘*’ mark, which had located the interruption in Anne’s writing habits occasioned by Mrs. Barlow’s entrance early in their flirtation. Other marks indicated a textual action or relation within Anne’s writings, such as the letter ‘L’ marks that brought the
correspondence into her journal volumes, or the section ‘§’ mark that initially specified
the journal entry material that she wanted indexed. Lastly, there was Anne’s
employment of metasignage – marks that were not limited to a single purpose or record,
but correlated material across different formats. These were a more sophisticated textual
and semantic practice again than the other sorts of marks employed in her writings. The
most immediately evident of the metasigns was the plus ‘+’ mark, which connected her
masturbatory practices to her reading practices. The metasign plus ‘+’ mark signified
Anne’s sexual literacy. Through her signification practices, Anne brought her own
textual spaces into relation with each other, linking these processes with her sexuality.

The most fundamental metasignage in Anne’s writings in Paris was the editorial
practice used in the index to create her own autobiographical account of Paris. Perhaps
only used by the editors of the journal writings as a way into the daily accounts of the
journal entries, the index has received no analytical or material attention prior to my
study. The use of a section ‘§’ mark was not limited to noting those sections of journal
entry text to be indexed. Anne deployed the section ‘§’ mark in her index space to
further arrange the material already collected in her journal entries into an
autobiographical account of her Parisian sojourn. Although grouped by the symbol of
the section ‘§’ mark, there were three variations of importance in Anne’s
autobiographical account. The incidence of a single section ‘§’ mark in the index
marked those sociable events in Paris that she considered reasonably notable. Anne’s
autobiographical account ranged from the moderate significance of the sexual
knowledge she learned or exchanged, identified by the double section ‘§§’ marks, to the
most noteworthy sexual interactions directly experienced by herself, denoted by the
triple section ‘§§§’ marking. The combination of these three editorial levels in their
entirety over seven months constituted an autobiographical account of Anne’s sociable
and sexual progress in Paris in 1824–25. It was the story that she created and marked in
her Paris sojourn, a history that we can read and reconstruct of her sociable and sexual
adventures in Paris. The analysis of Anne’s editorial structuring of her writings as an
autobiographical process was the main contribution of my thesis project.

Anne’s autobiographical account was the principal textual location where the
significance of her sociable relationships in Paris could be actively reconstructed. The
metasignage in her index marked those relationships that were in the process of
becoming emotionally significant to her. In Chapter Two ‘Anne’s Society: Sociability in
Paris 1824–25’, I analysed the rituals used in her writings to recognise the establishment and maintenance of the social relationships between herself and other Place Vendôme guests. As a friendship moved to companionship or even intimacy, it was the metasignage marking in the index, particularly the double section ‘§§’ marks, that demonstrated the progress of Anne’s sociable interactions or ultimately her sexual relations. In the initial establishment of sociable interactions, of a calling relationship or a visiting acquaintance, it was the reciprocity of the visits and calls that Anne diligently observed in her writings. In the journal entries, the sociability of these practices were textually symbolised by the ‘V’ and ‘Vc’ marks. As Anne moved from acquaintance to friendship, her choice of nominations in the plain and crypt handwritings could also be revealing about the polite, informal or friendly standing she had established with her fellow guests. The visiting marks and nominations in the journal entries and the graduated section marking in the index outlined a circle of affectionate, familiar and close relationships amongst the gentlewomen, and one gentleman, of the Place Vendôme household.

Anne’s textual practices constructed an intricate picture of the domestic world of the Place Vendôme household of English expatriates. The strong homosocial bonding between Anne and the widowed mothers and daughters, Mrs. and Miss MacKenzie, and Mrs. Barlow and Jane, initially took up a fair part of her textual attention. It was with the arrival of Melle. de Sans that Anne’s autobiographical account shifted from her circle of friends to become focused upon the possibility of a relationship with the French gentlewoman. Anne’s competing interest in Mrs. Barlow, as another and ultimately successful amatory interest to Melle. de Sans, was reflected in the remarkable flurries and cessations of the metasignage in her index. The thwarted expectations of Mr. Franks, peripheral to Anne’s notice until his intentions became clearer, were only briefly recognised in her writings. However, it was this evident disinterest in Mr. Franks that appeared to have brought Anne’s sexual interest in Mrs. Barlow to the attention of Mme. de Boyve. In attacking Mrs. Barlow’s reputation, Mme. de Boyve was attempting to demarcate and regulate the boundary between women’s proper sociability and sexuality contravened by Anne and Mrs. Barlow. As the situation escalated, Anne attempted to ascertain the truth concerning Mrs Barlow’s sexual history with two gentlemen, M. Chateauvillard and Mr. Hancock. At the same time as she tried to resolve her doubts about Mrs. Barlow’s virtue, Anne worked within the household to manage the damage of such claims against Mrs Barlow’s character.
Anne’s doubts about Mrs. Barlow’s reputation were not resolved by the fact of their sexual connection. Mrs. Barlow’s secrecy concerning the correspondence with her suitor, Mr. Hancock, as well as the advice Mrs. Barlow had sought by letter from her own aunt, were a cause for concern. Anne had demonstrated her attachment to Mariana with the selective reading of their correspondence to Mrs. Barlow, but Mrs. Barlow had not reciprocated such candidness with Anne. The aspersions cast on Mrs. Barlow’s character raised questions about her sexual virtue and, for Anne, these claims were fuelled by the epistolary evidence of an understanding between Mrs. Barlow and Mr. Hancock. However, Mme. de Boyve’s claims also fundamentally implicated Mrs. Barlow’s social standing. Thus, Mrs. Barlow’s decision to remove from 24 Place Vendôme was a social action to protect her reputation. It was proof, as Anne comprehended it, of Mrs. Barlow’s virtue, her proper sociability. The social display of Mrs. Barlow’s sexual propriety convinced Anne of the wisdom of continuing their sexual relationship. Just over a month later on 15 January, she accompanied Mrs. Barlow in the removal from 24 Place Vendôme to the new apartment at 15 Quai Voltaire (220–21). Anne’s verbal defence of her lover and Mrs. Barlow’s decision to remove from 24 Place Vendôme were socially understood gestures that asserted Mrs. Barlow’s respectable reputation. Paradoxically, it was such sociable actions that enabled Anne and Mrs. Barlow to develop their sexual relationship in privacy.

Anne’s growing trust in Mrs. Barlow’s social and sexual character was most clearly visible in the textual devices in her writings. In Chapter Three ‘Anne’s Sexuality: Sex in Paris 1824–25’, I focused upon the textual process she used to establish and record the intense sexual relationship she developed with Mrs. Barlow. The last few months of the sojourn in Paris were the most significant by her account, for it was during this time that Anne employed the highest concentration of textual practices in her writings. From 18 October, Anne began telling the stories of her sexual past to Mrs. Barlow, as their flirtation became a serious courtship (109). At the same time, their discussions concerning the shared imaginary of ‘going to Italy’ became a particular and experiential conversation about the nature of a same-sex desire between women. From 8 December, as the passionate romance with Mrs. Barlow became sexual in practice, Anne began deploying her triple section ‘§§§’ marking in her index to track the exciting and momentous events of their intimate relationship (index 13). It was these later months of the sojourn in Paris that were the most heavily excised by Helena Whitbread in her edited publication of the journal entries, _No Priest but Love_ (Whitbread 1992). The
marginalisation of Anne’s relationship with Mrs. Barlow has allowed, I argued, a sentimental notion of her grand passion for Mariana to remain uncontested. The significance of her relationship and experience with Mrs. Barlow in Paris needs to be taken into consideration in our reshaping of Anne’s sexual past.

In reshaping that past, we must include Anne’s account of her history and relationships. The stories about her sexual past that Anne related to Mrs. Barlow were rich with her experience of love, flirtation, romance, desire and lust. These stories were not marked in any particular way in her writings, except through her invocation of having told a ‘story’. Unlike other textual elements, Anne’s stories did not relate to a record or special entry, nor did she mark them out with specific symbols. Presumably, these stories did not warrant any signification as Anne already knew them well. Instead, the stories were embedded in the details of the journal entries or index recording all the important matters the two gentlewomen discussed. In producing these stories for Mrs. Barlow, Anne offered an oral account in instalments that constituted a retrospective history of her sexuality. These stories were used in a Romantic fashion – to tell the heart of a matter, the essence of her character. Thus, the stories Anne told on the subject of herself could be considered another format of her autobiographical project. In documenting the confidences she made to Mrs. Barlow in the journal entries, we as readers can access the textual record of her oral autobiographical account. Anne’s oral autobiographical account was not the immediately pressing story of her sexual adventures in Paris. Instead, these stories were the sexual adventures recorded in her journal entries in the past, related for her current lover Mrs. Barlow in Paris.

The fine and delicate art of flirtation was not limited to Anne. In Paris, it was Mrs. Barlow who first introduced the topic of homosexuality into their courtship. On 19 October, Mrs. Barlow suggested to Anne the connections between ancient texts on same-sex desire, the culture of Italy and their potential future (110). From this beginning, Anne and Mrs. Barlow created a legitimate space for the expression of an economy of female friendship, and later desire, with the phrase ‘going to Italy’. As their negotiations over a future together intensified, the notion of ‘going to Italy’ was transformed to represent their different understandings of the nature of love and commitment. The working over of the imaginary concept of ‘going to Italy’ was recorded daily by Anne in her journal entries, but it was from these incremental accounts that she constructed an intensely significant account of her sojourn in Paris.
From 8 December, when Anne recognised that Mrs. Barlow was indeed *a virtuous woman*, the most emphatic metasignage in her index began with the triple section ‘§§§’ marking (180, index 13). From the acknowledgement of these momentous interactions with Mrs Barlow in the index of her journal volume, Anne edited the chronological story of her adventures in Paris into a succinct and autobiographical account of her sexual relationship with Mrs. Barlow.

The representation of ‘Anne Lister’ in Paris during her sojourn in 1824–25 that I have constructed is distinct from the editorial representations by Muriel Green, Jill Liddington and Helena Whitbread. My thesis on Anne’s sexual and social practices in Paris is an attempt to displace some of the constructions of her social and sexual subjectivity in these representations. The point of entry into these radically different accounts was to examine Anne’s sexual relations within all of her social relationships, analysing the practices she utilised to develop and negotiate these relationships, within the separate sources of the letters and journal writings from her sojourn in Paris. In contradistinction to Muriel Green’s assumption of epistolary asexuality for instance, my project has shown that Anne’s homosexuality profoundly structured the nature of her correspondence (Liddington 1994, 57). The highly stylised letters illustrated Anne’s adept employment of the epistolary mode of early nineteenth century writing. There were only two gentlewomen from the Place Vendôme guesthouse that she wanted to, or did, correspond with – Melle. de Sans and Mrs. Barlow. These two gentlewomen were Anne’s only serious amatory interests during her sojourn in Paris. The evidence from Paris was that the correspondence was not purely a textual space relating Anne’s sociality, but was also a mode of communication that maintained and expressed her sexual relationships. The letters then must be included in future analyses of Anne’s homosexuality, as one of the textual formats that established her sexual subjectivity.

In Paris, Anne and Mrs. Barlow’s separate epistolary relationships complicated the notion of a competitive hierarchy of affections regarding Mariana or Mr. Hancock. Likewise, the commencement of a sentimental correspondence with Mrs. Barlow after Paris illustrated a seriousness in their relationship at variance to that seen in Helena Whitbread’s edited publication, *No Priest but Love* (Whitbread 1992). Out of all of Anne’s romances, there were only two gentlewomen she wrote to regularly from Paris: Mariana Lawton and Isabella Norcliffe. After she departed from Paris in March 1825, Mrs. Maria Barlow joined the exclusive group of lovers Anne made into
correspondents. It confirmed, in epistolary terms, the significance Anne placed upon the intimate relationship with Mrs. Barlow. Within the journal volume, the importance attributed to her relationship with Mrs. Barlow was marked out by the most intense metasignage in her index. As well, Anne’s relation of her sexual stories to Mrs. Barlow, I argued, presented a considered and precise understanding of her sexual past. Anne and Mariana had created a Romantic hope for a future together, as Anne told Mrs. Barlow regarding her two gold rings in October and November. The account did not relate a saga of grand passion reduced to the ‘cynicism’ of a ‘careerist’, as Whitbread has represented Anne’s sexual history after Mariana with Mrs. Barlow (Whitbread 1992, 8). Future histories of Anne’s romances need to consider the relationship with Mrs. Barlow in Paris as equally significant and serious as the relationship with Mariana.

Anne gave her sexual relationship with Mrs. Barlow the prime position in her autobiographical account of her adventures in Paris. The centrality of Anne’s sexuality to her subjectivity demonstrated a divergent understanding to Jill Liddington’s representation in Female Fortune and Nature’s Domain (Liddington 1998; 2003). From all of her writings, Anne employed the crypt handwriting to construct a differentiated textual space in her journal volume, where aspects of her homosexuality, identity and relationships were recorded. However, the crypt handwriting was not relegated only to the space of the journal volumes, as she recorded also using it in her correspondence. Additionally, when Anne gave the crypt to friends and lovers she attracted a special and interested audience to read, and perhaps participate in, her sexual practices, relations and writings. Through the crypt handwriting Anne regulated the sociality of her homosexual practices amongst a group of interested gentlewomen. Thus, the crypt handwriting in the journal volume was not limited to the interior recording of a sexual self, but nor was the correspondence solely a testament to social relationships with other women. To marginalise or absent Anne’s sexuality from a consideration of her sociability, as Liddington has done, is to regulate the sorts of knowledge that can be constructed from Anne’s history (Liddington 1998, 251; 2003). Any analyses of Anne’s writings in the future should incorporate a consideration of her sexuality and sociability as fundamental and constitutive of her subjectivity.

Anne provided her own framework for analysing her writings. Marked with the metasignage in the index, it was the editorial account Anne wanted to read and recall from her sojourn in Paris. Yet, it was only one of the ways that she recorded and
constructed what was of significance to herself as a future reader. Utilising Liz Stanley’s feminist methodology ‘feminist auto/biography’, I theorised Anne’s textual processes in her journal volume and correspondence as autobiographical forms of self-representation (Stanley 1992a). Tracing the story of Anne’s sexual adventures in Paris brought the signification and editorial processes of her self-construction in the index to the foreground. Reconstructing the sexual stories of Anne’s past highlighted the oral and historical processes of her self-representation in the journal entries. Both were important textual narratives Anne iterated and reiterated concerning her own sexual and social character. Considering Anne’s writings as autobiographical enabled me to review received knowledge about her, as a biographical representation of ‘Anne Lister’ by Muriel Green, Jill Liddington or Helena Whitbread. Such a theoretical move made it possible to disengage some of the claims to truth regarding Anne’s character from the critical analysis of her history. It was not necessary for me to represent her homosexuality as contained by a normative narrative of grand passion, or her sociability as reactively devoid of homosexuality, as a mechanism for my understanding of Anne’s active sexual and social agency in this thesis. In offering an alternative representation of ‘Anne Lister’ in her sojourn to Paris in 1824–25, I hope I showed that valid choices are available for reconsidering Anne’s agency, sexuality and writings.

The journal entries, index notations, extraction and copying of individual letters constituted periodic instalments in the construction of Anne’s autobiographical project to record her story in a range of textual ways. Here, the textual parallels can be seen between Anne’s writings and other contemporaneous literary modes like the confessional journal and epistolary novels of Jean-Jacques Rousseau (1712–78), or the autobiographically sourced poetry of Lord Byron (1788–1824), Anne’s literary mentors. However, the index was further developed by her into an autobiographical account of her sexual progress, a history of romance and relationships in Paris. As the substantive foundation for the index notations, the discrete journal entries were the lived source material for the tale of Anne’s erotic adventures in Paris. There were clear similarities between the journal volume and correspondence, and the amatory modes of contemporaneous literature. A journal for instance, could be the repository for the declaration of sexual and sentimental practices like Rousseau’s Confessions (1782), or a series of letters could relate the sexual temptations of a woman of sensibility like Héloïse in Rousseau’s epistolary novel La Nouvelle Héloïse (1761). So too, Childe Harold proceeded through a series of sentimental and sexual journeys through Italy, as
had Byron in 1816–17, in the fourth canto of *Childe Harold* (1818). The recording in her journal entries of the amatory relations, particularly with Mrs. Barlow, constituted Anne’s own Romantic story of sexual progress in Paris.

The journal volume and letters described a circle of sexual and social relations amongst Anne’s lovers, friends and family. By turns Romantic, sentimental, erotic, descriptive and scientific, Anne’s writings were greatly influenced by the discourses and mentalities of her era. The Romantic compulsion to bare the inner consciousness was seen in the sentimental language of the correspondence, the memoir of her journal recording, and the stories she related to Mrs. Barlow of her sexual past. The Enlightenment project to describe to the fullest the limits of knowledge was seen in Anne’s textual need to document her world, classify different types of information, and exhaustively catalogue her history and experience. The detailed recording and markings of times, letters, calls, visits, reading materials, shopping and language learning was not, and should not, be considered apart from the recording and markings of masturbatory practices, sexual intimacies, medical treatment, metasignage in the index, discursive constructs or stories of her sexual past. These textual, sexual and social practices were distinct in purpose and period, detailed minutely by Anne daily in the journal entries, or marked in the index into an autobiographical account that related significant events in her life over months or even years. Yet, considered in their entirety, these discrete rituals, patterns and practices constituted the whole autobiographical project. Thus, to consider some aspects or elements of Anne’s writings as social or sexual would be to see only parts of her complete life story. These relations were intertwined in Anne’s writings and life during her sojourn to Paris. The sociable relations of the domestic drama at Place Vendôme were complexly bound up with the sexual relations of Anne’s romance with Mrs. Barlow in her writings.

The relationship with Mrs. Barlow did not cease after Anne left Paris in March 1825. A correspondence was initiated, as indicated by the copy of the first letter to Mrs. Barlow on 4 April (ML/166). Not quite a year after she returned home from Paris, Anne inherited Shibden Hall on 26 January 1826, upon the death of her Uncle James. Within the year she would travel again to France and the capital that had been her home. Anne arrived in Paris on 2 September 1826, two years almost to the day after her sojourn begun on 1 September 1824. It was an entirely different enterprise in some important respects. Anne did not travel alone to Paris in 1826, hoping for a cure to her venereal
condition; this time she was accompanied by Aunt Anne, for the benefit of her elderly aunt’s poor health. Anne did not move in with Mrs. Barlow, who was still resident in Paris at 15 Quai Voltaire, as the two Lister gentlewomen took an apartment at 6 Rue de Mondovi. The seven months that Anne had abided in Paris from September 1824 to March 1825, became a year and seven months in Paris on this trip, from September 1826 to March 1828. However, the most significant difference concerned Anne and Mrs. Barlow’s relationship. Instead of imagining the possibility of ‘going to Italy’, Mrs. Barlow, with her daughter Jane, and Anne travelled together through Italy and Switzerland for five months in 1827. The tour to Italy was ‘two years hence’ from their romance in Paris, as the two gentlewomen had agreed years before. However, Mrs. Barlow did not become her life companion, we know from Anne’s history, but the story of their later relationship remains to be told.

A study of Anne and Mrs. Barlow’s correspondence and of their later history together would throw further light on their relationship that I studied in my project on Anne’s sojourn in Paris in 1824–25. In Paris, Anne was able to explore with Mrs. Barlow the possibilities for an active sexual relationship that controlled and prevented the transmission of her venereal disease. It involved ongoing management of her disease and treatment, and the development of sexual practices between herself and Mrs. Barlow. Anne learnt that her choices for a loving and close relationship were not limited to those lovers who were already infected with the same venereal condition, like Mariana. Mrs. Barlow had not evidenced any venereal symptoms or contagion as a result of their close physical contact after an intimate relationship of several months during Anne’s sojourn in Paris in 1824–25. Following Paris, Anne may have deduced she could in the future have an embodied relationship with a gentlewoman like Mrs. Barlow whilst infected for, with her careful sexual practices, the risk of transmission would be low. That Anne did indeed reason this was suggested by the relationship with Ann Walker in the 1830s. During their eight year relationship, Ann Walker also appeared to have been uninfected by Anne’s venereal condition. With our modern insight and awareness of the complexity of safe sexual practices and disease transmission, Anne’s venereal condition would be an appropriate focus for future studies. An analysis of Anne’s sexual practices with her lovers could reveal, in more depth, her management of her condition over her lifetime.
There are other possibilities for study indicated by my research on Anne’s writings. The relationship with Eliza Raine, their correspondence and journal volumes, which have been briefly analysed by Jill Liddington, warrant greater attention to determine if Eliza was one of the ‘three favorit[e]’ lovers Anne mentioned to Mrs. Barlow on 25 October (116). A study focused upon Isabella Norcliffe, who was definitely one of the favourites, and her lifelong relationship with Anne has yet to be undertaken. Frequently relegated to a marginal position in Anne’s love life, the significant and enduring relationship between Anne and Isabella deserves investigation, for the correspondence in Paris showed it was more important than previously considered. Other possibilities for study were indicated by the sophisticated literary imagery Anne drew upon to establish a conversational imaginary with Mrs. Barlow regarding same-sex sexuality. There would be a rewarding project in a longitudinal study of what Anne read, as recorded in the literary indices written over her lifetime. It would, I believe, be valuable research for understanding the relationship between Anne’s sexuality and her reading practices. A study of the symbols and marks she used throughout her life was beyond the scope of my project, fascinating though it looks to be. An analysis of these signification systems and their changes over time is nevertheless imperative, especially given the interconnections of Anne’s signification with her sexuality.

The textual practices Anne used to record her life in Paris illuminated the emotional valency of her writings. The journal volume reflected her need to record her sexual and sociable experiences with accuracy. The correspondence demonstrated her desire to express the sentimental connection to her family, friends, lovers and country. The diligent and detailed textual processes of recounting, crypting, abbreviating, editing, correcting, inserting, drafting, extracting, copying, indexing, listing, marking, symbolising, signifying, stylising, timing, categorising, managing, phrasing and constructing a story with her writings, all bore witness to Anne’s autobiographical project as a textual account that required above all else to be documented with veracity for life. The continuation of many of these textual formats, ritualistic processes and material practices throughout her life for more than thirty four years of daily notation, I would argue, negates any claims that Anne’s sexuality was not integral to her sociability or to her subjectivity. To represent her in entirely social or completely sexual terms would be to miss half of the complex, absorbing and engaging gentlewoman that was ‘Anne Lister’. Anne was not a stereotype: she was neither a heroine, nor a victimiser. Anne was instead an early nineteenth century gentlewoman who treated seriously her
love for the ‘fairer sex’, who pursued her desires unequivocally, and who wrote about her life with dignity (Whitbread 1988, 145). It was this self-representation of ‘Anne Lister’ that I encountered in my study of her sojourn in Paris in 1824–25 and have done my best to portray. There is much original work yet to be done on this fascinating gentlewoman, Anne Lister, her intricate writings, and her vital and decisive homosexuality.
APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1:

Guide to Referencing Anne’s Papers from Paris 1824–25

The Writings Paris 1824–25 SH:7/ML/–

West Yorkshire Archive Service catalogue number (Anne Lister Papers).

SH:7/ML/E/8 Journal volume from 20 June 1824 to 31 July 1825.

All references are to journal entries, unless otherwise stated, and employ Anne’s pagination. Three page numbers had, as Anne noted in her index, a ‘(mistake in the numbering)’ (index 8). The repeated pages are quoted in text as 76[sic], 77[sic] and 267[sic]. The correct pages appear without amendment.

The journal volume contained a summary of letters in the front papers (unpaginated), journal entries, and an index to the journal entries and literature in the end papers (unpaginated). The front papers consisted of a three page summary of the correspondence. This is referenced as ‘summary’ pages 1–3, where page 1 begins at the earliest date 21 June 1824. The end papers consisted of twenty three pages of index to the journal entries with three columns of a literary index interspersed. The entire section is referenced as ‘index’ pages 1–25, where page 1 begins at the earliest date 20 June 1824. I distinguish the literary index by specific mention in text.


Each letter was individually catalogued (unpaginated). The letters are referenced by catalogue number, where page 1 begins at the opening salutation.

SH:7/ML/AC/7, AC/8 and AC/13 Account books from 1822 to 1827.

Each account book was individually catalogued. The account books are referenced by catalogue number and employ Anne’s pagination.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ML/</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Recipient</th>
<th>Pages</th>
<th>Edited Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>8–12 September</td>
<td>Aunt Anne</td>
<td>Four pages</td>
<td>(Green 1938, 209–13; 1992, 72–73)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>18 August – 12 September</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td>Four pages</td>
<td>(Green 1938, 213–16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>27 September – 6 October</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td>Seven pages – four pages with last three pages crossed</td>
<td>(Green 1938, 216)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>28–29 September</td>
<td>Aunt Anne</td>
<td>Four pages</td>
<td>(Green 1938, 216–20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>18 October</td>
<td>Aunt Anne</td>
<td>Four pages</td>
<td>(Green 1938, 220–22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>31 October</td>
<td>Aunt Anne</td>
<td>Four pages</td>
<td>(Green 1938, 222–23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>7 November</td>
<td>Aunt Anne</td>
<td>Four pages</td>
<td>(Green 1938, 224–26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>21–22 November</td>
<td>Aunt Anne</td>
<td>Four pages</td>
<td>(Green 1938, 226–27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>29 November (backdated)</td>
<td>Aunt Anne</td>
<td>Two pages</td>
<td>(Green 1938, 228; 1992, 73–74; letter dated erroneously as 29 October)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>7 December</td>
<td>Aunt Anne</td>
<td>Four pages</td>
<td>(Green 1938, 228–29; 1992, 74–75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>12 December</td>
<td>Aunt Anne</td>
<td>Four pages</td>
<td>(Green 1938, 229; summary)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>26 December</td>
<td>Aunt Anne</td>
<td>Four pages</td>
<td>(Green 1938, 230–31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>17 January</td>
<td>Aunt Anne</td>
<td>Four pages</td>
<td>(Green 1938, 232–33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>30 January</td>
<td>Aunt Anne</td>
<td>Four pages</td>
<td>(Green 1938, 234)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>6 February</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td>Four pages</td>
<td>(Green 1938, 234–36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>10–14 February</td>
<td>Aunt Anne</td>
<td>Four pages</td>
<td>(Green 1938, 236–37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>14 March</td>
<td>Aunt Anne</td>
<td>Four pages</td>
<td>(Green 1938, 237–39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>8 April (copy)</td>
<td>Mrs. Barlow</td>
<td>Three pages</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>– 4–8 April (original)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Figure 1 Guide to the Correspondence 1824–25]
# APPENDIX 2:
People, Timeline and Symbols of Paris 1824–25

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anne's nominations</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Relation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Paris</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madame de Boyve</td>
<td></td>
<td>Proprietor of 24 Place Vendôme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monsieur de Boyve</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mme. de Boyve’s husband</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Barlow</td>
<td></td>
<td>Anne’s lover in Paris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss Jane Barlow</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mrs. Barlow’s daughter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colonel Barlow</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mrs. Barlow’s late husband</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madame Galvani</td>
<td></td>
<td>Anne’s language teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. MacKenzie</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fellow guest at Place Vendôme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss MacKenzie</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mrs. MacKenzie’s daughter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mademoiselle de Sans</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fellow guest at Place Vendôme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Franks</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fellow guest at Place Vendôme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Hancock</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mrs. Barlow’s admirer, previous guest at Place Vendôme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monsieur Chateauvillard</td>
<td></td>
<td>French gentleman visitor to Place Vendôme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monsieur de Nappe</td>
<td></td>
<td>French gentleman visitor to Place Vendôme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monsieur Dupuytren</td>
<td></td>
<td>Venereal specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Page</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mrs. Barlow’s maid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madame Chenelle</td>
<td></td>
<td>Place Vendôme housekeeper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Norcliffe</td>
<td></td>
<td>Isabella’s mother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss Norcliffe</td>
<td></td>
<td>Anne’s lover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Lister</td>
<td></td>
<td>Anne’s paternal aunt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Captain Jeremy Lister</td>
<td></td>
<td>Anne’s father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marian Lister</td>
<td></td>
<td>Anne’s sister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Norcliffe</td>
<td></td>
<td>Isabella’s mother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss Norcliffe</td>
<td></td>
<td>Anne’s lover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Belcombe</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mariana’s father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Belcombe</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mariana’s sister, Anne’s lover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Stephen Belcombe</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mariana’s brother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. William Duffin</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eliza Raine’s guardian, Anne’s friend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Marsh</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Duffin’s second wife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliza Raine</td>
<td></td>
<td>Anne’s first lover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sibbella Maclean</td>
<td></td>
<td>Anne’s friend</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Timeline of Anne's Paris Sojourn 1824–25

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Writings</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>August</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24–29</td>
<td><em>Anne left Shibden for a week in London – included ‘this treadmill business’.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>September</strong></td>
<td><em>Anne wrote twenty three journal pages and five letters, crypt handwriting comprised one quarter of journal entries.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Anne arrived at 24 Place Vendôme in Paris.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Single section ‘§’ marks commenced.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Mrs. Barlow began to interest Anne.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Mademoiselle de Sans arrived.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>October</strong></td>
<td><em>Anne wrote thirty four journal pages and four letters.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Anne began flirting with Melle. de Sans.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Anne began a serious flirtation with Mrs. Barlow.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>The MacKenzie and Mr. Franks departed.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>‘Going to Italy’ commenced, crypt handwriting increased to half of journal entries.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Anne commenced stories of her sexual past.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Anne kissed Mrs. Barlow and they declared their courtship.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Mme. de Boyve’s ‘history of the flirtations of Mrs. B-‘.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>November</strong></td>
<td><em>Anne wrote forty two journal pages and four letters.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Mrs. Barlow sat on Anne’s knee.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Anne grubbled Mrs. Barlow.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>*Anne learned of the ‘intrigues carried on in the house’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Anne’s scheme with the two names and its dénouement.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Anne ‘absolutely told Mrs. B- of being venerealized[ sic]‘.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Anne first consulted M. Dupuytren.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>December</strong></td>
<td><em>Anne wrote thirty six journal pages and seven letters.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Mrs. Barlow decided to leave 24 Place Vendôme.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>January</strong></td>
<td><em>Anne wrote twenty seven journal pages and five letters.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Mrs. Barlow signed the lease of 15 Quai Voltaire.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Anne and Mrs. Barlow left 24 Place Vendôme for 15 Quai Voltaire.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>February</strong></td>
<td><em>Anne wrote fifteen journal pages and three letters.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Anne’s last consultation with M. Dupuytren.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>March</strong></td>
<td><em>Anne wrote sixteen journal pages and two letters.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Anne left Paris.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Anne in London for a week before returning home to Shibden.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>April</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4–11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sign</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Incidence</th>
<th>Signification</th>
<th>Referent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td>Asterisk ‘Star’</td>
<td>Journal entry</td>
<td>1 time</td>
<td>Interruption or pause</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>X mark ‘Cross’</td>
<td>Journal margin</td>
<td>2 times</td>
<td>Masturbation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>Plus sign ‘Cross’</td>
<td>– Journal margin</td>
<td>18 times</td>
<td>Masturbation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>++</td>
<td>Double plus sign</td>
<td>– Journal margin</td>
<td>1 time</td>
<td>Literacy</td>
<td>Literary index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Hash sign</td>
<td>Journal margin, entry, and index margin</td>
<td>6 times (journal)</td>
<td>Footnote</td>
<td>Generally corresponding hash sign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>##</td>
<td>Double hash sign</td>
<td>– Journal margin</td>
<td>2 times (paired)</td>
<td>Footnote</td>
<td>Linked topic Corresponding double hash sign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦</td>
<td>Struck through section mark</td>
<td>Journal margin and entry</td>
<td>2 times (paired)</td>
<td>Footnote</td>
<td>Corresponding struck through section mark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§</td>
<td>Section mark</td>
<td>– Journal entry</td>
<td>6 times (paired)</td>
<td>Footnote and indexation</td>
<td>Corresponding section mark and index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>– Journal margin</td>
<td>1241 times</td>
<td>Indexation</td>
<td>Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Single section mark</td>
<td>– Index margin</td>
<td>147 times</td>
<td>Classification – of moderate importance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§§</td>
<td>Double section mark</td>
<td>Index margin</td>
<td>95 times</td>
<td>Classification – comparative importance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§§§</td>
<td>Triple section mark</td>
<td>Index margin</td>
<td>12 times</td>
<td>Classification – of the highest importance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[vv]</td>
<td>Double v mark</td>
<td>Index margin</td>
<td>2 times</td>
<td>Indicating ‘vice versa’?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vid.</td>
<td>Vide</td>
<td>Journal margin, entry, and index margin and index</td>
<td>26 times (journal)</td>
<td>Refer</td>
<td>Indicated topic or page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vide</td>
<td>Vide</td>
<td>Journal entry – crypt hand</td>
<td>3 times</td>
<td>Refer</td>
<td>Indicated topic or page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Letter mark</td>
<td>Journal margin</td>
<td>66 times (including struck through mark)</td>
<td>Epistolary</td>
<td>Letter details in journal entry and summary of letters list</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Note mark</td>
<td>Journal margin</td>
<td>1 time</td>
<td>Epistolary</td>
<td>Note details in journal entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Visit mark</td>
<td>Journal margin</td>
<td>25 times</td>
<td>Sociability</td>
<td>Visit, call or card details in journal entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vc</td>
<td>Visits and calls mark</td>
<td>Journal margin</td>
<td>64 times</td>
<td>Sociability</td>
<td>Visit, call or card details in journal entry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sign</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Incidence</th>
<th>Signification</th>
<th>Referent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Venereal mark - Journal margin and entry</td>
<td>2 times (linked)</td>
<td>Signification – change in venereal mark</td>
<td>Mark details in journal entry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Journal entry</td>
<td>7 times</td>
<td>Venereal condition with no virulent discharge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EO</td>
<td>Venereal mark combined with flow dots</td>
<td>Journal entry</td>
<td>153 times (with overlap instance)</td>
<td>Combination – venereal condition with flow of virulent discharge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Venereal mark combined – no variation</td>
<td>Journal entry</td>
<td>37 times</td>
<td>Classification – no application of treatment?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.</td>
<td>Venereal mark combined – dotted in middle</td>
<td>Journal entry</td>
<td>14 times (1 dot) 21 times (2 dots) 4 times (3 dots) 1 time (4 dots)</td>
<td>Classification – dots indicate number of times treatment applied in the middle of the day?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E....</td>
<td>Venereal mark combined – dotted below</td>
<td>Journal entry</td>
<td>2 times (1 dot) 57 times (2 dots) 1 time (3 dots)</td>
<td>Classification – dots indicate number of times treatment applied in the evening?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E...</td>
<td>Venereal mark combined – all dotted</td>
<td>Journal entry</td>
<td>2 times (1 each) 19 times (1 dot middle, 2 dots below) 1 time (2 dots middle and below)</td>
<td>Classification – dots indicate number of times treatment applied in the middle of the day and in the evening?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Flow dots – no dots</td>
<td>Journal entry</td>
<td>27 times</td>
<td>Classification – no virulent discharge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☞</td>
<td>Flow dots – one dot</td>
<td>Journal entry</td>
<td>46 times</td>
<td>Classification – low virulent discharge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☞</td>
<td>Flow dots – two dots</td>
<td>Journal entry (and one overlap into journal margin)</td>
<td>46 times</td>
<td>Classification – medium virulent discharge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☞</td>
<td>Flow dots – three dots</td>
<td>Journal entry</td>
<td>32 times</td>
<td>Classification – high virulent discharge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPENDIX 3:

Anne’s Journal Volumes 1806–40

The Journal Volumes Anne Lister 1806–40 SH:7/ML/E/1–26

The earliest extant journal volume, begun in 1806, was a notebook (E/26/1) [Figure 1]. It consisted mainly of loose pages and note scraps. It did not contain any distinct material arrangements. In thirty four years of journal writing only two journal volumes contained only journal entries: the first extant journal volume and another in the mid 1830s (E/26/1; E/18).

The five extant journal volumes for the 1810s period of Anne’s life dated from 1816 to 1819 (E/26/2–3; E/1–3). In all of these journal volumes, the records sections were thoroughly and meticulously kept, with each list dated and well organised. However, the index and reading list all shifted to different locations in the journal volumes over the period. When Anne began indexing the journal entries in 1816 and 1817, the list totalled only two pages and was divided between the front and end papers (E/26/2–3). The book list was part of the index, allocated a bottom corner of the end papers index. In the next three journal volumes dated from 1817 to 1819, the reading list was expanded to include another item of reading material – pamphlets (E/1–3). The reading list was separated out into two single page lists, one list for pamphlets and one for books. Both lists were near, but not within, the index. As well, these later journal volumes all included a new record in the front pages, a summary of letters that Anne sent and received. Anne began the lifelong practice of reversing her journal volume to write the indices progressively in 1817 (E/1). Anne continued to employ the reverse practice for indices, when she did have an index, throughout the remainder of her journal volumes. In the 1810s journal volumes Anne was interested in constructing and maintaining records, but her patterns were not yet established. The 1810s journal volumes displayed Anne’s emergent interest in keeping a journal and her experimentation with its design.

Anne was more serious with her authorial practices in the 1820s journal volumes. These eight journal volumes dated from 1819 to 1829, including the Paris 1824–25 journal volume, were all arranged in the same manner with matching features throughout (E/4–11). Each contained: a summary of letters sent and received in the front pages, an index to the journal entries in the end pages, and a ‘Literary Index’ to the books and
pamphlets Anne read in the end pages. In these journal volumes, the literary index was interspersed into the body of the index. In addition, half of these journal volumes contained travel itineraries for Anne’s journeys (E/6–7; E/10–11). She used her flyleaf for extra information for the first time in 1822 (E/6). It became a usual practice from 1825, spilling over into the end papers in 1828 (E/9; E/11). Each of the 1820s journal volumes became more detailed and voluminous than the last. The first journal volume for the decade, begun in 1819, totalled around a respectable two hundred and fifty pages; the last volume, completed in 1829, totalled over three hundred and fifty pages (E/4; E/11). Some journal volumes were so detailed, they reached their fullest extent and the journal entries met the reversed indices. This occurred in the years from 1819 to 1821, and twice more from 1822 to 1823, and from 1823 to 1824 (E/4; E/6–7). The 1820s journal volumes showed that Anne was earnestly engaged in diligently recording, listing and indexing her significant life experiences to the fullest capacity in her text.

In the 1830s journal volumes, Anne’s meticulous record keeping dropped away. Of the thirteen journal volumes dated from 1829 to 1840, only one journal volume contained the full suite of records of summary of letters, index and literary index (E/12–24). It was the second last journal volume dated from 1829 to 1840 (E/23). What occurred instead were a series of different record lists in various combinations. All of these journal volumes contained some sort of notes in the front or end papers. The exception was the journal volume dated from 1835 to 1836, which contained no notes, no indices, nor any records of any kind (E/18). It only contained journal entries, as did the first extant journal volume (E/18; E/26/1). There was one journal volume that contained indices, but no summary of letters (E/21). There were four journal volumes that only included a summary of the letters (E/14–16; E/24). Seven of the journal volumes contained only notes in the front and end papers (E12–13; E/17–20; E/22). Some of the journal volumes featured extras, such as newspaper clippings in 1831, a map probably of Shibden estate the next year, and a record of visits from 1839 to 1840 (E/14; E/15; E/23). In the 1830s journal volumes Anne kept her records irregularly, frequently wrote notes in the front and end papers, and collected more loose memoranda. Anne’s managerial responsibilities increased as the landowner of Shibden Hall estate, which she inherited in 1826. With financial independence came the ability to travel. Anne had less time to dedicate to writing up the journal volumes. The 1830s journal volumes reflected her increasing busyness during the last decade of her life.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E/</th>
<th>Volume Format</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E/1</td>
<td>Journal entries: 21 March 1817 – 25 January 1818 169 pages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Front papers: quotation:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I propose from this day, to keep an exact journal of my actions and studies,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>both to assist my memory &amp; to accustom me to set a due value on my time.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Introduction to Mr. Gibbon’s Journal – A. Lister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>End papers: 6 pages index + 2 pages book and pamphlet list + 2 pages summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of letters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E/2</td>
<td>Journal entries: 26 January 1818 – 10 April 1819 234[(sic) pages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Front papers: 3 pages summary of letters + 3 pages book and pamphlet list</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>End papers: 23 pages index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E/3</td>
<td>Journal entries: 11 April 1819 – 22 November 1819 224 pages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Front papers: 2 pages summary of letters + 2 pages book and pamphlet list</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>End papers: 23 pages index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E/4</td>
<td>Journal entries: 23 November 1819 – 10 February 1821 244 pages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Front papers: 4 pages summary of letters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>End papers: 1 page notes + 20 pages index and literary index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E/5</td>
<td>Journal entries: 11 February 1821 – 8 May 1822 247 pages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Front papers: 4 pages summary of letters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>End papers: 19 pages index and literary index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E/6</td>
<td>Journal entries: 9 May 1822 – 25 April 1823 246 pages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Front papers: 2 pages notes + 3 pages summary of letters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>End papers: 1 page itinerary + 21 pages index and literary index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E/7</td>
<td>Journal entries: 26 April 1823 – 19 June 1824 286½ pages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Front papers: 4 pages summary of letters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>End papers: 1 page itinerary + 27½ pages index and literary index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E/8</td>
<td>Journal entries: 20 June 1824 – 31 July 1825 333 pages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Front papers: 3 pages summary of letters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>End papers: 24 ½ pages index and literary index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E/9</td>
<td>Journal entries: 1 August 1825 – 24 October 1826 338 pages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Front papers: 1 page notes + 4 pages summary of letters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>End papers: 29 pages index and literary index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Front papers: 1 page notes + 3 pages summary of letters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>End papers: 30 ½ pages index and literary index, which incorporated 3 ½ pages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>itinerary, + 16 pages travel journal entries 15 June – 27 August 1827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E/11</td>
<td>Journal entries: 30 May 1828 – 15 April 1829 331 pages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Front papers: 2 pages notes + 3 pages summary of letters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>End papers: 2 pages notes + 25 pages index and literary index, which incorporated 4 pages itinerary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E/12</td>
<td>Journal entries: 16 April 1829 – 28 February 1830 231 pages (no journal entries from 18 October to 12 November, pages 190–220 blank)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Front papers: 1 page notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Loose papers: 7 pages memoranda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E/13</td>
<td>Journal entries: 1 March 1830 – 31 December 1830 357 pages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Front papers: 1 page notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>End papers: 11 pages notes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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| E/14 | Journal entries: 1 January 1831 – 31 December 1831 332 pages
|      | Front papers: 1 page notes + 3 pages summary of letters
|      | Loose papers: Newspaper cutting about ‘pestilential boxes’ which release chlorine gas to ‘neutralize[sic]…noxious effluvia’ + 3 pages summary of letters + 3 pages memoranda |
| E/15 | Journal entries: 1 January 1832 – 12 January 1833 347 pages
|      | Front papers: 1 page notes + 4 pages summary of letters
|      | Loose papers: map of Shibden(?) estate |
| E/16 | Journal entries: 13 January 1833 – 9 March 1834 348 pages
|      | Front papers: 2 pages summary of letters
|      | End papers: 1 page notes |
| E/17 | Journal entries: 10 March 1834 – 21 March 1835 356 pages
|      | End papers: 1 page notes |
| E/19 | Journal entries: 1 March 1836 – 8 January 1837 358 pages
|      | End papers: 1 page notes |
| E/20 | Journal entries: 1 January 1837 – 30 November 1837 321 pages
|      | End papers: 1 page notes |
| E/21 | Journal entries: 1 December 1837 – 9 August 1838 310 pages
|      | Front papers: 1 page notes
|      | End papers: 5 pages index and literary index + 2 pages notes |
|      | End papers: 1 page notes |
| E/23 | Journal entries: 21 March 1839 – 4 February 1840 279 pages
|      | Front papers: 1 page notes
|      | End papers: 2 pages notes + 3 pages index and literary index + 21 pages letter copies
|      | Loose papers: 2 pages visits list |
| E/24 | Journal entries: 5 February 1840 – 11 August 1840 336 pages
|      | Front papers: 1 page summary of letters
|      | End papers: 19 pages letter copies |
| E/25 | A series of extracts on local topics, made from the journal volumes by Anne’s relative John Lister, and published in the *Halifax Guardian* 1887–92 |
| E/26/1 | Notebook entries: 11 August 1806 – 22 February 1810 40 pages
|      | (notebook, loose papers and memoranda) |
| E/26/2 | Journal entries: 14 August – 4 November 1816 40 pages (many missing pages)
|      | Front papers: Title page in Anne’s script: “Wed. 14 August to Tues. 5 November 1816 Vol. 2” + 1 page index + Greek inscription
|      | End papers: 1 page index and book list |
| E/26/3 | Journal entries: 5 November 1816 – 20 March 1817 44 pages
|      | Front papers: Title page in Anne’s script: “Tues. 5 Nov. to Fri. 21 March 1816 and 1817 vol. 3” + 1 page index
|      | End papers: 1 page index and book list
|      | Loose papers: 2 pages memoranda |

Guide prepared by Kate Makowiecka, Murdoch University Library, 2001
Revised by Dannielle Orr, 2004

*[Figure 1 Guide to the Journal Volumes 1806–40]*
APPENDIX 4:  

Anne’s Account Books for Paris 1824–25


At the time of the Paris sojourn, Anne was dependant upon her Uncle James and Aunt Anne for her finances. She did not have the financial ease to write off some of her accounting discrepancies. In the journal entry for 2 October for instance, Anne wrote she spent more than three hours over approximately fourteen pounds:

pothering over my accounts – added them up again & again – fancied I had lost 3 or 4 hundred francs – Found I had not entered in my book the 2 most expensive things I had [h[5] – – my shawl & new gown – the addition of these & what I ’have’ paid Cordingley (which I had forgotten) I had at last the satisfaction of discovering, set all right. (93)

Anne was not always able to spend much time on her accounting. She wrote in the letter of 8 to 12 September to Aunt Anne, ‘with one thing or other, I have only just had time to keep my accounts and journal’ (ML/146, 1). In terms of her material circumstances and the possibilities it afforded her, the account books were an important aspect and textual record of Anne’s history.

Anne recorded the process of her accounting, in all but one instance, in plain handwriting in the journal entries.¹ On 2 September, according to the journal entry, she brought her accounting up to date ‘to the end of my English money payments’ (68). The French accounting could begin. In September, Anne’s practice was to settle her accounting every few days.² ‘How tiresome the trouble I often have with my accounts – I must manage better’, she wrote on 2 October (93). However, Anne became absorbed in the courtship of Mrs. Barlow and the domestic drama with Mme. de Boyve. From October until mid January 1825, her accounting was irregular.³ It was not until Anne and Mrs. Barlow moved to 15 Quai Voltaire that Anne kept up with her account books.⁴ With the new residence came increased financial responsibilities. During these few months at 15 Quai Voltaire, Anne not only kept her own account books, but Mrs.

¹ The exception was 31 January, when Anne wrote, she ‘[b]egan my accounts when Mrs. B- c[a]m[ed]’ (234).
² For September accounts, see 2, 3, 8, 13, 14, 16 and 23 September (68, 69, 73, 77, 76[sic], 77[sic], 84).
³ For irregular accounts, see 2, 20 and 27 October, 10 November, 18 December and 9 January (93, 111, 118, 138, 192, 215).
⁴ For accounts after their removal, see 17 and 18 January (222, 223).
Barlow’s individual accounting, as well as the household finances. Anne’s financial responsibility for their domesticity, suggested a nice intimacy between the two gentlewomen and their communal house management. In February and early March, Anne finally brought her accounting from November, December and January up to date. In late March, she diligently worked on her account books to complete her French accounting prior to her departure. Anne was adept at managing and accounting for her own and other’s finances.

The accounting for the Paris period was located in three different books (AC/7; AC/8; AC/13). None of the account books evidenced any use of the crypt, although Anne employed plain hand abbreviations. The first of the account books for Paris was a travel expense book which began with Anne’s travel expenses in 1822 and continued until late 1825 (AC/7). All of her journeys were accounted for, including the 1824–25 Paris trip. The outlays for the Paris sojourn in the travel expense book AC/7 were covered in a few pages (71–77). Anne accounted for the exchange amounts and rates she got for her English money (AC/7, 71). She did not change a regular sum of money, but she did make an exchange transaction about once a month and noted the rates given by her money changer in Paris. Generally, Anne received about twenty five francs to a pound, with varying rates of commission (AC/7, 71). Sometimes she exchanged money with other Place Vendôme guests, like all of Mrs. MacKenzie’s French money before she returned to England (AC/7, 71). The travel expense book also contained accounts for the money she received from Aunt Anne and Uncle James for 1823 and 1824 (AC/7, 78–79). It was this money from her family which made the Paris trip possible through Anne’s frugal economising.

The daily accounting for Paris was kept in the second account book AC/8, which contained, Anne wrote, the ‘French account’ (AC/8, 1). ‘Daybook of 1825’, she called this account book in her travel expense book (AC/7, 77). She began the daybook on 30 August 1824 when she arrived at Calais (AC/8, 1). The French accounting continued

---

5 For Mrs. Barlow’s accounts, see 18 and 21 January (223, 225); and for the household accounts, see 27 February and 26 March (250, 266).
6 For catching up accounts from 15 November to 10 December, see 5 February (237); from 11 to 29 December, see 6 February (238); from 29 December to 18 January, see 8 February (238); from 22 to 27 January, see 16 February (243); and from 27 January to 15 February, see 2 March (251). Anne did not state when she completed bringing her accounts up to date. It was most likely during her next accounts session on 12 March (256).
7 For late March account keeping, see 22, 24, 25 and 26 March (262, 265, 266).
until 3 April, when Anne boarded the packet boat in Boulogne (AC/8, 1–48). However, the daybook continued for her expenditures for the rest of 1825 (AC/8, 49–74). Anne’s expenditures in Paris were accounted for in francs and centimes, with some of the account records written in French. Once she boarded the boat to return home, she reverted to accounting for her money in pounds, shillings and pence (AC/8, 49). The French accounting was kept as a running account, with expenditures divided into daily records [Figure 1]. Anne calculated the total at the bottom of each page, with the sum carried over to the next. Just as in the previous account book, she noted the rates and amounts of her money exchanges for 1824 and 1825 (AC/8, 26–27). These figures were the reverse of the totals in AC/7, for the daybook tabulated the French money she received, not the English money she paid. Anne also recorded the reconciliations and acquittals of all the French expenses for her trip (AC/8, 25–28). In total, Anne received in exchange 8333 francs, or about £333, and spent about 8311 francs, or about £332, during her Paris sojourn (AC/8, 26–28).

The last relevant account book for the Paris sojourn was Anne’s ‘Private Summary’, a ledger of general expenses and receipts (AC/13). It contained all of her French expenditure arranged in a two page spread for the annual accounting periods of 1824 and 1825 (AC/13, 15–18). She divided each year into twenty one types of expense by month [Figure 1]. The totals, by expense and by month, were in English and French currency, with an overall annual total in both pounds and francs. The most expensive months in Paris were December 1824 at approximately 1260 francs, and March 1825 at approximately 1995 francs (AC/13, 16, 18). The expense in December was partly due to the purchase of presents. March was an expensive month for it was when Anne did most of her purchasing for friends and family before she departed. In March, she settled her Paris accounting with the crafts and trades people she had commissioned to do work. The most expensive purchases in Paris were clothes at about 2024 francs, followed by her board of 1800 francs, and presents at about 1054 francs (AC/13, 15–18). English women’s fashions were, as costume historian Jane Ashelford stated, greatly informed by French aristocratic fashions (Ashelford 1996, 174). The particulars about Anne’s purchases of clothes and materials in Paris would make fascinating costume history.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditure Types</th>
<th>Expenditure Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(AC/13, 15–18)</td>
<td>(AC/8, 1–48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Clothes’</td>
<td>Purchase of material; made-to-order clothes; a shade; gloves; handkerchiefs; French iron for plaiting frills; stays; shoes; petticoat braces; sewing silk; percale for night caps; black silk bootlaces; black riband for Anne’s apron; cotton night cap; dressing gown alteration; black material for spencers and spencer lining.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Hair cutting &amp; dressing’</td>
<td>‘Hair dressing (spoiling)’ on 13 November (AC/8, 15).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Oil brushes combs’</td>
<td>Toothbrush, hair front, small sized hair curling paper.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Sundries’</td>
<td>Perhaps the ‘2 bunches of violets’ on 3 December (AC/8, 18).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Postage’</td>
<td>Letters received and sent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Parcels &amp; Porterage’</td>
<td>Money to servants for errands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Books’</td>
<td>French and Italian dictionaries and grammar books, the Journal des Débat, pamphlet ‘Le roi est mort’, or ‘The King is dead’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Instruction’</td>
<td>French lessons from Mme. Galvani.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Travelling Expenses’</td>
<td>Customs bills of duties, commissions on money exchanges, the trunk maker who packed Anne’s trunks for departure. Anne had eight pieces of luggage that weighed ‘115 Kilos’, noted due to the carriage charge on 31 March (AC/8, 46).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Sight seeing’</td>
<td>Tour of Chambre des Députés.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Servants’</td>
<td>New Year’s gift of money to the servants of 24 Place Vendôme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Amusements’</td>
<td>Spectacles at St. Cloud, concert at 18 rue Mt. Martin, Vaudeville theatre, the French Opera, Louvre modern paintings exhibition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Lost at cards &amp;c.’</td>
<td>Anne won about 10 francs playing cards at Place Vendôme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Carriage &amp; Chair Hire’</td>
<td>Hire of carriages, chairs and coaches.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Washing’</td>
<td>Weekly washing, soap, starch, soda for washing Anne’s drawers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Fruit’</td>
<td>[in the 1825 ledger this included ‘confectionery’ (AC/13, 18)] – Pears, peaches, Fontainebleau grapes, pastries, black raisins, dates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Medical Advice, medicine &amp; Baths’</td>
<td>M. Dupuytren, medicine from Planche the apothecary, tickets for the Bains Chinois baths, the purchase of a seringue à manivelle (a cranked syringe), laxative powder.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Board &amp; Lodging’</td>
<td>Board paid per month to M. de Boyve for Anne’s rooms at 24 Place Vendôme, housekeeping money at 15 Quai Voltaire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Wood’</td>
<td>Firewood for Anne’s rooms at Place Vendôme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Charity’</td>
<td>A poor girl who got a hired chair, a poor Italian known to Mme. Galvani.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Presents’</td>
<td>A bunch each of violets and roses for Jane’s birthday on 9 November (AC/8, 14); nacre thread windier for Marian; roses for Mme. de Boyve; repair of Mme. Galvani’s eye glasses; Galignani’s edition sixteen volumes octavo of Byron’s works ‘(containing the suppressed poems)’ for Mrs. Barlow on 31 December (AC/8, 24); artificial flowers and Marseilles preserved oranges for Isabella; shawls for Aunt Anne and Marian; a jewellery set for ‘M.P.L’, or Mariana, on 31 March (AC/8, 46).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Figure 1 Expenditure Types and Examples in the Account Books]
APPENDIX 5:  
Anne’s Writings in Paris 1824–25

These examples effectively illustrate the intertextuality of Anne’s writings. The journal entries for 7 and 8 December displayed the greatest range of textual marks, discussed in Chapter One (178–79) [Figure 1A]. Anne paginated each journal entry page (verso and recto). Each page typically contained the year and month. The pages were unlined. The first part of a journal entry was the marginal separator. The journal entry proper consisted of two parts – the marginal notes and journal entry text. The marginal notes typically included the day of the week, day of the month, and Anne’s rising and retiring times.

Anne summarised the contents of the journal entries into her index (index 12–13) [Figure 2A]. In the index margins, she included the date and marginal marks. The index proper contained the content, with the pages cross-referenced. Anne was reading the popular work *Voyage Autour De Ma Chambre* (1794), or *Voyage Around My Bedroom*, by Xavier de Maistre (1763–1852) on 7 and 8 December (178–79). Anne purchased the book on 4 December (174). It was recorded in the literary index, where she cross-referenced the page, with the title in the literary index text proper (index 3) [Figure 3A].

Anne posted a letter on 8 December (179). The posted letter was recorded in the summary of letters list (summary 1) [Figure 4A]. The summary consisted of three columns of information – the date and correspondent, to and from. According to the journal entry, Anne wrote the letter on 7 December (179). The letter was to Aunt Anne (ML/157) [Figure 5A]. The letters were written on a large sheet folded in half and written on three sides. On the last side, Anne wrote at the ends (top and bottom) and under the seal (right hand side). The last side, when folded with the flaps sealed together, formed the address panel.

On 8 December, Anne began her bathing medical treatment and purchased tickets for the Bains Chinois, or Chinese Baths (179). The purchase was recorded in the account book (AC/8, 19) [Figure 6A]. The private day book tabulated four columns of information – the date, expense and amount in French money of francs and centimes. She totalled her sums on each page, with the sum brought forward to the next page.

Transcriptions of the materials are included after each example [Figures B].
[Figure 1A Journal Entry 7–8 December (178–79)]
Figure 1A. Journal Entry 7–8 December (1787–90)
scrape with M. Chateavillard[sic] whose gay foppish character she described saying he might deny having succeeded in such a manner as to leave people to believe the contrary when I had said I liked not the conduct of Madame de B- to Mrs. B- I had merely noticed her way of thinking & insinuating she would marry anyone & her manner of saying none but she complained of the conduct of M. de Nappe allowing M. de Bellevue to call her senty[sic] ni touché &c. Miss H- said the reason of 'his &'

§§ M. de Nappe’s conduct to her might be that they had heard this but she never liked to say anything because it would be traced to M. de Cussy & might get him into scrapes I asked if M. de Cussy had told her this she said no I answered significantly you know it from some other quarter nearer home she could not deny this I know something of this perhaps you know it by the same means she acknowledged that she thought she did but she had promised never to name it it could do no good for Mrs. B- to 'k now it I promised to keep all this to myself & after a few nothings left Miss H- said the reason of his & M. de Nappe's conduct to her might be that they had heard this but she never liked to say anything because it would be traced to M. de Cussy & might get him into scrapes

§§ know it from some other quarter nearer home she could not deny this fait I I know something of this perhaps you know it by the same means she acknowledged that she thought she did but she had promised never to name it it could do no good for Mrs. B- to 'k now it I promised to keep all this to myself & after a few nothings left Miss H- & came to my room to breakfast found Mrs. B- here talked away telling her all the immaterial parts of our conversation Miss H-'s praise of her &c. so that without at all letting slip the material part she fancied I had told her all ~ Sat down to breakfast at 12 35/60 – Mrs. B- with me, till luncheon time (after 1) when Col. Gregory had called & sat about ¾ hour with Mrs. Cunliffe, & went to Mrs. B- in her room & brought her here at 2 40/60 – meant to have gone out, but it began to rain, & we chatted till 5 10/60 – Dinner at 6 – meant to have come upstairs before 8, but Melle. de S- played on the piano, & ‘thus’ kept me till after 9 – then came M. de Bellevue & 2 other gentlemen – meaning to wish good night bade Mme. Carbonier remember (she is to go on Thursday) laughing & saying she would do it longer than Melle. de S- She laughed & asked who, I thought, liked me most – Knowing she expected me to say Mrs. B-, I laughed & said Mme. de B- who overhearing her name inquired what I had said – I repeated it verbatim, adding that it was a little machanceté of mine – Pourquoi, said she, peut-être c’est vrai – no! said I, you do not like me so well as you did – why, said she? Because je ne vous aime pas à présent au ta‘nt que jetai d’abord – I had some days since told both Mme. Carbonier & Melle. de Sans, I meant to tell Mme. de B- this, but I saw they were both astonished; however, Mme. de B- asked me to explain – I said I would do dans le passage des Panoramas – when she went with me again chez le pâtissier – but she would know some reason she said I could not make her take those she could not like (hinting at Mrs. B-) I could not control her affections – I explained that the first reason was my astonishment to find she could suppose an English girl (Miss Vigors) could take her Mme. de B-’s pocket handkerchiefs & give them to Mme. Chenelle – She began to speak of Miss V- not quite favourably saying she was a person who had the nouvelle Heloise in her room, & spent her time in reading it – Here I stopt her by saying that was nothing – there was only one volume that was exceptionable – a little too warm – & ‘merely’ to read that was nothing – She then began to explain that she had merely ‘thought’ Miss V- had got the handkerchiefs by mistake from the wash, & therefore gave them ‘away’ in the hurry of leaving Paris, &c. &c. I said I did not like … the way in which she had spoken of M. de Nappe’s conduct to Mrs. B- &c. that she ‘Mrs. B-’ had told me many things by accident & all the story of Mr. Hancock the morning after Madame de B-’s mention of the name that I always put all things together & then judged which was right Madame de B- said she had him daily in her room ‘& gone shopping with him &’ had been with him six hours at a time & she wondered how I could defend such conduct I said the other ladies had had gentlemen in
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Events and Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Dec 1824  | Miss Harvey used to have M. de Cussy. Madame de B- said M. de Bellevue had allowed Mrs. B- & M. de B- were like amants. I said I disliked this little fellow exceedingly for all this. de Nappe no she declared he had not (by the way how could she know this) & have you never mentioned this story to anyone? no never! never! but t'ou me a moment after she 'so' unluckily let slip the name of Miss Harvey I taxed from her own word with having told her she said she had meant to 'say' Miss Lister & declared on her parole d'honneur she had never named it to Miss H- she would not on any account nor had she ever mentioned it but to me. I was unjust to change my opinion of her without cause. &c. &c. thought I to myself your word of honour cannot be worth much at this rate & we wished good night having already taken each other apart to whisper too much. Mrs. B- had gone off from the first & Miss H was just gone before it began. Mrs. B- went away a little before me & I left the drawing room at 10. & It immediately for into her own room, brought her away with me & she came & sat with me till 1 ½, with no interruption but our going to Mme. Carbonier for ¼ hour (Mrs. B- took her some needles), & we talked the matter over a little - Mrs. B-saying, that, tho' I would never allow it, she knew Mme. de B- had said much to me against her, & she knew what I had done was all out of kindness to her - she explained a little why she thought Mme. de B-capable of speaking against her - I said little or nothing, except oh! no! no! - by the way when I told Madame de B- I had not told Mr. [sic] B- what she had said & as I had promised I would not I would keep my promise to take care you never 'let her' find it out by implication. Mrs. B- asked what had passed between 'Madame' de B- & me I told her about Miss Viggor's & what very little else I could but studiously concealed the rest she says she is sure Madame de B- has said much against but I [have] promised not to tell & she will not ask me but she knows what she is capable of saying &c. &c. I parried all this as well as I could. Very fine day till between 3 & 4 p.m. then rain - ate very little at dinner today meaning to begin my meagre diet & rubbing with mercury &c. F. 60º. at 12 p.m. E. O. wrote 3 pages & the ends of a letter to my aunt to go tomorrow, & had just done it at 3 20/60 - then rubbed in the mercuria ointment three quarters 'hour.'

| Weds 8   | was just washed when a man brought me my new hat - sent for Mrs. B- got partly into bed again, & she sat by me about an hour - read her my letter to my aunt - finished dressing & went & breakfasted in Mrs. B-’s room at 12 ¼ - at 1 Cordingley took to the post office rue J. J. Rousseau, my letter to my aunt (Shibden) - said the plan I was to adopt was different from what I had done before - that it sounded well - would give me 'much' trouble - I was to take a warm bath every other day, - & be quite well in a month tho' this would probably be rather too [s]hor[t] a time - said my only anxiety was about Cordingley - I had thought of sending her home without me - Mrs. B-’s maid would do all I wanted - at 2 ½ Mrs. B- & I took Cordingley & went to the Bains Chinois - gave 15 francs for 6 tickets - single tickets 3 francs each - linen [ou]nd for this - there were baths at 30 sols but no linen was [ou]nd at this price - Mrs. B- promised [sic] to return in an hour - I got into my bath (28 degree Reaumur) at 3, staid in about 50 minutes - felt myself very comfortable in it, tho' rather cold than hot - dressed - walked back with Mrs. B- who had waited some time for me, & got home at 4 20/60 - She came & sat with me 20 minutes - Dinner at 5 ¼ - Left the drawing room at 8 35/60 - Mme. de B- going or gone to a party - nobody with us to night - had my hair curled - read a few pages of the Voyage autour de ma Chambre - Mrs. B- told me this morning she had paid a visit to Melle. de S- |
Mr. Hancock’s letter. Could live in Paris for how much Mme. de B- called Observations, unfavourable to her & the contrary to Mrs. B- I love virtue most but you next her good conduct observations upon my thus deceiving. (157–9).

about virtue as my mistress my tongue was her consolation stories I told her of being venerealized. All well at home address of the woman consulted M. Dupuytren connection with her surgeon for me to consult would not (162–3). 

most but you next her good conduct the contrary to Mrs. B- I love virtue as my mistress my tongue was her consolation stories I told her of being venerealized. All well at home address of the woman consulted M. Dupuytren connection with her surgeon for me to consult would not (162–3).

Called on Miss Middleton & Mrs. Cunliffe. Mrs. Heath called Mrs. B- with me. conversation about Madame de B- owned why I did not like her so well Melle. de S- played to me. (161).

All well at home address of the woman who works frills & very broad hemmed pocket handkerchiefs & one pair 104 francs. absolutely told Mrs. B- of being venerealized[sic] it was this was her consolation stories I told her. vid. never thought of indecency to her. (162–3).

surgeon for me to consult would not inveigle me wear their hair. (163–4).

afraid the surgeon should mention good pension at Tivoli were it anyone else she should dislike said she was married who gave it me the person I had infected the case was mistaken who gave it me & she only laughed would she excuse me the most speech of Mrs. B-’s. Modern stationery at the Louvre. M. Dupuytren his address called. Called on Mme. G- give up my § child for you about M- no further connection with her. (164–5).

consulted M. Dupuytren vid. the bottom of page 166 & top of 167 curious observations on the different pleasures of coition had no connection with other women he could not give me the whites see (p. 166.) – curious tales I told Mrs. B-. Party Sat with Melle. de S- Melle. de S- receives the Count P- & his fon[sic] in bed. Called on Mme. Carbonier half a mind to give her my promise if[sic] nurse me let me suck her. (165–8).

what pleasure sodomy could give. Called on Miss H-y, Couturière. the lady who venerealized[sic] me had any family said yes but that. Mme. Carbonier called M. de Ch the story about how told by Mrs. B- herself. vid. Called on Melle. de S- in bed with Mrs. B- I did not manage well till just a little at the last hand on her naked breast met Madame Ch in returning Mrs. B- was fine M. de B- let me pay him too much. (168–9).

Mme. G- paid me a visit Had my hair cut. Company Mrs. B- not quite well. with her my hand upon her breasts sucked so near that I shall manage if[t] I meant grumbling how I had found out Miss V- Mr. D- & Miss Marsh put herself forwards towards me would not dislike my sleeping with her in love with me. (169–70).

Called on Mme. Carbonier Saw the École de mosaique, & École vétérinaire. White “un Charlatan”. numbers of pupils & professors &c. Called on Miss Pope. Attention of M. de Glos to Mrs. B- Mrs. B-’s attachment to me. would allow her daughter a hundred a year (171–3).

Offered call on Mrs. C- & Miss H-Shopping with Mrs. B- her attachment is more & more apparent. the Cunliffes at Sir – Riddles when young Coll offered to Miss B-. (173).

you make me as bad as yourself more than ever before & I exceedingly so she loves me. Miss Pope went Execution of Mr. Fontleroy. much anxiety about you. (174).

Called on Mme. G-M. Dumano, her Greek pupil Anecdote of lady H. Stanhope anecdotes to Mrs. B- intrigued with three at the same time. Lou has refused Eust. Strickland Steph’s success & cleverness Watson’s match off, &c. worse & as to the compl. (175–6).

go to M. Dupuytren’s Planche the apothecary. Spoke to Mme. de B- for a more comfortable room for Cordingly took Mrs. B- with me for the medicine. Spent the evening at Mme. G-’s. She gave me de Parney’s poems. the character she has in Guernsey how strange to do such a thing for a friend. (176–7).

Called on Miss H- M. de Cussy her amant Madame de B- must have told her about M- B- & M. Chateauvillard. Called on Mrs. C- Told Mme. de B- I did not like

[Figure 2B Index 23 November – 23 December Transcript (index 12–13)]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Dec 1824  | Her, so well as at first. Explained why. her word of honour she never told Miss H-. (177–9).  
8 new satin hat. Bains Chinois – took my § first. she has heard &c. from Melle. de S- will leave the house make love most §§§ respectfully she is a virtuous woman comparison in her favour between her & M-. observations. on my complaint. (179–180).  
9 Mme. Carbonier left us – Length of her journey ¶ in what time would be performed – left us at 6, would arrive at § Neuchâtel on Sunday – about 500 miles §§ French, of course. my conduct at first was a regular system M- cannot claim two people. Mme. G- & M. Dumano, & another gentleman (de Lavèvre) spent the evening here. observations on M- she had § once behaved ill to me Mrs. B- hopes she shall never see her not on speaking terms with C- Miss H[ill] &c. denies knowing the affair about M. Chateauvillard my astonishment at this. (180–1).  
§ 10 Artificial flowers (best) at Nattier’s. IN-’s opinion of Miss Mc.L- & Miss Duffin – the former “rather below par” in point of abilities & reading!!! Called at §§ Mrs. Lees[s] [sic] Pension Pair of gold spectacles Had a bath Mrs. B- with me. §§ Grand discussion between Mrs. B- & me with Mme. de B- Mrs. B- determined to leave the house, &c. &c. kissed the nipple with only one fold &c. I could not bear your eyes that is to see her breast (182–4).  
11 Mrs. B- determined to leave this house. Went to the Topljts. see the fresco painting of the Cupola of Sainte Gènèviève. Went au Page, the best silk shop in Paris. More about Mrs. B-’s going Rate of exchange Soirée. Miss Morse. &c. &c. (184–5).  
12 very confidential about M-. Mme. de B-’s long interview with Mrs. B- made her doubt me for the moment Long observations on this subject my uncle & aunt quite satisfied. obs on finding Mrs. B- reading my journal. (185–7).  
13 Melle. de S-’s hysteric fit. ask my uncle to send me a remittance thro’ Mrs. B-’s agent Pension rue neuve des Augustins § no. 41 and ditto rue de la Paix no. 14. observations on both Mrs. B- & I sat with Mrs. C- her opinion against visiting.  

§§§§§ Mme. de B- partly what Mrs. B- said to her should go & sleep with her no objection observations on my health. (188–9).  
14 the packing man brought me. Observations § on myself we had a sort of lovers’ quarrel led to speak of my father’s being &c. &c. & my mother’s death Paire of rooms & bed rue neuve des Augustins no. 41 will not suit us. (189–90).  
15 Shall remain here 4 or 5 weeks longer § Mme. G- called she only meant to have felt friendship Observations Best optician in Paris. Cordingley had a bath she would give me up &c. does not much like M- vid. story of Miss Bagoud. General Whitelock, §§ lady Ousely, &c. Mrs. B- gave me a hair chain. (190).  
16 In bed all the day. Mme. G- called – Conversation about masters Melle. de S-called observations on Mrs. Barl. (191).  
17 Mme. de B- called & then Mme. G- five hundred franc bill again Mrs. B- with me. (191).  
18 Called on Mrs. Middleton went to M. Dupuytren Mme. G- called you tied me by the strongest of all ties & you are & must be my own. Arrival of Mr. Gladstones. (192).  
19 All well at home – the new cook very likely….. the child jealous Cordingley has told me she has begun &c. so that the medicine has answered in an agony with itching. Took my 6th. bath Dinner in bed. Mrs. & Miss B- came in the evening. (193).  
20 Mme. G- called Still afloat for an apartment Dined downstairs Observations on Mr. Gladstones & Miss Dalby. nipple to my mouth & sucked it. vid. § Observations on the Misses Canning & Morse – reputed fortune of the latter. (193–4).  
21 Mrs. Heath & Mme. G- called obs on Mrs. Barlow. (194).  
22 Mme. G- called warm bath in Mrs. B-’s room she let me grubble her I think I could do anything for you I once thought I could sleep with you now I find I could not told her almost all about Miss V-’ the King opened his parliament (195).  
23 Went out apartment hunting Rent & price § of furniture Mrs. B-’s aunt tomahawked by a party of american Indians Cozy evening the subject of Mrs. B-’s going, & Mme. de B- thoroughly talked over (196).  

[Figure 2B Index 23 November – 23 December Transcript (index 12–13)]
Figure 3A: Literary Index for Journal Pages 50–196 (index 3)
Hack horse from Mr. Carr. Drove my aunt to Bradford to meet M- Called at Lichtcliffe. Observations on Miss H- (27).

Mrs. W. P- & Miss H- called My thought of her chased away. Drove M- to Elld.br. the nature of the regard between Miss Macl & myself. My father & Marian drank tea with us. read her Miss Macl’s last letter & my answer to it. (28–9).

talked of Miss Vallance her stomach when she had spasms & rub queer too Drove M- to Haughend. she had not been so happy these eight years & would never kiss anyone else now he never came near her Mrs. Milne. Observations Saw M- off, taking her father & Mrs. M- to Parkgate. Confidential conversation with Mrs. B- about M- very decided. vid. [sic] Saw Mrs. B- off in the mail. Made. de. B-’s satisfactory answer to her inquiries about me. She is doubly anxious to know me. (30–31).

Bradford. Letter to Mrs. H. S. B- Bingley, Rumblesmoor, Ilkley. my aunt’s letter to Mr. Wiglesworth. Skipton – bad dinner. The servants have wages, & give what is given to them to the mistress. (31–2).

Breakfast at Giggleswick. My aunt goes to church there. The horses off their food. Stop at Settle. Walk about the town. (32–3).

Settle, Ingleton, Kendal. Roper’s hotel – Kirkby L- church monument to the memory of the 5 women servants that were burnt to death Casterton & Underley halls. Mr. Noel’s Stud. Kendal-castle. Preston Packet observations on the horses. (33–4).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Desc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>High heat, July 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>High heat, July 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Heat in town, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Heat in town, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Heat in town, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Heat in town, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Heat in town, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Heat in town, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Heat in town, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Heat in town, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Heat in town, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Heat in town, 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Heat in town, 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Heat in town, 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Heat in town, 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Heat in town, 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Heat in town, 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Heat in town, 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Heat in town, 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Heat in town, 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Heat in town, 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Heat in town, 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Heat in town, 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Heat in town, 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Heat in town, 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Heat in town, 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Heat in town, 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Heat in town, 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Heat in town, 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Heat in town, 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Heat in town, 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Heat in town, 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Heat in town, 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Heat in town, 30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Figure 4A Summary of Letters 21 June – 9 December (summary 1)]
## Continuation of the Summary of letters of 1824

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>From</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June 21</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td>Mrs. Belcombe</td>
<td>Miss Ust</td>
<td>Miss Marshall</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 29</td>
<td>Mrs. Belcombe</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Miss Vallance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Septem-ber 13</td>
<td>Miss Marsh</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-2</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Septem-ber 13</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-2</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-2</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-2</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-2</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-2</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-2</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-2</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-2</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-2</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-2</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-2</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-2</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-2</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-2</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-2</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-2</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-2</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-2</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-2</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-2</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-2</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-2</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-2</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-2</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-2</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-2</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-2</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-2</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-2</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-2</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-2</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-2</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-2</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-2</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-2</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-2</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-2</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-2</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-2</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-2</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-2</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-2</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-2</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-2</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-2</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-2</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-2</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-2</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-2</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-2</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-2</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-2</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-2</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-2</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-2</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-2</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-2</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-2</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-2</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-2</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-2</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-2</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-2</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-2</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-2</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Made de Boyve</td>
<td>Miss Maclean</td>
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you again. In truth we allow him to want to do all for me heart.

I cannot say much now but believe me, and know really till you begin to believe, you have not to small reason for the smallest disagreement about in every way - could you know half the kindness and attention of my friend but to - you and he quite shaped do not want a more, all the way think me anybody much the better for any thing worse like, known not a better - my only astonishment is really living me with enough to take in still interest and trouble for a person with whose acquaintance it has to show that you, time always finds me friends, and body help while always was so to value and deserve them - had a letter from barrica on having you which, blind it is sure the way now be in gods for - by will write in a few his stay your for sample - but from where more to time before taking my boat - must indeed write else it would a help for me to write them, part of writing gone day to day, in the hope of telling them this day away leaving here not the wonder what from there - how that I cannot go not suit to much as usual, I feel a little more idle and have
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besides, little joy for myself - the great calamity seems that pride

minute has been lighter - not for sure - but instead has been a

kindred spirit. Also the whole

cess of my Fountain - it will not perhaps occur, nor any long

little as if one lived at a place first known, perhaps our first

able to form a few hundred calamities, all give act

the need result in England - How different it is now - further the

lying the people are sitting in the middle garden in the

been broken - the most beautiful flowers are true in baskets over

flowers - tell bunches of pinks are everywhere. The red and

the mouth and flowers the rose, jumle, convolvulus, and so on

con have little remarkable flowers, but there are some on

eating them, and that I wish at all - I begin to see

tells me, not much apparent difference, but the middle

been in January or in which - any chance so it coming

is again the gentleman's estate, are missing, the the head's ind

my summer object - How, so far as I am going this again,

but believe usually Clews has appointed at school, and

regardled by 75 - if I can locate the constitution must be

I have, the chances of my continued life must be small - May 4
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Dear Aunt Anne,

I have a request, if you would be so kind as to indulge me. My father and my uncle, and Marian and both of your daughters, that you did any of you yet get much more comfortable than you have been continued this winter. It is certainly more so in climate and health, and must come round to the opinion that the French ladies, as with some taste, in the English, but after all, England for ever! Hope perfectly.

Yours truly,
[Signature]
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I really could not write, my dear aunt, by yesterday’s post – I was detained so long, I could not get back in time to write even half a dozen lines – You will of course be anxious to hear the result – the advice is very different from that I have had given before, and, at least, sounds better – I am to leave off what I have hitherto tried, and adopt a new system – the whys and wherefores I shall not think of attempting to explain till my return home – the plan will give me a great deal of trouble – I am to take a warm bath for an hour every other day, &c. &c. but I find it is time to do something decided; and I only hope you and my uncle will be satisfied that I am judging wisely – say the best you can to my father and Marian – tell them my anxiety to improve myself in French – And do ‘not’, my dear aunt, even fidget yourself for one moment – I do assure you, I have not been in such good spirits these three years, and have nothing to say that is not satisfactory – I am told to take a month – All things considered, this seems hardly enough; but it is impossible to say as yet – my only anxiety is about Cordingley – Perhaps I may send her back; for I can do quite well without her – But I shall do nothing till I hear from you again – Mrs. Barlow will allow her servant to do all for me I want – I cannot say much now; but believe me, (and I would really tell you truly, were it otherwise) you have not the smallest reason for the smallest disquietude about me, in any way – Could you know half the kindness and attention of my friend Mrs. B-, you would be quite satisfied – I do not want a nurse, – all the party think me looking much the better for my stay here, – but if I did, I know not a better – my only astonishment is at her liking me well enough to take so much interest and trouble for a person with whom her acquaintance has been so short – But my good fortune always finds me friends; and I only hope I shall always know how to value and deserve them – I had a letter from Mariana on Sunday, from which, I find, it is probable, she may now be in York for ten days – I will write her a few lines by tomorrow’s post, if possible, but fear I shall not have time before taking my bath – I must indeed write to her, to Isabella, & Miss Mc.L-, to all of whom I have put off writing from day to day, in the hope of telling them the day of my leaving here – they will wonder what I am about – Now that I cannot go out quite so much as usual, I feel a little more idlj[e]; and have, besides, little to say for myself – I see from Galignani’s paper, that York Minster has...
been lighted with gas; and that Lord Middleton has built a handsome Gothic Church at Birdsale – I have read, too, the whole account of Mr. Fauntleroy, &c. &c. but, as to what occurs here, one knows as little as if one lived at Johnny Groat’s house, unless one goes out, and reads the journals – You, Mariana, Galignani, – all give accounts of the bad weather in England – How different it is here! Yesterday, and Sunday, the people were sitting in the Tuileries Gardens, as tho’ it had been summer – the most beautiful flowers are sold in bouquets at all the flower-stalls, bunches of violets are everywhere to be had, and the marché aux fleurs is rich in roses, pinks, carnations, &c. &c. we have still remarkably “fine” grapes – but I have now given up eating them, and take no fruit at all – By the way, M- tells me, with much apparent satisfaction, that the match between Watson and John is broken off, without any chance of its coming on again – the gentleman’s estates are minus, and the lady’s friends very prudently object – It seems, Dr. Belcombe has been very ill again, but Steph’s exceeding cleverness has astonished Mr. Edward Wallis, and recovered his Dr. B- I should fear, however, the constitution must be so shaken, the chances of long continued life must be small – I long to hear a repetition of the good accounts of my father, and my uncle, and Marian, and better of your rheumatism – That you should any of you get out much, must be impossible when you have such continued bad weather – The Parisians certainly excell us in climate; and perhaps one must come round to the opinion that the French ladies dress with more taste, than the English: but, after all, England for ever! I am perfectly satisfied while I am here; but nothing should induce me to live here, or live anywhere abroad, always – our manners, our ideas are so different from the French, I can understand anything better than the frequent intermarriages between the two nations – Many of our compatriotes are flocking here for the winter; and balls and suppers grow apace – Cordingley is well, and sends her duty – Do not mind writing me a long letter, but write as soon as you can – I am very anxious to hear from you again – my best love to you all – ever, my dear aunt, most affectionately yours, AL-

[address panel] received Monday December 13th. assured Tuesday December 14th. 1824
Miss Lister
Shibden-hall Halifax
Yorkshire
Angleterre

[Figure 5B Letter to Aunt Anne 7 December Transcript (ML/157, 1–4)]
[Figure 6A Private Day Book 6–10 December (AC/8, 19)]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Francs</th>
<th>centimes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>Brought over……</td>
<td>2411</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fiacre to Mme. Galvani’s (&amp; chez Planche on my account) à l’heure 2 francs of which</td>
<td>}</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mrs. B- paid 16 sols</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Last week’s washing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>To Cordingley for 3 small loaves for herself 6 sols and a something for her luncheon the other day 4 sols</td>
<td>}</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>To the porter’s wife for a letter from Miss Maclean the 19th. ult. 26 sols and for a letter from M- Sunday the 5th. inst. 36 sols</td>
<td>}</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My ½ share of our fiacre on Monday from Mme. Galvani’s 16 sols and of our commission to the porter for getting the fiacre &amp; coming with it 15 sols</td>
<td>}</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Six bath-tickets at the Bains Chinois</td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To the bath-woman in attendance for herself</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>To Mme. Galvani for the black satin bonnet she has been good enough to get me Bath-woman in attendance for herself</td>
<td>}</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pair of black satin shoes</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Letter from I.N. (Langton)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2477</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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