

John Cleland's *The Dictionary of Love*:
An XML Edition

Emily K. Davis

Thesis submitted to the Faculty of the Virginia
Polytechnic Institute and State University in partial
fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts
in
English

David Radcliffe, Chair
Daniel Mosser
Carlos Evia

April 27, 2007
Blacksburg, Virginia

Keywords: Dictionary, Love, Cleland, XML, Digital
Humanities, Sociolinguistics

Copyright 2007, Emily K. Davis

John Cleland's *The Dictionary of Love*: An XML Edition

Emily K. Davis

(ABSTRACT)

Conducting and disseminating humanities research is fast becoming a highly technological endeavor. The variety of multimedia options for presenting information changes the questions we ask and the answers we find as well as the problems we encounter and the solutions we devise. The following essays provide an account of creating a digital edition of John Cleland's *The Dictionary of Love* using XML.

The project utilizes traditional literary research methods while working toward an untraditional digital final product, a characteristic that highlights the feedback loop between form and function. Thus, the purpose of this project is twofold: to provide students and scholars information and analysis on *The Dictionary of Love* and, in the process, to examine and discuss the challenges, drawbacks and benefits of producing the content as a web-compatible resource.

Table of Contents

Author's Acknowledgments	v
Forward	vi
Chapter 1: About the Project	
The 'Why?' and 'How?' of Constructing a Digital Resource	1-8
Questions and Challenges	9-14
Chapter 2: Publication History of <i>The Dictionary of Love</i>	15-19
Chapter 3: Analysis	
<i>The Dictionary of Love</i> and Language in Richardson's Pamela	20-23
Literary Examples	24-30
Appendix A: Biography of John Cleland	31-33
Appendix B: Biography of Ralph Griffiths	34-36
Appendix C: Biography of J. F. Dreux du Radier	37
Appendix D: XML Tags	38-40
Works Cited	41-44
Curriculum Vitae	45

To Russell

Author's Acknowledgments

Foremost, I would like to thank my parents, Dwight and Holly Davis, for their love, support, and encouragement in this enterprise, and in every other thing.

I am also grateful to my committee for their patience and guidance throughout this process, and to Dr. Radcliffe, especially, for his tireless enthusiasm for the project and his confidence in my ability to succeed.

Finally, I am greatly indebted to Terri Whaling, whose efforts on my behalf went above and beyond her responsibilities and made it possible for me to be in two places at once.

Forward

This collection of essays describes the process of digitizing John Cleland's translation of *The Dictionary of Love* (1753). The project involved transcribing the dictionary as well as the variations found in subsequent editions, using XML (eXtensible Markup Language) to encode the text and to add annotations, and then transforming the XML files into web-compatible HTML (Hypertext Markup Language). The first two sections of this document detail why the DOL is an appropriate choice for a digital resource and what issues and challenges I faced while working on this project. These essays appear on the website under 'About the Project.'

The following sections make up the interpretive aspect of the project: they include a brief piece on the publication history of the DOL as well as two essays designed to highlight the possibilities of using the DOL as a resource when examining eighteenth-century literature and culture. Users can access this information on the website under 'Analysis' and 'Literary Examples.' The appendices include biographies of the original author, the translator and the publisher of the DOL and a list of the XML tags used to mark-up the text.

Please note that any terms in bold-face do not represent emphasis in the original work; rather, they indicate words that will become links to the definition pages in the final digital product. All italicized words or phrases, excluding titles, reflect the emphasis in the original work.

The following is a list of acronyms used throughout the essays. For clarity and efficiency's sake, I will only use the acronyms from this point forward:

SGML – Standard Generalized Markup Language
XML – eXtensible Markup Language
DTD – Document Type Definition
XSLT – eXtensible Stylesheet Language Transformation
XSL – eXtensible Stylesheet Language
XSL-FO – eXtensible Stylesheet Language- Formatting Objects
CSS – Cascading Style Sheets
HTML – Hypertext Markup Language
XHTML- eXtensible Hypertext Markup Language

About the Project: The 'Why?' and 'How?' of Constructing a Digital Resource

Presenting the Dictionary of Love as a Digital Text using XML

In his *Introduction to the Harleian Miscellany* (1744) Samuel Johnson argues that "small tracts and fugitive pieces" are as requisite to understanding a people as are great works of literature:

From pamphlets, consequently, are to be learned the progress of every debate; the various state to which the questions have been changed; the artifices and fallacies which have been used, and the subterfuges by which reason has been eluded: in such writings may be seen how the mind has been opened by degrees, how one truth has led to another, how error has been disentangled, and hints improved to demonstration, which pleasure, and many others, are lost by him that only reads the larger writers, by whom these scattered sentiments are collected, who will see none of the changes of fortune which every opinion has passed through. (242)

The *Dictionary of Love* is one such example: it records obscure information about manners and linguistic usage that prove very useful for interpreting eighteenth-century plays, novels, and essays. Furthermore, as a digital publication rather than a printed volume, it makes information much more accessible and formats it in ways more useful for modern students.

In an essay published in 1996, Peter Shillingsburg argues that traditional scholarly editions, that is, those in codex form, have failed to "[revolutionize] literary criticism and ...do not fulfill the needs or desires of the cognoscente..." (24). He writes that the most obvious advantage of printed editions over electronic ones—that "they can be read by the unassisted naked eye"—cannot compensate for the more comprehensive research possibilities offered by digital compilations (24). Although, technologically speaking, anything ten years old is considered obsolete, Shillingsburg's analysis of the functions and benefits of the electronic edition is still apposite, and I begin my justification for producing a digital edition of *The Dictionary of Love* (1753) here.

This project is a resource for studying eighteenth-century English gender roles and courtship rituals and guidelines. I am not merely presenting a text to be examined on its own, but a work of reference used for reading. The digital medium is particularly useful for presenting reference works like dictionaries and encyclopedias, since it encourages users to, as Shillingsburg puts it, "copy parts and react to parts, and to reconfigure parts, and to leave our two cents' worth in the margins for the benefit of posterity" (29).

An electronic edition is more accessible than a book in a library. The *DOL* and its subsequent editions are not available as reprinted books. Copies are only available on microfilm in several university libraries or in rare books collections. Microfilm provides a relatively primitive scanning and viewing apparatus and special collections understandably have numerous restrictions on the handling of their materials. C. M. Sperberg-McQueen points out, in his rationalization for the use of a standardized markup

language, that "scholarship is materially easier when we can have both books [editions] out on our desk at the same time for direct comparison" (57). He recalls the past practice of "libraries...chain[ing] books to the shelves" to illustrate the problems of working with digital editions that are technologically incompatible with one another (57). The *DOL* is not even comparable to a book chained to a shelf; it is in fact more difficult to find and less convenient to study, having never achieved a modern-day reprinting. It seems that an electronic edition is now the most viable option for publishing this text.

Printed editions, which can contain several volumes, are frequently cumbersome and expensive, and even the largest and costliest tome may not include all of the relevant scholarship associated with a particular text. The substantial monetary and time investments necessary to produce such editions often discourage their publication at anything more frequent than ten-year intervals (Sperberg-McQueen 46). Hence, "our libraries are full of current editions twenty-five, fifty, or one hundred years old, and of editions even older which continue to be consulted although no longer current" (Sperberg-McQueen 46). The work of preparing a digital edition is typically an ongoing process that continues even after publication; in what follows I describe the initial steps taken to put the *DOL* online in a form useful for students of eighteenth-century literature.

Even a cursory examination of text encoding schemes and webpage layout guidelines reveals a number of options for creating a digital edition. Among these, SGML has become the customary encoding mechanism in humanities research.

Sperberg-McQueen succinctly describes the benefits of this language: "the structure of SGML markup makes it possible for markup to become much more elaborate and subtle, without overwhelming the ability of either software or users to deal with the complexity" (56). An SGML-based editor permits users to define element tags that parse the text according to the types of analysis they wish to do or expect other users to do. In Hockey's words, SGML markup is "descriptive," and it allows programs to perform "functions, such as indexing, searching, printing and hypertext linking" on the semantically encoded text (33). Users can essentially customize their searches in digital text based on their research goals; many different applications can be carried out a single encoded file without altering that file (Hockey 33). SGML files also require a DTD, which provides a description of the elements and their attributes and indicates how all of the elements are related. Moreover, the DTD provides instruction about how to organize the SGML files; otherwise, the files are just pieces of data that do not inherently suggest any particular relationship or convey any clear information (Hockey 34-35). This organization is represented by how the tags are nested, or hierarchically arranged, and is not necessarily pre-determined. In short, the SGML schema puts nearly all of the decisions—from creating and arranging the tags to deciding how that information should appear on a webpage—into the hands of the encoder.

My project utilizes XML, a subset of SGML. XML developed largely as a result of the work done on the Text Encoding Initiative (TEI), a project that aims to develop encoding guidelines, in the form of DTDs and tag sets, for digital humanities research (Short 17). The first version of XML approved by the World Wide Web Consortium in 1998 suggested that it would also revolutionize data organization and representation in the mathematical and scientific fields (Mackenzie, Sikorski & Peters). XML is not only a technical means for disseminating documents; in many applications it is a tool for analyzing the information contained in documents. One could argue that XML's primary

contribution is not related to computer science as much as it is to general critical thinking. It is an example of what Rockwell describes as "this intellectual process of iteratively trying questions and adapting tools to help us ask new questions" (211). Short's prediction for XML also reflects this sentiment:

As the wider XML 'revolution' gathers pace, there are signs that some of the long-term significance of the TEI will be related to XML, and the opportunities it is starting to bring to textual scholarship, not only in burgeoning quantities of encoded texts...but also in the development of new tools to exploit them. (17)

Thus, XML provides a flexible structure that users can optimize based on their research needs and a clear syntax that computers can understand and process. After choosing to use XML, the next step was to develop a tag set that would emphasize the pertinent elements of the DOL and create a foundation for putting it on the Web.

Parsing the Text of the Dictionary of Love using XML Tags

Escaping the "pre-defined tag sets" (Hockey 33) of markup languages like HTML is extremely advantageous because it allows for editors to customize their tags based on the text and on what elements of the text they wish to highlight. However, the tags must still be arranged hierarchically, and balancing the issues of accurately representing the text, analyzing that text and creating a manageable, consistent tag set can be challenging.

I began by noting the broadest descriptions of the elements I wanted to encode: the *main entry*, which includes the word being defined, the *definition* and the *analysis* based on that definition. At the most basic level, every record in the XML file would include the entry number (<number>) and the main word of the dictionary entry (<mainword>). The next step was to decide what format or content related aspects of the entry I wanted to highlight. In making this decision, I considered who my audience was likely to be and what types of analysis the text might be useful for.

Students studying the literature or the courtship history of eighteenth-century England are my primary audience. I also concluded that sociolinguists and lexicographers might find the dictionary an interesting document for the study of language and gender and semantic development.

With these potential users in mind, I attempted to choose tags to be nested within the *definition* element that would facilitate various analyses of the text. For example, these tags would encode dialogue, sub-terms and sub-definitions, proper names, uses of foreign language phrases and uses of the main word in an exemplary context. Once the information was coded, users could search for relevant entries without having to scroll through a long document. Choosing the elements to be nested under the main *analysis* tag (<analysis>) was simpler because the tags did not have to correspond to an exact feature of the printed text; rather, these tags would contain pieces of information that I supplied.

The tags originally included <gender>, <pos> (part of speech of the main word) and <courtshipstage>. For example, as defined by my DTD, the content of the <gender> tag can be 'male' or 'female.' The <courtshipstage> tag is further divided into the segments <starting>, <negotiating> and <outcome>, each of which has three possible choices:

starting (meeting, wooing, flattering); negotiating (dating, conflict, jealousy); and outcome (marriage, sex, breakup). For example, 'difficulties' is defined as follows:

They are the zest of a passion, that would often flatten, languish, and die without them. They are like hills, and tufts of trees, interspersed in a country, that interrupt the prospect, only to make it the more agreeable.

In the <courtshipstage> tag this entry might be represented like this: <courtshipstage><negotiating>conflict</negotiating></courtshipstage>. Users could then bring up all the entries that dealt with negotiating or, more specifically, with conflict. Also included under the <analysis> element are the <index>, <litex> (contemporary literary example), <comment> and <variation> (between editions) tags, which allow me to include additional information that may be useful in understanding or searching for entries.

Other tags that do not nest within the <definition> or the <analysis> element include <syn> (synonym), <explanation>, <maxim> and <reference>. These elements contain information that is found, as I perceive it, outside of the body of the definition. For example, in the header, the main word 'forsake' is followed by the phrase "to quit, leave, desert, cast off," after which the definition of the word begins. To accommodate this header information consistently, I chose to eliminate most of the function words used in this context and encode each word as a separate synonym. The code for this entry would look like this:

```
<mainword>forsake</mainword>
<syn>quit</syn>
<syn>leave</syn>
<syn>desert</syn>
<syn>cast off</syn>
(start <definition> tag here)
```

The final example shows how the <reference> tag functions:

```
<mainword>lovely</mainword>
<reference>
<instruction>see</instruction>
<word>amiable</word>
</reference>
```

In addition to the semantic tags, I also included several basic formatting tags to indicate paragraphs, emphasis and lists. These can occur within either the <definition> or the <analysis> elements. Such tags reflect the formatting of the original document, but they can also be used to reformat the information on a webpage by substituting HTML code for the XML tags.

In the process of marking up the text, I discovered that certain tags or arrangements would not work and must therefore be edited or sometimes removed altogether. Many of

the necessary changes involved rewriting code to allow a term to have more than one entry for analytical elements like <pos> or <courtshipstage>.

For instance, the definition of the term "To Adore" might qualify, depending on the reader's interpretation, as an example of 'flattering' or 'wooing' or both, within the <courtshipstage> tag:

This sacred word is adopted into the love-language, and proves two things.

First, That the men are perfectly knowing, and acquainted with the vanity of women, who are apt to take themselves for little goddesses, or at least divine creatures.

The Second, That they are not sparing for any expressions they thing may make them lose the small share of sense their vanity may have left them.

I love: love did I say? I adore you! The true meaning of which fine speech is, "The secret of pleasing consists in flattering your self-love, at the expence of your understanding. I am straining hard to persuade you, that you have distracted my brain; not that it is so in the least; but, whilst I laugh at you in my sleeve, for your swallowing this stuff, I may gain wherewith to laugh at you in good earnest.

I therefore adjusted the DTD to allow the <courtshipstage> elements to occur more than once so that the tags could contain two or more stages. The code now reads:

```
<!ELEMENT courtshipstage (#PCDATA | starting | negotiating | outcome)*>
<!ELEMENT starting (meeting | wooing | flattering)*>
<!ELEMENT negotiating (dating | conflict | rivalry)*>
<!ELEMENT outcome (marriage | sex | breakup)*>
```

The asterisks indicate that the <courtshipstage> element can contain zero or more occurrences of the 'starting,' 'negotiating,' and 'outcome' data and that, subsequently, each of those elements can contain zero or more occurrences of the data listed within their corresponding parentheses.

It also became clear that some of the analytical categories would benefit from having expanded tags that included more specific details about that particular element. Within the <pos> tag, for example, I nested additional elements to describe, if the term was a noun, whether it was a person, emotion, behavior or thing. This would allow users to search only for, say, emotions, rather than having to pull up all the nouns and sift through them. Entries like 'Caprice,' 'Declaration' and 'Haughtiness' might be designated <pos><noun>behavior</noun></pos>; 'Delicacy,' 'Lust' and 'Zeal' may be represented as <pos><noun>emotion</noun></pos>, and so forth.

I rejected several tag ideas because they would almost certainly have been too obscure or specific to be useful. For example, attempting to encode the text using such tags, including <actor> and <acted on>, which would have gone within <pos><verb></verb></pos> and would have contained the content 'male,' 'female' or 'both,' called their utility into question: since there was no question of homosexuality in the *DOL*, at least as far as I have discovered, noting the gender of the participants in an exchange did not need to be a priority. Although it may be worthwhile to revisit this idea in the future, it was not a fundamental enough distinction to warrant being included in the first draft of this project. Moreover, the purpose of the tag was not lucid, and it is

unlikely, in this case, that most people would have thought to search by the same terms that I used to encode. In short, these tags were neither functional nor universal enough to make the first cut.

Putting the Document on the Web

The last major stage of creating a website with XML involves using the transformative language, XSL. XSLTs act on XML files the way CSS act on HTML encoded material. All of the webpages on the World Wide Web are written in some form of HTML. Unlike XML, however, HTML uses predefined tags, and is therefore inappropriate for analytical purposes. An XSLT translates XML files into XHTML, which is based on the more strict syntax rules of XML, but shares the tags of HTML, thus allowing the document to be displayed as a webpage.

According to the W3C (World Wide Web Consortium) XSL is made up of three parts: XSLT, a language used to transform XML to XHTML; XPath, a language used to sort through elements and attributes in an XML document; and XSL-FO, a language used to format XML, which I am not using in the project.

The basic individual letter pages display a simple table with each word and definition on one row, in two different columns; however, I would like to modify that to display the entries more like they appear in the printed text. That is, I would like to list the main word and have the list of synonyms, maxims, explanations or phrases follow underneath with the definition coming last, in a vertical arrangement. Additionally, I would like to include a link, where appropriate, to take the user to the variations among editions. Some words do not change from edition to edition.

Here is an example of the code for a page that displays, in a table, all of the terms that begin with the letter 'B' and their definitions:

```
<?xml version="1.0" encoding="ISO-8859-1"?><!--
DWXMLSource="AllWordsCode.xml" --> <xsl:stylesheet version="1.0"
xmlns:xsl="http://www.w3.org/1999/XSL/Transform">

<xsl:template name="BPage" match="/dictionary">
<html>
<head>
<title>DOL Entries "B"</title>
</head>
<body>

<div align="justify" id="header">
<h1><font size="+4" color="#CC0000">"B"</font></h1>
</div>

<div>
<table width="600" border="1">
<tr>
<th>Entry</th>
```

```

<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
<xsl:apply-templates select="record"/>
</table>
</div>
</body>
</html>

</xsl:template>

<xsl:template match="record">
<xsl:if test="starts-with(mainword, 'B')">
<tr>
<td><xsl:value-of select="mainword"/></td>
<td><xsl:value-of select="definition"/></td>
</tr>
</xsl:if>
</xsl:template>
</xsl:stylesheet>

```

Tags such as `<xsl:template>` and `<xsl:value of>` are examples of the XSLT component of XSL. The element `<xsl:template>` is fairly self-explanatory: its content describes how the XML code is to be represented in XHTML. As always in XML, it is all about nesting tags. For example, this template says that below the page heading, the body of the page should include a table that has two columns, one for the 'Entry' or dictionary term and one for the term's 'Definition.' Because all of the information is already recorded and encoded in the XML document, it is only necessary to direct the browser to it; it does not need to be written out again here. Thus, the code states that the content for the table is a template that pulls out all the information from the `<record>` tag in the XML file (`<xsl:apply-templates select="record"/>`).

Then, however, the coder must further specify what the "record" template is supposed to include. The attribute 'match' indicates which tag the template refers to: here again, the template to be nested within the main page is `<xsl:template match="record">`. For this page, I only wanted to list the 'B' terms, so the code indicates that, out of all the records in the XML file, for this particular template, it should only show those whose `<mainword>` entry begins with the letter 'B': `<xsl:if test="starts-with(mainword 'B')">`. Then, for each record that meets this criterion, the browser should pull the "mainword" entry and the "definition" entry and format them in a table:

```

<tr>
<td><xsl:value-of select="mainword"/></td>
<td><xsl:value-of select="definition"/></td>
</tr>

```

The way that the information is written in the `<xsl:>` tags illustrates XPath expressions. For example, the first line of code, after attaching the XML file and giving

the XSL declaration, is `<xsl:template name="BPage" match="/dictionary">`. The backslash before 'dictionary' tells the browser that in this template, everything is going to be specified from, or follow, the root element 'dictionary.' This is an example of an absolute path. If there is no backslash, as in the tag `<xsl:template match="record">`, it is a relative path, and it says, basically, that this template starts at the node with this name (i.e. "record"), not at the root of the document. In this way, XPath expressions tell the browser where to find information: they follow the hierarchy of the XML document (as laid out in the DTD) and map a "path" based on how the elements are nested and arranged.

The analytical elements will essentially serve as index terms, and the homepage will contain a menu from which users can choose part of speech, courtship stage, literary example, etc. For example, if a user chooses 'wooing' from the courtship stage menu, he will be taken to a list of linked terms that fall into that category. From there, they can navigate to each of the terms. Additionally, the homepage will contain links to the interpretive essays about the dictionary and the project. Any term from the *DOL* that appears in the essays will be linked so that users can select it and see the entry.

Although my website at present is very basic, more detailed XSLTs, and later CSS, can be used to create stylistically sophisticated pages that focus as much on design as they do on content. I am still in the process of deciding how to present the analytical content of the XML document, such as the textual variations, parts of speech and literary examples. In the coming months, I will experiment with various fonts, page layouts, graphics and other web-design features to create a web resource that I hope provides useful material in an engaging and dynamic fashion.

About the Project: Questions and Challenges

Phase I

The goal of this project is to make *The Dictionary of Love* (1753) accessible online for anyone who might find its content or its history useful or interesting. Although the analysis and annotations anticipate an audience of English-literature students, eighteenth-century scholars, sociolinguists and lexicographers and even the curious layperson should have no trouble navigating the site and will ideally find it a worthwhile and entertaining discovery.

I first ran across the *DOL* in the *English Short Title Catalogue* while researching more traditional eighteenth-century dictionaries. At the time, aside from several original editions in rare book collections across the United States and Britain, it was only available on microfilm and as a digital facsimile in Thomson-Gale's proprietary database *Eighteenth Century Collections Online*.

Rather than put another facsimile on the Web, my intention was to produce an annotated transcript with variant readings from the several English editions of the work that appeared in the later half of the eighteenth century. Upon discussing the nature of the text and the goals of the project with my committee, we determined that eXtensible Markup Language (XML) would be the most advantageous means of putting the *DOL* on the web. I began by drafting a skeletal methodology that laid out which encoding scheme I would use and which textual features I would highlight.

My plan was to use XML to encode the text, parsing the terms and definitions to identify various linguistic elements and appending to each entry explanatory comments such as examples from contemporary literature and variations of the entry in subsequent editions. In addition to the transcription and annotations of the text, the final project would also include several essays that detailed the publication history of the dictionary and its place in eighteenth-century courtship conventions, and examined its sociolinguistic and literary implications. All of this information would be displayed on a website by using XSLT to convert the XML files to web-compatible XHTML.

I immersed myself in XML and began to develop familiarity with the syntax I would be using to encode the text of the *DOL*. Initially, I used online research to teach myself how to use XML, testing sections of code as I went along. The primary advantage of using XML instead of another mark-up language, such as HTML, is that it allows the user to define tags according to the specific needs of the project.

This freedom can be daunting, however, and with it comes a greater potential for making ineffective choices, analytical oversights and time-consuming errors in coding. Almost as soon as I commenced working, I discovered that my initial proposal was an inadequate blueprint for this project: sparse and lacking in specifics, it provided no clear instruction for accomplishing the goal it outlined. Before I could begin coding, I needed to determine which aspects of the text required annotation and which elements of the text needed to be tagged. Furthermore, I need to figure out how to create a workable hierarchy, one that would account for all the information but would arrange it in a uniform way that would be easy to navigate and manipulate later. This was the first of many stumbling blocks.

Phase II

Overcoming this first hurdle required that I reevaluate the plan and reestablish, in more specific terms, what the final project needed to include and how it should work. However, coming up with a new plan was not so much a matter of creating a correct foundation as it was a matter of simply choosing a different direction and striking out; trial and error was often the name of the game.

The revised first step, then, became to devise a tag set that would aid potential users in their intellectual pursuits, a task that necessitated at least a basic understanding of the audiences' fields of knowledge. Therefore, time not devoted to studying coding rules and practices was spent looking for the answers to questions about eighteenth-century culture and the *DOL* itself: Who first translated the dictionary into English and who was the target audience? How do the editions differ from each other and what do those differences imply about changing societal or literary ideas? How were the dictionaries used or received when they were originally published?

Based on the answers I found to these questions—or on the further questions that these queries unearthed—I could begin creating a tag set. Not having done much literary research on the document at this point, the first tags I created focused on basic linguistic and formatting elements: parts of speech, proper names, dialogue, synonyms, etc. As I progressed, I began to create analytical tags that added information to or commented on the entries rather than simply encoding what was there. Some of the tags included in this initial brainstorm were courtship stage, gender, slang vs. standard language, emotional state, and style height of the word. Clearly, some of the tags overlapped, as far as what information they were encoding. For example, slang vs. standard language and style height were two versions of the same element; however, using the former element only allowed a binary interpretation whereas applying the latter element opened up a wider range of possibilities.

A wider range, however, was not always desirable. Many of the analytical tags never made it into the final document because they were too broad or ambiguous to be useful. The tag <gender>, for example, became confusing to use, because it referred to different things for different parts of speech and even varied among words within the same part of speech: nouns referring to people (e.g., coquette, fop, beau) were usually straightforward enough; however, the word 'fribble' threw a monkey wrench into even this most basic application:

Fribble: This word signifies one of those ambiguous animals, who are neither male nor female; disclaimed by his own sex, and the scorn of both....

Additionally, tagging nouns that referred to things required that I determine the gender of words like 'inclination,' 'sacrifice,' and 'obstacle,' which quickly proved to be a pointless and random exercise, since I could not satisfactorily explain, even to myself, why such words would be described as male or female. For verbs and adjectives, it was unclear whether gender should refer to the subject or the object of the action or to the person using the word or the person being described, respectively.

In short, it began to feel like imposing the gender tag on the text limited rather than enhanced its usefulness: I was not creating a guide or revealing a latent pattern; I was damming possible interpretive pathways. When it became clear that a tag was more of a hindrance than a help, I eliminated it and revisited the text and my notes to look for other possibilities.

Most of the analytical tags changed several times over the course of the project in response to new research. Likewise, my research was often redirected as I developed a better understanding of tagging procedures and coding rules. All of this information worked together in a feedback loop that necessitated constant reevaluation and revision.

After researching and drafting for roughly two months, I had a base tag set, ready to be translated into the DTD, which would provide the framework for the subsequent XML document. The set included both structural tags (formatting; basic linguistic components such as parts of speech and sections of dialogue) as well as analytical tags (commentary on the entries such as which stage of courtship it would fall under; descriptions of the variations among editions): for example, each entry in the *DOL* would be marked up to identify the term (<mainword>), any synonyms listed (<syn>) and the definition of the term (<definition>). Within the <definition> tag, there were elements to parse, among other things, dialogue, foreign language phrases, and examples of the term in context. Analytical tags such as <pos> (part of speech), <courtshipstage>, and <variation> (between editions) completed the set.

One of the most challenging aspects of creating a tag set is that it must be able to fit into the hierarchical structure of a DTD. This means considering if and how the elements are related and developing a nesting system that is both consistent and comprehensive. For example, some tags may only be needed for only one or two entries, but they must be incorporated into the DTD using the same rules that govern the structuring of the most frequently used tags. Depending on how specific the coder wants to get, a DTD can be complex and lengthy. Additionally, the format and content of the original text also impacts how detailed the DTD must be. The terms defined in the *DOL*, for instance, are not all one word: many of the verbs are listed as infinitives, such as 'To Love' and 'To Address.' This can make alphabetization problematic; spelling variations can also create problems.

Other entries attach two words to one definition, as in the record 'Sick. Sickness.' The issue here was whether the word should be recorded as a noun or an adjective. To solve this problem, I revised the DTD to make it possible for an entry to have two parts of speech (<pos> and <altpos>). While I wanted to represent the text accurately, the variation among terms would have made organizing the information in XSLTs confusing: for example, if I tried to sort by the first letter of the <mainword> content, all of the verbs would be grouped with the 'Ts' because of their infinitive construction. Here again, I solved the problem by creating two elements, <mainword> and <altword>: the former contained a regularized version of the term (i.e. one word) and the latter allowed me to encode the term as it was originally published. In the end, I used multiple tags to incorporate all of the material in several categories, including the entry word, the part of speech and the variations among editions.

Once the DTD was complete, I began transcribing the *DOL* into XML. Although I had a better grasp of the concept of markup as well as of the specific language I was using, I still struggled with an outline that failed to anticipate many coding and research

questions. This time, however, most of the difficulties lay in trying to manage the dialogue between the analytical coding and literary research aspects of the project. Encoding the structural elements of the text took only a few weeks, but considering how to fill the analytical tags was more complicated. Although the ultimate goal was to create a digital humanities resource, I found that working on the two aspects of the project separately and in a piecemeal fashion was inefficient.

For several months, I worked on the project in separate chunks: coding one day, research and writing the next. While compartmentalizing this way made the workload more manageable, it also made it difficult to envision how the two halves were going to create a whole. The methods I used and information I gathered for one aspect of the project did not inform my work on the other: I did not consider, for example, how the digital format influences a traditional literary analysis. As a result, nothing seemed to be working; no real progress was being made. I was soon in a stalemate with my project: it stubbornly resisted conforming to the schedule and plan I had devised, and I refused to alter my approach. Indeed, I was so attached to the ideas I had developed about how this was going to work, that I wasn't even sure where to start changing gears.

I reexamined my research: I reread the articles, reviewed the coding practices and reorganized the information. I came across John Unsworth's "The Importance of Failure," in which he argues that "... hypertext research projects should be expected to address unsolved problems...and the proof of their having done so should be that they culminate in a new plateau of ignorance, a new set of unsolved problems." By these standards, I was making great strides, at least in my own accumulation of knowledge. When I considered the problems as part of my research instead of as discrete forces working against the project, I found that my efforts thus far were not as fruitless as I believed.

What had I learned then? Generally, that any scholarly enterprise has an energy and a dynamic of its own, that one makes progress in such an endeavor by following the research trajectory, on whatever tangent it offers. But digital humanities projects are even more unruly, since one must consider how the ultimate form of the project and the information and argument being presented interact with and influence one another.

More specifically, and as it relates to text encoding, I discovered that what I previously understood to be inert scaffolding is instead an intricate structure whose function is as much exegetical as formal and analytical. There is, however, no clear method of integrating the traditional and digital analyses of a text: no precedent determining which part to do first, how or when to compare the parts, which part should take priority or how to represent that hierarchy. In short, I finally understood that I could not rely on a "right way" to work on this project. So after months of balking at the egregious disconnect between my expectations and the reality of the situation, I turned my attention to creating and documenting what Unsworth champions as "the ignorance that was uniquely yours..."

Phase III

My experience suggested that it would have been more practical to have created the analytical content of the project before beginning the digitizing process. However, at this stage, the necessary adjustment was one of perspective rather than procedure: digital projects are constantly in flux, and it is all about making the rules up as you go. By

abandoning any preconceived notions about how the two halves of the project *should* work together, I could better visualize the possibilities and therefore more easily anticipate and troubleshoot problems.

Once I had the XML file of the *DOL*, I focused on creating the XSLTs that would determine how the information would display. The XSLT stylesheet converts the tagged XML document into an HTML document that can be read as a webpage. Assisting me with the XSLT development was a group of students from one of the committee member's Writing for the Web class. I had never even created a basic HTML website, so using XSL to convert XML to XHTML was a bit like a monolingual English speaker trying to translate between French and German. The group created a template that illustrated many of the parts of the XSL syntax that would be the most useful in manipulating this particular XML file; however, the design possibilities are endless, and the template could not provide more than a glimpse of these options. Ultimately, I benefited most, not from using the template per se, but from being able to study the code alongside its corresponding website and thereby see exactly how the various expressions interpret and display the data. Although detailed coding manuals and handbooks provided some guidance and served as beneficial resources, here again, trial and error was the best teacher.

As the coding became less demanding, partly because it was nearing at least an interim stage of completion and partly because it was no longer a wholly foreign language, the literary research component of the project became more manageable. For approximately nine months, I had devoted the majority of my time to learning XML, creating a DTD, transcribing the *DOL* and developing XSLTs. Now I began to pull together the supplementary research I had gathered: literary examples of the terms in context; reviews of the *DOL* in contemporary magazines; biographical facts on its author, translator and publisher; information about the eighteenth-century's "culture of improvement" (Borsay); and sociolinguistic theories regarding politeness and courtship.

Although the gap between 'digital' and 'humanities' was closing, coding the XSLTs continued to raise questions and introduce considerations about the critical nature of the project. The XML tags provided one level of analysis, and the XSLTs had to incorporate that analysis into a visual organization of the data. In some ways, the XSLTs would simply display the XML content, but they also had the potential to create additional dimensions of interpretation. Thus, the several aspects of the project became even more tightly interwoven, creating a shorter distance between cause and effect and expediting the discovery process.

Again, I was forced to reevaluate which elements of the text I wished to highlight, in what way and for what purpose. Until this point I had not given much thought to the principals of visual rhetoric. Sketching images of a webpage seemed like a secondary concern, as if bringing together the necessary pieces would somehow automatically and clearly suggest a certain design. To some extent, this is true: the way the tags are defined in a DTD creates the basic hierarchy that will appear, to some degree, on the webpage. However, beyond this, there are questions of font size, color, graphics, page arrangement, and linkage. In this way, coding is an ideal tool for any kind of research project because it forces the user to define and test their goals, theories and assumptions over and over, from a slightly different point of view each time. It demands and ensures a comprehensive study, if not understanding, of the material.

Once a foundational site of the *DOL* has been established, the opportunities for development and change are endless. My philosophy for this project echoes John Lavagnino's argument in favor of a "criterion [of] adequacy...[or the] criterion of incompleteness" (71). He asserts that using digital technology does not alter the essential pattern of humanities scholarship, which often consists of examining the same text numerous times, from various perspectives. Hence, just as we might reject the contention that there can be a definitive edition of a written text, so too should we eschew the idea that an encoded text can ever be complete. Indeed, Lavagnino writes that "to do everything would require not only that we know what everything *is*, but that we also be able to adopt all critical positions ourselves" (71). In this light, one might consider XML, or any markup language, as an editorial tool more than a computer language, in which case, the digital and print worlds are more partners than rivals. To use Harold Short's words, "[this 'hybrid' is] perhaps even in some way [an] 'ideal,' in which a paper or material original is preserved and treasured for what it is, and the electronic is exploited for what it makes possible" (16).

I would like to continue amending this project when new research or ideas emerge. Additionally, I would certainly encourage implementing users' suggestions for markup and including further analysis of the *DOL*.

Publication History of *The Dictionary of Love*

The Dictionary of Love made its British debut in 1753, twelve years after Jean François Dreux du Radier's *Dictionnaire de l'amour* appeared on French bookshelves. Publisher Ralph Griffiths put a two-shilling price tag on the "pocket-size[d]" book and commented in his *Monthly Review*,

its design is to rally and expose the common-place love-phrases, modes of address, &c. as used by the gay and gallant of both sexes. With what humour, spirit, or elegance [the author] has done this, the reader will discover, from the few following explanations, selected from as many different parts of the book....(464-465)

Originally published anonymously, this English version of the *DOL* would not be ascribed to author John Cleland until the twentieth century when Roger Lonsdale discovered a hand-written footnote in which Griffiths makes the disclosure ("New Attributions to John Cleland," 1979). According to Lonsdale, Cleland omitted some definitions in his translation and added some new entries of his own, which are "usually somewhat less cynical and more genuinely pessimistic about modern decadence than those translated faithfully" (286). The *DOL*, in comparison to some of Cleland's other works, sold fairly well (Lonsdale 287).

There were several reprintings of the *DOL* throughout the later half of the eighteenth century, although Cleland is not known to have had a hand in any of them beyond the 1753 edition. Versions of the *DOL* appeared in England in 1776, 1777, 1787, 1795 and 1806. There are also listings for several versions printed outside England, including ones in Dublin (1754) and Philadelphia (1798). The latest reprinting appears to be R. Buchanan's edition, published in 1824 in Edinburgh (WorldCat Database).

The 1776 edition came from publishers J. Bell and C. Etherington with a slightly modified title: *Dictionary of Love, or the Language of Gallantry Explained*. Aside from the following brief note from the editors, this edition is basically a wholesale reprint of the 1753 version:

This book was first printed in London, near thirty years ago, and as it has become exceeding scarce, it has been thought proper to reprint it.

However, an advertisement for the this edition of the dictionary appeared in *Lloyd's Evening Post* and made it clear who the work's intended audience was: "This Day was published, Price 2s. A beautiful and interesting little Work, for a Lady's Pocket, intitled A Dictionary of Love." Lonsdale comments that the *Monthly Review* also "drily noted the reappearance of 'this important Dictionary'" (287). *The London Chronicle* was sold by J. Wilkie, who would, the following year, contribute to another version of the *DOL*.

In 1777, publishers J. Bew, J. Wilkie, G. Riley, and W. Caville put out *A Dictionary of Love, with notes. Wherein is the Description of A Perfect Beauty; The Picture of A Fop or Macaroni; And a Key to All the Arch-Phrases and difficult Terms used in that Universal Language*. This edition made numerous, obvious changes to the content itself, adding footnotes and two new entries ('old maid' and 'ugly').

Additionally, the 1777 version seems even more playful than the previous editions. The preface takes on a less formal tone, mentioning several times that the book is meant as an amusement. Moreover, the new preface does not go to the same lengths to impress upon its readers the importance of the material; it seems that this edition's advertised purpose was more divertive than didactic.

Accordingly, some of the entries have been shortened, making them seem more entertaining and less serious. For example:

To **Hate** (1753 and 1776): Is never understood in a literal sense, but when employed against the ugly and the old. In general it is construed in a contrary sense. A mistress, from whom a favor is extorted by an agreeable violence, whilst she faintly resists, says, *Pray let me along, I hate you mortally*: this signifies, "Your boldness is far from displeasing me; you may even venture as far as it will go." *Can you hate me then?* means "I want to give myself the pleasure of hearing an assurance to the contrary, or of perplexing you, or of seeing how prettily you can turn a declaration of love." *I know you hate me*, in the mouth of a coxcomb, signifies, "I defy you, for the soul of you, to be otherwise than violently in love with such a pretty fellow as I am."

To **Hate** (1777): Is never understood in a literal sense, but when employed against the ugly and the old. In general it is construed in a contrary sense. *I know you hate me*, in the mouth of a coxcomb, signifies, "I defy you, for the soul of you, to be otherwise than violently in love with such a pretty fellow as I am."

Another pared entry is for the term "To Love," which lacks an entire paragraph that describes a man for whom "love" entails trying his hardest to strip a woman of her virtue. Further, the following entry for 'ruin,' which appeared in both the 1753 and 1776 editions, is missing from the 1777 version of the dictionary:

To **Ruin** (1753, 1776): a woman, to rob her of her honour, or (what is worse to many of them) of the reputation of it. Terrible as this word sounds, there are of them, who would look on no unhappiness so great, as that of having no reason ever to fear it would be attempted. Do you want to ruin me? is a phrase of capitulation: a kind of dying speech of virtue, just going to be turned off.

Here again, the editors appear to be omitting passages and words in order to prevent the dictionary from being as serious-minded as its predecessors.

Additionally, this omission implies that the editors may have been trying to make the dictionary more satisfactory to female readers. In addition to its surface meaning (i.e., that the aforementioned "question" is a surrender), the final phrase—"a kind of dying speech of virtue, just going to be turned off"—has the nuanced meaning that women can and do employ their virtue like servants who could be 'turned off' at will. It hints that women use virtue (or the semblance of virtue) when they need it to entice men and then turn it off when it becomes necessary to achieve the final goals of the seduction. Such entries that focused too much on warning or disparaging remarks may have been less pleasant for a woman to read, no matter how much humor they were couched in. By removing such entries, the editors created a work that is much less likely to cause women

discomfort or offense.

Other indications that the editors meant for the 1777 edition to be more light-hearted appear not in reduced entries but in augmented ones. The following italicized segment is an addition to the definition of the term 'faults.'

Faults: The person one loves never has any. Either the lover does not see them (*blinded by Cupid's fillet,*) or, is as much reconciled to them as to his own....

This line could have been added for clarification, although the meaning does not seem hard to grasp without it. However, if this version of the dictionary was indeed trying to be more acceptable as an amusement to young people, perhaps this line was included merely to inspire a humorous visual image.

In some cases, the editors changed the language of an entry completely. One of the most interesting modifications in the 1777 edition concerns the term 'old maid.' In the 1753 and 1776 editions, this term came as a subheading under the larger entry for 'maid.' The change in definition furthers the case that the editors of the 1777 edition may have been trying to appeal to female readers:

Maid, Old maid (1753): is an atrociously abusive expression, generally employed to signify one who could get no-body to make her otherwise; and always means a repenting one.

Old Maid (1777): Is a term used to distinguish those who could not get any body to make them otherwise. It is however, too often a term of reproach, because it is not a woman's own fault if she is an old maid; if she never was lucky enough to be asked the question.

Clearly, the second definition is more sensitive to women and takes into account the difficulties a woman faces when trying to make a successful marriage. Also, the 1777 definition does not directly state that an 'old maid' must regret her state, although, it does indicate by using the word 'lucky' that being married is a more desirable condition.

However, the most extensively changed single entry is by far the definition for 'beauty.' All editions of the dictionary include a list of the physical qualities that make a woman beautiful. In general, the lists from the 1753, 1776 and 1787 editions, which are identical to each other, are less detailed, using descriptions such as "a smooth, high forehead," "two lips, pouting, of the coral hue" and "a small mouth."

In contrast, the 1777 and 1795 editions represent the same areas of the body as "forehead white, smooth and open, neither flat nor prominent, but like the head well-rounded" and "the mouth should be small, the lips not of equal thickness; they should be well turned small rather than gross; soft, even to the eye and with a livid red in them."

One could argue that the extended descriptions are also meant to attract female readers: they are full of descriptions of what is said to be fashionable and beautiful, not unlike the magazines, such as *Cosmopolitan*, that women read today. Moreover, the longer the description, the more likely a woman is going to be able to find herself somewhere in it, in which case the 1777 edition appeals to a woman's vanity. The two lists do share four of the same criteria: "a sweet breath; an agreeable voice; a shape,

noble, easy and disengaged; a modest gait and deportment."

Finally, as mentioned in the earlier description of the 1777 edition's title page, the editors' notes are some of the version's most delightful additions. Most appear as footnotes and are purely emphatic in nature, meant to stress the importance of a certain point. They seem, however, to be more colloquial than the standard entries in the dictionary. Moreover, their tone is almost one of camaraderie, aimed at female readers. In other words, they sound more like advice a woman might get from her mother or friend than they do the humorous moralizing of an outsider.

The excerpts below come from the terms 'To Abuse,' 'To Adore,' 'To Address' and 'Confidence.' Each one is immediately followed by the footnote that accompanies it:

To **Abuse**: ...Thus, when a lady grants a slight favor, as a kiss or her hand, perhaps even of her mouth, and the lover, *who is never to be satisfied, proceeds on such encouragement to liberties that put decency in danger; the lady, naturally alarmed, chides the encroacher....

*Girls! be sure however, that you keep such a fellow as this at a distance.

To **Adore**: ...I love: love did I say? I adore you! The true meaning of which fine speech is, "The secret of pleasing consists in flattering your self-love, at the expense of your understanding. I am straining hard to persuade you, that you have distracted my brain; not that it is so in the least; but, whilst I laugh at you in my sleeve, for you swallowing this stuff, I may gain wherewith to laugh at you in good earnest*.

*A truth worth remembering

To **Address**: ...To whom do you think you are addressing yourself? is oftener a trap for a compliment, than a denotation of anger*.

*A proper hint to all prudes!

Confidence: ...A confidante-maid, who does not abuse her mistress's confidence, is a miracle for rarity*

*An important hint to young women not to have any female confidant in love affairs.

Interestingly, there are no notes added for any terms beyond those that begin with 'D,' except for one odd addition to the term "Jealousy," which appears below:

If you would see this passion properly ridiculed, read the Comedy of Every Man in his Humour – the character of Kiteley is highly finished.

The next edition in 1787, also published by J. Bell, is, unsurprisingly, a reproduction of his earlier 1776 edition. Publisher W. Lane's 1795 edition appears to be a slightly altered copy of the 1777 version, which eliminates most of the footnotes and some of the synonyms and is missing the entry 'yellow' entirely.

I have not seen the later versions from 1806 or 1824; nor have I seen versions published in 1754 in Dublin and in 1798 in Philadelphia. However, Lonsdale describes the 1795, 1806 and 1798 versions as "slightly abridged" (287), and I gather from this collective treatment that the later versions are not very dissimilar from the 1795 edition that I have examined. The 1754 and 1824 editions have yet to be described.

Analysis: *The Dictionary of Love* and Language in Richardson's *Pamela*

Polite language is a duplicitous business. It is the go-to linguistic tool used by gentlemen and scoundrels alike; it can indicate sincere concern and respect or it can mask nefarious intentions of a disingenuous speaker—and nowhere is this duplicity more insidious than in the arena of love. It is no wonder then that books have been written to sort through the true, the false and—mostly—the equivocal of decorous speech. The *Dictionary of Love* (1753), a tongue-in-cheek hybrid of reference, humor and conduct genres, is one such work.

In addition to standing on its own as a noteworthy eighteenth-century publication and an entertaining read, the *DOL* is also valuable for what it can illuminate about contemporary literature, much of which satirizes, condemns or otherwise deals with the goings-on of polite society. The following essay will discuss some sociolinguistic tenets regarding the nature and function of polite language, utilizing illustrative examples from Samuel Richardson's *Pamela* and suggesting the role the *DOL* might play in interpreting the novel.

Polite Language 101 or Pamela's Dilemma: He loves me, I love him not.

In the most basic sense, polite language can be used to draw someone in or to keep someone out. The first few sections of *Pamela: or Virtue Rewarded* (1740) illustrate both of these functions: Mr. B attempts to win the young serving-woman's virtue, if not her heart, using genteel speech and ostensibly magnanimous gestures; Pamela, rightfully suspicious of her master's interest in her, constructs a barrier of propriety to shield herself from his troubling attention.

Pamela's first letter relates how Mr. B is very kind to her after her mistress's death. Initially, she finds his solicitude endearing and does not doubt his honor when he tells her, "I will take care of you all, my good maidens; and for you, Pamela...for my dear mother's sake, I will be a friend to you, and you shall take care of my linen" (25). Both his speech and his behavior paint him as a noble-minded master, aware of the responsibility connected to his station and well worthy of his position. This is how Pamela, naïve and herself artless, views the exchange.

To one with a more experienced, or perhaps simply more cynical, mind, his actions raise a red flag. Pamela's parents caution their daughter against accepting Mr. B's generosity too freely. His politeness and goodness seem over-the-top, so to speak, and are therefore causes for concern rather than gratitude. Carey McIntosh wisely notes in *Common and Courtly Language: The Stylistics of Social Class in Eighteenth-Century English Literature* that "courtly-genteel language is a reliable sign of aspirations to upper-class rank, not necessarily an index of true good breeding" (114). Although McIntosh's examination of "courtly-genteel language" refers to specific words, such as 'honor', 'duty', and 'interest,' it is certainly reasonable to suppose that polite language in general could function in the same way.

Pamela would have done well in this situation to have read the *DOL*, which is aimed largely at "the fair sex, whose mistakes are the most dangerous." Indeed, had Pamela run across the entry for 'friend,' she may have been more wary of Mr. B's commitment to her when he says, "I will be a friend to you":

Friend: This character, from a man to a lady, is often no other than a mask worn by a lover obliged to disguise himself, and who is the more to be feared, for his dissembling his designs, and watching the advantages of a critical moment. The women should admit no friend that may possibly become a lover. They love their danger who do not attend to this advice.

For her part, Pamela girds herself with decorum, not only keeping herself above reproach but also at times reproving her master of his conduct. Toward the beginning of the novel, Mr. B comes upon Pamela in the summer house and commands her not to run off, as she usually does. Flustered, Pamela answers, "It does not become your good servant to stay in your presence, sir, without your business required it; and I hope I shall always know my place" (34). Because she is in all other ways at the mercy of her master, Pamela must stand her ground with the only weapon she has: her words. Pamela's adherence to societal conventions confers on her a certain, if limited, authority because she is in the right, according to the rules of politeness.

Power Plays

Pamela's situation is not unlike that described by modern-day sociolinguists who suggest that women are more likely to use authoritative, standard speech variants because that kind of "symbolic capital is the *only* kind that women can accumulate with impunity" (Eckert 34). In other words, women's inability to gain real economic and/or other types of influence results in their use of prestigious or standard variants as a means of securing at least the semblance of power through their mastery of the language (Trudgill, Labov). Additionally, some researchers submit that women use more standard variants to avoid being seen as lower class, which carries connotations of sexual promiscuity, a quality which is still highly stigmatized for women (Gordon). Thus, women's politeness can be seen as a mechanism of gaining, or at least not losing, status and subsequently, power.

Having learned to be somewhat artful herself after suffering through Mr. B's many plots and harassments, Pamela chooses her words carefully to defend herself against the sham-marriage her master has designed for her. She again insists upon propriety when she tells him, in carefully chosen words, "Your poor servant is far unworthy of this great honour; for what will it be but to create envy to herself, and discredit to you?" (209). He responds angrily; however, she observes "if it was a piece of art of his side, as I apprehended, to introduce the sham-wedding, (and, to be sure, he is very full of stratagem and art,) I think I was not so much to blame" (209).

Of course, power struggles in love are not always as serious as those between Pamela and Mr. B. Courtship rituals involve games of all kinds, including verbal sparring, which is the domain of the *DOL*. Specifically, the purpose of the *DOL* is not to simplify the love language, but to decipher it— and it often compounds the circumlocutory or euphemistic

characteristics in the process. It encourages mastery of indirectness rather than promoting directness in speech:

All arts are distinguished by terms peculiar to them. Physic and Heraldry are scarcely sciences, but in virtue of their hard technical nomenclature. Love itself, having lost its plain, unsophisticated nature, and being now reduced into an art, had recourse to particular words and expressions: of which it no more behoves lovers to be ignorant, than for seamen to be unacquainted with the terms of navigation. Neither is the glossary of it so easily acquired as might be imagined. (vi-v)

According to linguists Penelope Brown and Stephen Levinson, being indirect is part of "the language of formal politeness," at least in most western cultures (57). Eighteenth-century England was no exception to this general rule.

Even John Cleland's *Fanny Hill* declares "Truth! stark naked truth, is the word" and says, "I will not so much as take the pains to bestow the strip of a gauze-wrapper on it..." (39). Well, truth it may be, in content, but that does not prevent Cleland's descriptions from being dizzyingly periphrastic. In fact, as McIntosh notes, "the most erudite students of language may make fools of themselves in their attempts to employ it as an instrument for expressing truth" (40). Thus, those seeking to express a sincere sentiment often choose either to say nothing at all (perhaps the wiser course) or to vainly pursue their intended meaning through reams of explication.

However, if one did elect to speak, one was faced with the paradox that made it desirable to use the most inconspicuous language to reveal the most profound emotions. In describing the "polite letters of the eighteenth century," McIntosh observes that they "must be at once natural and new; they must do the job brilliantly without calling attention to themselves" (141). During courtship then, the most successful candidates had to be masters or mistresses of their craft so as not to let any strings show when they performed. Although the *DOL* appears to have been marketed toward women, Richardson's Mr. B suggests that it is men who need the instruction more:

What the deuse do we men go to school for? If our wits were equal to women's, we might spare much time and pains in our education; for Nature learns your sex, what, in a long course of labor and study, ours can hardly attain to. (202)

The *DOL* emphasizes that Nature's only worthwhile purpose is to provide art with a disguise so that it will not "[defeat] its ends by being too transparent" (vi). According to these two statements, Nature/disguise/indirectness seems to be a talent of women, and the *DOL* seems designed to hone those skills, aiding its readers in developing an artful, but well-camouflaged, style that would certainly have been an advantage in navigating the courtship rituals of the eighteenth century.

Climbing the Social Ladder

Ultimately, Pamela's success in marriage is due to her staunch commitment to remaining virtuous; she is rewarded for her transparent and honest nature. How realistic such an unblemished ascent might be remains a topic of debate; it is safe to assume that

booksellers peddling the *DOL* would not have been too keen on anyone promoting such a single-minded approach to love and happiness. But in fact, even the virtuous Pamela's transition to happy Mrs. B is not achieved without knowledgeable and skillful manipulation of language.

As shown above, she must use her words to defend her honor when she has no other recourse. Additionally, once she becomes Mrs. B, she again relies on a sense of decorum to prove to Lady Davers that she belongs in her new role. Her politeness becomes more aggressive than defensive: she now employs polite language not to protest her unworthiness but to demand her acceptance. In both cases, she is essentially using a studied formality to remind her tormentors to mind their manners, a reproach which would have carried a great deal of weight in the eighteenth-century:

Now, pray, madam, said I, (but got to a little distance,) be pleased to reflect upon all that you have said to me, since I have had the honour, or rather misfortune, to come into your presence; whether you have said one thing befitting your ladyship's degree to me, even supposing I was the wench and the creature you imagine me to be? (325)

McIntosh writes that "people's use of language in...eighteenth century England correlated directly with their position in society" (8). It does not necessarily follow that upper-class speech was any more effective than lower-class speech in expressing things—in fact, it may have been just the opposite, given the numerous conventions attached to more polite language. However, there is no doubt that "[having] access to higher dialects" was an advantage to those in the lower middle class (McIntosh 37). As we see in Pamela's first few letters, she was fairly well-educated by Mr. B's mother; Mr. B himself notes that she "write[s] a very pretty hand" (26). Though she is from a humble background, Pamela clearly has a way with words—a way, moreover, that often makes her appear more genteel than many of her superiors.

Although they seem unlikely to share a common goal, *Pamela* and the *DOL* both impress readers with the importance of understanding polite language and social conventions. While the novel provides comprehensive social and moral models for young men and women to follow, the *DOL* encourages them to learn the specific terms used in love, which could, have a significant impact on their ability to move successfully in society.

Analysis: Literary Examples

No, Is a term very frequently employed by the fair, when they mean nothing less than a negative. Their yes is always yes, but their no is not always no. The air and tone of it determines the signification: Sometimes too the circumstances, a smile, or a look.

~The *Dictionary of Love* (1753)

Although the *DOL* claims in its preface to reveal the "just value" of the terms used in love, one may come away from reading it with more questions than answers. Paradoxically, this is an apt reaction, one that thoughtful readers will parlay into the realization that such words—and such circumstances—in fact defy definition. This wry perspective on love and courtship is the *DOL*'s real contribution as a resource.

The following examples, drawn from Cleland's *Fanny Hill*, Congreve's *The Way of the World*, Richardson's *Pamela*, Fielding's *Shamela*, and Lillo's *The London Merchant*, will illustrate how the *DOL*'s definitions expose rather than simplify the complexity of love and the tricks of lovers.

All of these novels and plays were published before the *DOL*, so my discussion is not meant to suggest that any of the authors were influenced by the latter work; rather, I hope to show that the *DOL* is a resource for studying the language of love as influenced by the sentimental and commercial milieus of eighteenth-century England.

In some cases, the works use the terms as they are defined in the *DOL*, reinforcing an obvious ideology or stereotype; in other cases, the *DOL* can inform a more elaborate analysis of the courtship conventions and gender constructions illustrated or implied in those works.

John Cleland's *Fanny Hill: Memoirs of a Woman of Pleasure*

In the simplest case, a dictionary serves to assist readers in finding definitions of unfamiliar words. Since it is a novel both by the same author as the *DOL* and on roughly the same subject, *Fanny Hill* contains, as one would expect, many of the words and meanings found in the dictionary; however, there is certainly room for speculation about how Cleland adjusts his language based on genre and intended audience.

Fanny's first experience as a 'woman of pleasure' is hardly a pleasurable one, for her or her would-be seducer. The procuress, Mrs. Brown, arranges as Fanny's first customer an odious old man who shows no tenderness towards the young woman and who behaves like "a brute" (56). Frightened and inexperienced, Fanny fends off the man's violent advances, and he leaves in a huff, proclaiming "that [Mrs. Brown] might look out for another **cully**... that he would not be fooled so by ever a country mock modesty in England..." (57). Cleland's *DOL* defines '**cully**' as

one who gives much, and receives at most the appearances of love in return. Their tribe is very numerous; the chief divisions of them are,

The marrying-**cully**, and the keeping-**cully**. The first is used as a cloak: the second, like an orange, squeezed of its juice, and thrown away.

The *DOL* and *Fanny Hill* frequently use an interchangeable vocabulary to describe emotional, monetary and sexual exchanges, revealing intriguing similarities between courtship and business. In applying the definition of '**cully**' to Fanny's situation, and perhaps to the world of a woman of pleasure in general, the word 'virginity' might be substituted for 'love,' and the "much" that is given is more likely measured in guineas and shillings than in glances and sighs. Fanny's customer, in short, does not want to pay for a false maidenhead, as he believes Fanny's to be. Here we see the same words used in parallel situations involving love and money.

One of the more entertaining *DOL* entries, the definition for the word '**no**,' which appears above, also appears in essence in Cleland's novel. Though she is still grieving for the loss of her true love, Charles, Fanny's protests to her new lover, Mr. H, are not wholehearted, and she notes that "he saw there was more form and ceremony in my resistance than good earnest..." (99). This behavior stands in stark contrast to that of characters such as Pamela, for whom '**no**' really means '**no**.' Fielding's *Shamela*, however, seems to follow Fanny's thinking a little more closely, as both women affect demureness and attempt to exploit the ambiguous nature of courtship, hoping to profit from their ostensible innocence and sense of propriety.

William Congreve's *The Way of the World*

Congreve's comedy of manners, published in 1700, illustrates many of the same concepts that the *DOL* would address 53 years later. These similarities may prove useful for those studying the literary and cultural changes that occurred during the transition from the Restoration period to the more sentimental age that followed.

In Act I, Scene I of *The Way of the World*, Fainall questions Mirabell about his treatment of Lady Wishfort, who has recently become somewhat hostile toward the latter man:

What should provoke her to be your enemy, unless she has made you **advances** which you have slighted? Women do not easily forgive omissions of that nature. (1.1.76-78)

The *DOL* echoes this sentiment in the definition of the term '**advances**:'

When these are made on the woman's side, they either suppose an excessive superiority, or an excessive love.

A woman who has made **advances**, never remembers them without rage, unless she has reason to remember them with pleasure.

Likewise, the following passage, spoken by Mirabell about Millamant, whom he loves, uses the term '**faults**' just as it is described in the *DOL*:

Faults: The person one loves never has any. Either the lover does not see them, or is as much reconciled to them as to his own. If they offend him, he is so far from being a true lover, that he is scarce more than an acquaintance, and less than a friend.

Mirabell: And for a discerning man somewhat too passionate a lover, for I like her with all her **faults**; nay, like her for her **faults**. Her follies are so natural, or so artful, that they become her, and those affectations which in another woman would be odious serve but to make her more agreeable. I'll tell thee, Fainall, she once used me with that insolence that in revenge I took her to pieces, sifted her, and separated her failings: I studied 'em and got 'em by rote. The catalogue was so large that I was not without hopes, one day or other, to hate her heartily. To which end I so used myself to think of 'em, that at length, contrary to my design and expectation, they gave me every hour less and less disturbance, till in a few days it became habitual to me to remember 'em without being displeas'd. They are now grown as familiar to me as my own frailties, and in all probability in a little time longer I shall like 'em as well. (1.1.141-156)

As noted in the introduction, the *DOL* provides no definitive answers; however, it does give modern-day readers insight into words' connotations in eighteenth-century society. For example, the discussion of wit that occurs among Fainall, Mirabell, Witwoud and Petulant in Act 1, Scene 1 ends with the couplet "Where modesty's ill manners, 'tis but fit/ That impudence and malice pass for **wit**" (480-481). This final quotation, along with some of the characters' dialogue, agrees with or demonstrates the *DOL*'s interpretation of '**wit**':

The **wit** of these times consists in a defiance of common-sense, a licentious impertinence. Its chief employment is to put off false sentiments for true ones: to carry off the most worthless proceedings with an air of triumph in them: to ruin women, to debauch the wife or sister of a bosom friend: to feign a love one never felt. In short, it makes many comedians in love, and not one true lover.

The primitive acceptance of this term was an honourable one. A **wit** was formerly a character of worth and solidity. It supposed a refined, shining understanding: one who had the courage to think before he spoke or wrote: who stuck to the standard of reason and propriety. But this was too grave a character to maintain long its estimation. Such as yet adhere to it, are called, in derision, Philosophers, and are very little valued by the men, and not at all by the women, who look on them as odd, sober, insipid personages.

Opposed to these is another species of **wits**, who are now in high reign. Every thing with them is lively, sparkling and frothy. These are the idols of the women, and are by them preferred to all except the moneyed man, whose substantial eloquence out-butts even the powerful charms of their splendid nonsense.

Samuel Richardson's *Pamela*

Greek mythology tells of Argus (Argos) Panoptes, a hundred-eyed giant appointed by Hera to guard her husband Zeus's consort, Io. Argus was eventually killed by Hermes, at Zeus's behest, but Hera honored him by placing his eyes on the tail of the peacock.

The *DOL* definition for **Argus** concludes that "his name has been since given to all who are set as spies over women," but then goes on to suggest that the presence of any Argus-like figure increases the likelihood of infidelity rather than discouraging it:

When a husband assumes that character [Argus], it is not only piquing his wife in honour to a trial of skill, but makes a sauce of the highest taste for a gallant, who might himself go to sleep over his intrigue, without such a difficulty to enliven it.

One of the gallantest poets of antiquity employs a whole elegy, to engage his mistress's husband to clap an Argus or two upon her, without which he declares to him plainly, that he will not do his drudgery for him; for that, as it was, he might as well be her husband, as to go to bed with her with so little let or impediment.

Your cautious mamma's are very often the dupes of Argusses in petticoats, they plant round their daughters dear, and who often call the enemy that would not perhaps think of them, instead of guarding their charges from him.

Richardson's allusion to the Greek giant may serve not only to highlight the extremity of Pamela's situation, but also to alert readers that the young heroine is more aware and discerning than her years and experience suggest. In response to Mrs. Jewkes's scrutiny of her correspondence, Pamela compares her unsympathetic guardian to the Greek giant saying,

Well, thinks I, I hope still, **Argus**, to be too hard for thee. Now **Argus**, the Poets say, had a hundred eyes, and was made to watch with them all, as she is. (113)

Obviously, this description deals with Mrs. Jewkes's incessant watchfulness over the captive Pamela; however, the *DOL* definition also applies, as the older woman not only monitors her charge closely but also functions as a co-conspirator with Mr. B, assisting him in his attempts to seduce his young servant.

The comparison is made relatively early in the novel, only a few days after Pamela has been kidnapped and taken to Mr. B's Lincolnshire house. Like Pamela's other characterizations of Mrs. Jewkes in these early sections, this one aids in coloring the housekeeper as the utterly heartless and depraved creature that she indeed proves to be. Pamela rightfully fears for her virtue, perceiving that not only will Mrs. Jewkes not protect her, but she will in fact actively clear the way for her master's schemes against the young woman.

In this case, knowledge of the *DOL* may aid readers in understanding the characters and in recognizing foreshadowing elements. However, the *DOL* definition assumes that daughters will disobey their parents and thwart their Arguses by rendezvousing with young men; Pamela's defiance, conversely, involves guarding her virtue more closely, adding an interesting twist to this application.

Henry Fielding's *Shamela*

Fielding's parody of Richardson's tale of "virtue rewarded" and the *DOL* seem to be in the same mind, having a more cynical, or at least more pragmatic, view of love. Shamela announces that she

preferred [her] virtue to all rakes whatever—And for his **promises**, and his **offers** to me, I don't value them of a fig. (294)

If one considers the *DOL* definitions of the words '**offer**' and '**promises**,' Shamela is quite right to use the term 'value,' which can apply to material worth as well as to more abstract appreciation. Shamela reveals the mercenary side of love with her declaration; the *DOL* likewise exposes the dissembling nature of the language of courtship with entries like '**offer**,' which compares the use of the term with two different direct objects, one related to emotion, the other to money:

I offer you a heart penetrated with the tenderest passion. Words of course that signify very little. *I offer you my purse,* not only sounds better, but expresses more sincerity.

Thus, her dismissal of her suitor's addresses works on two levels, as Shamela at least feigns indignation at his empty words and at his '**offers**' to induce her to sleep with him. She should likewise be suspicious of his '**promises**,' which the *DOL* defines as

Promises of Matrimony (See Matrimony): Without entering into a detail of signification of this terms, it will suffice to observe, that making them is one thing, and keeping them another.

Knowledge of the *DOL* reinforces the sense of parody in Fielding's work. Both Pamela and Shamela initially reject their seducers' '**offers**' and '**promises**;' however, the former does so because she is staunchly chaste and genuinely values her virtue above all things, no matter what their supposed value; the latter, considering the *DOL* interpretations, does so because she knows that such declarations have little to no value at all and she simply "prefer[s]" to keep her "virtue" until she receives a more attractive proposal.

Fielding and Cleland seem also to have been on the same page regarding the terms '**reconciliation**' and '**old maid**.' Fielding writes, "Nothing can be more prudent in a wife, than a sullen backwardness to **reconciliation**; it makes a husband fearful of offending by the length of his punishment" (299). The *DOL* acknowledges that "some **reconciliations** are attended with such pleasure, that it is almost worth making a quarrel on purpose, for the sake of the joy of reconciliation." However, it warns that "it is dangerous to risk this practice so often as to stale it: for it may happen that the reconciliation may never come." This, in a roundabout way, supports Fielding's assertion that withholding reconciliations is an effective means of controlling a husband.

Both men also note that '**old maids**' often owe their spinsterhood to their own faults or failings; although Cleland seems to be a bit more sympathetic in his description. An epigraph to one of Shamela's letters comments, "What a foolish thing it is for a woman to dally too long with her lover's desires; how many have owed their being **old maids** to their holding out too long" (294). Cleland, similarly, defines the term as "an atrociously

abusive expression, generally employed to signify one who could get no-body to make her otherwise; and always means *a repenting one*."

Unsurprisingly, these two works literally or implicatively define many terms in the same ways. While Fielding's novel focuses on the relationships of a single, burlesqued character, Shamela's duplicitous words and attitudes regarding courtship mirror Cleland's satirical treatment of the emotion in the *DOL*.

George Lillo's *The London Merchant*

Issues of love and money—or more accurately, of marriage and money—went hand-in-hand in eighteenth-century society. The Marriage Act of 1753 (a bill whose appearance, incidentally, coincided with the publication of the *DOL*) illustrates one attempt by the government to regulate marriage for economic reasons. Although both supporters as well as opponents of the bill made emotional appeals in their arguments, David Lemmings shows that self-interest and commercial considerations were the driving forces behind the legislation. Simply put, the bill was designed "to prevent clandestine marriage and bigamy," both of which threatened "the marriage market for the male propertied elite," by giving parents and guardians (specifically fathers) more legal control over who their children (specifically daughters) married (Lemmings 339).

Given the interconnectedness of these two subjects, it is not surprising to find that relationships in these areas had a great deal in common. The *DOL* includes several entries, such as '**fortune**,' '**gold**,' '**offer**,' '**presents**' and '**interest**,' that also show similar interests and attitudes in financial matters and matters of the heart. These specific definitions, as well as the general orientation of the *DOL*, suggests that both men and women were as concerned with making a financially advantageous match as they were with finding love. Moreover, throughout the *DOL*, there runs the theme of 'his and hers' currency: women's power and worth lay in their virtue; men's influence and desirability depended on their monetary assets. Interestingly, however, the entry for 'reputation' only concerns women:

One of the great centinels upon female virtue.

Think of what your love exposes me to: Consider what may be said of us; signifies, 'At least we must save appearances: cover our game and throw dust in the eyes of the world.'

Thus, in some women, reputation is but a crime, the more in them, since they owe it to the vice of hypocrisy.

Based on this treatment, one might assume that reputation, too, was primarily a woman's tool.

In George Lillo's *The London Merchant*, however, the tragic George Barnwell appears as ruined as any seduced maiden when his reputation is tainted, not by fornication, but by embezzlement and, later, murder. Barnwell's loyal friend Truman laments, "But few men recover reputation lost; a merchant, never" (3.3.37-38). Barnwell, as a merchant, is defined by money—even more so than other men, perhaps—and his misuse of it can be considered tantamount to a woman's disregard for her virtue. In this and other ways, Barnwell seems a stereotypically feminine character.

Again according to the *DOL*, '**favours**' are defined as "All that a mistress grants to her lover...." Thus, when Millwood, Barnwell's seducer, angrily says, "But know that you are the only man that could be found who would let me sue twice for greater **favours**," (1.5.70-72) she is using a word with an erotic connotation that places her in the more dominant, and hence masculine, role.

Similarly, Lillo's use of the word 'vanity' contradicts traditional gender roles when it points to men, and not women, as being blinded by their conceit and pride. In "British Seduced Maidens," Susan Staves encapsulates the relationship between the seducer and (traditionally) his victim:

In the eighteenth century, the man's unfair advantage was usually underscored by differences of age, of education, of country versus town, and of social class, but there was also frequently the underlying idea that the natural mental resources of women are simply not equal to those of men. (116)

However, Lucy, Millwood's servant, wisely remarks of Barnwell,

To do him justice, notwithstanding his youth, he don't want understanding; but you men are much easier imposed on in these affairs than your **vanity** will allow you to believe. (3.4.8-10)

The *DOL*'s somewhat playful, though still apt, definition of '**vanity**' mirrors Barnwell's fate:

Vanity has brought more virtues to an untimely end, than any other vice. A woman, whose vanity is hurt by the apprehended desertion of a lover, to keep him, will very often take the very step which will bring on that desertion; and, in the loss of her virtue, rob her of all real foundation for vanity in the future.

Although it is arguably Barnwell's impetuous youth and love for Millwood, and not his vanity, that lead him to murder his uncle, Lucy's sentiment, when examined in the light of the *DOL* definition, once again suggests that Barnwell, in many ways, plays the feminine part in this tragic love affair.

Using the *DOL* in connection with Lillo's *The London Merchant*, one gets a broader view of the associations between sentimentality and commerce, two ostensibly dissimilar provinces, as well as a better understanding of relationship, including hierarchies and gender roles, within these worlds. One must remember that the *DOL* is, essentially, a satire, while Lillo's dedication to his patron Sir John Eyles indicates that his play was aimed at "the exciting of the passions in order to the correcting such of them as are criminal, either in their nature or through their excess" (3). However, this difference of genre may, in fact, make the conclusions drawn even more valuable, as they arise from a more comprehensive examination of language usage.

Appendix A: Biography of John Cleland

John Cleland (1710-1789)

Early Life and Career

John Cleland was baptized on September 24, 1720 in Kingston upon Thames, Surrey. His father, William Cleland, served as an officer in the British army before entering into a variety of civil-service jobs, acquired through a network of influential friends and acquaintances. William Cleland's dependence on such connections, however, made his position in society both tenuous and ambiguous and he found himself, as William Epstein describes, "trapped between the destitute anonymity out of which he had arisen and the privileged nobility into which he could never enter..." (12). Cleland's mother, Lucy, also had many notable contacts, including Horace Walpole and Viscount Bolingbroke.

When John Cleland was around eleven years old, his parents sent him to the prestigious Westminster School, where he earned recognition as a King's Scholar before his unexplained withdrawal in 1723. In 1728, at the age of seventeen, Cleland joined the East India Company in Bombay as foot-soldier and eventually, like his father, moved into civil service. He remained in Bombay until 1740, when he sailed back to London at his ailing father's request. William Cleland died in 1741, leaving Lucy in charge of the family estate.

Middle Years and *Fanny Hill*

Following his father's death, Cleland and his mother moved into a house in St. James Place, where he lived for the next six and a half years. Not much is known about Cleland's life during this period, although his biographer Epstein points out that "he was faced now, in his early thirties, with the problem of beginning a new career" (60). Apparently receiving little financial support from his mother, he was committed to Fleet Prison in February 1748 for failure to pay a debt of £840.

He remained in prison until March 1749 and during his confinement finished his novel, *Memoirs of Woman of Pleasure*, which he "later claimed, in a conversation with Boswell, to have written...in his early twenties, in order to show his colleague...that it was possible to write about a prostitute without using vulgar language" (Peter Sabor, in ODNB). The publication of this work, as well as the later, bowdlerized version, *Memoirs of Fanny Hill* (1750), introduced Cleland to bookseller Ralph Griffiths, to whose *Monthly Review* the novelist would regularly contribute in later years.

Both versions of *Memoirs* were targeted by the government as obscene, and arrest warrants were issued against Griffiths, Cleland, and printer Thomas Parker; however, nothing ever seemed to come of the charges, and none of the men suffered any significant punishment as a result of them.

For the next twenty years, Cleland was a prolific author; however, most of his works earned him neither accolades nor money. Among these disappointing endeavors were three plays—*Titus Vespasian* (1755), a tragedy; and *The Ladies Subscription* (1755) and

Tombo-Chiqui or, The American Savage (1758), comedies— none of which were ever staged, "two cantankerous medical treatises" and "three eccentric linguistic treatises" (Sabor, ODNB). He also attempted to exploit the popularity of his previous novels with the publication of *Memoirs of Coxcomb* (1751), a novel about the escapades of a male prostitute. The book failed to attract much attention.

During this time Cleland also wrote more than thirty book reviews for Griffith's *Monthly Review*, including "Monthly Catalogue: *Philosophical letters upon physiognomies*" (Aug. 1751); "Fielding's *Amelia* (Dec. 1751); "James Parson's *Remains of Japhet: being historical Enquiries into the Affinity and Origin of the European Languages*" (June, July 1768); and "Literary Article from Denmark: On the Proceedings of the Danish Society of Science" (Oct. 1770).

The Dictionary of Love

In November 1753 Ralph Griffiths published Cleland's translation of J. F. Dreux du Radier's *Dictionnaire de l'amour* under the complete title *The Dictionary of Love. In which is contained, the Explanation of most of the Terms used in that Language*. The work was published anonymously; however, as Roger Lonsdale was the first to point out, Griffiths identifies Cleland as the author in a handwritten annotation accompanying his review of the work in the December 1753 issue of the *Monthly Review*. In comparing Cleland's *DOL* and the French original, Lonsdale concludes that "about a quarter of the definitions are basically Cleland's own, usually somewhat less cynical and more genuinely pessimistic about modern decadence than those translated faithfully" (286).

Cleland's interest in the dictionary reflects the same preoccupation with façade that dominates most of his works, including *Memoirs*. Epstein characterizes the author as "a man who had spent most of his life trying to expose to public view a private world which would not have him" (166). The *DOL*, as an examination of the deceptive and affected nature of the language of love among society's elite, fits neatly into this campaign.

While it was certainly meant to be a diversion in its own right, the dictionary also seems to serve as a guidebook to the kind of euphemistic and circumlocutory language used by Cleland's fictional characters, such as Fanny Hill. Indeed, Cleland uses many of the terms from the *DOL* in *Memoirs of a Woman of Pleasure*.

Lonsdale claims that the dictionary was relatively popular and that its publication "appears to mark the end of a period in which Cleland was dependent on his pen for a living" (287). Further, some sources indicate that he began receiving a pension from the government around this time in an effort to "'nobly [rescue] him from the like temptation' (of writing pornography)" (Lonsdale 287-288). Yet Cleland was never entirely secure financially and was never fully able to escape the notoriety surrounding *Memoirs of a Woman of Pleasure*.

Later Life and Death

Boswell's impression of a sixty-two year old Cleland was as "'a fine sly malcontent'...[but with] 'something genteel in his manner amidst this oddity'" (Sabor, ODNB). On that same occasion, Cleland's friend David Garrick, the famous thespian,

was present, and Boswell relates that the latter "was talking vainly of his being appointed the executor of a clergyman by 'that great man, Lord Camden.' 'Not a very great man,' grumbled Cleland. I saw Mr. Garrick was not at leisure, so I went and breakfasted at the Mount Coffee-house." (80-81).

John Nichol's obituary of Cleland, however, describes him as "...a very agreeable companion" in his later years, remarking that "in conversation he was very pleasant and anecdotal, understanding most of the living languages, and speaking them all very fluently" (180). Cleland died in January 1789 and was buried in St. Margaret's churchyard. He never married, and he had no children.

Appendix B: Biography of Ralph Griffiths

Ralph Griffiths (1720? – 1803)

As is often the case with figures of the eighteenth-century book trade, the life of Ralph Griffiths is, to a large degree, the life of his literary enterprises. Most of what is known about the journal editor and bookseller comes from his and others' correspondence over professional matters and relationships within the business. As such, the depictions of Griffiths are various, some authored by admiring and respectful colleagues, others penned by contentious employees and rivals. There are, however, some aspects of his character upon which most scholars agree, namely his integrity and impartiality as an editor and his steadfast dedication to his primary publication, the *Monthly Review*. Beyond this, the evidence seems to suggest that he was at least as scrupulous and gracious a man as any in his position.

If Griffiths's involvement with the *Dictionary of Love* (1753) itself was cursory, he had a well-established relationship with its author/translator, John Cleland. Prior to the *DOL*'s appearance, Griffiths and Cleland faced scandal as well as formal charges of obscenity for the publication of the latter's notorious novel, *Memoirs of a Woman of Pleasure* (1749). Neither man was seriously penalized, however, and Cleland became a regular contributor to the Griffiths's *Monthly Review*, launched that same year.

Early Life and Career

Most sources, including The Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, state that Griffiths was born in Shropshire in 1720. His earliest known occupation was as a watchmaker in Staffordshire, but he moved to London in the early 1740s and began his literary career working with bookseller Jacob Robinson. He worked as a general bookseller from the mid 1740s until 1762, when he retired from that business to focus solely on his responsibilities as editor of the *Monthly Review*.

John Cleland and *Fanny Hill*

In 1749, John Cleland brought his manuscript *Memoirs of a Woman of Pleasure* to Ralph's brother, Fenton Griffiths, a printer and publisher. Fenton was "uncertain 'whether it would be safe for him to Publish the...Book,'" owing to its sexually frank content, but upon soliciting his brother's advice was "'advise[d]... 'to publish it'" (Epstein 71).

However determined the authorities were to stamp out such offensive material, their actions against *Memoirs* seem to effect a scuffle of words and principals more than an organized and effective prosecution. Indeed, some of the offenders' responses were comical: one particularly colorful story cites that as Griffiths was "about to be arrested he moved copies [of *Memoirs*] out of the back door as the officer came in through the front" (Maxted 96). Aside from their each having to pay a £100 recognizance, it is not clear that the men suffered any official punishment or censure for their actions. In any case, they

were not deterred from publishing a slightly bowdlerized, yet still bawdy, version of the novel entitled *Memoirs of Fanny Hill* in 1749/50 (Epstein 78).

The *Monthly Review*

Established in 1749, "the *Monthly [Review]* committed itself to a policy 'whose sole object should be to give a compendious account of those productions of the press, as they come out, that are worth notice'" (Albrecht 231). It was the first British periodical to review literature in all forms and on all subjects, rather than focusing on specific disciplines or addressing only certain groups of readers. The reviews themselves, however, were still largely "summary and quotation" (Albrecht 231).

For the most part, Griffiths seems to have been well-respected and even well-liked by his employees and his colleagues. Benjamin Nangle writes that "Dr. [Samuel] Johnson, who shared none of Griffith's views on controversial matters, gave it as his considered judgment that the *Monthly* was conducted without partiality" (v). In 1756, the *Critical Review* was launched as a Tory competitor to the Whig *Monthly*. Griffiths and Tobias Smollett, a major contributor to the *Critical*, frequently disparaged each other's publication.

According to Lewis Knapp, Smollett remarked that "[The *Critical Review*] will not be patched up by obscure Hackney writers, accidentally enlisted in the service of an undistinguishing bookseller..." (171). This job at Griffiths as "undistinguishing" is often considered the result of his being involved with the publication of the Cleland's lewd novel, *Fanny Hill*.

Despite the growing number of rivals, the *Monthly* continued to be one of Britain's most influential periodicals until Griffiths's death in 1803. Although his son, George Edward, took over the business, he "lacked the editorial imagination and managerial ability of his father," and the *Monthly* soon began to "decline in popularity and prestige" (Albrecht 232). In 1825, G. E. Griffiths sold his rights to the *Monthly Review*, thus ending the periodical's impressive 76-year run.

Griffiths and *The Dictionary of Love*

The Dictionary of Love. In which is contained, The Explanation of most of the Terms used in that Language was published anonymously in 1753 by R. Griffiths, at the Dunciad in St. Paul's Church-Yard. It was not until 1979 that Roger Lonsdale identified the author of the work: Lonsdale notes that "[Griffiths] himself reviewed the book in the *Monthly* in December 1753...and annotated his reference in his opening sentence to the 'ingenious author' as 'Mr. Cleland'" (285).

Although several more editions of the dictionary appeared throughout the second half of the eighteenth-century, Griffiths is not listed as the publisher and Cleland's involvement or lack of thereof is not known.

Home Life and Later Years

Griffiths married twice, and there is no evidence to suggest that he was not a good husband. His first wife, Isabella, died in 1764 at the age of 52; they had no children. In 1767, Griffiths married Elizabeth Clark and the two had three children: George Edward (b. 1771/2), Ann (b. 1773) and another daughter who apparently died in infancy (Antonia Foster, in ODNB).

In 1790, the University of Pennsylvania awarded Griffiths an honorary LL.D. Derek Roper, writes that "during the American [Revolution] he had supported the colonists, not only by his editorial policy, but by providing a 'post office' for their intelligence agents," and states that the degree was awarded "partly in recognition of these services" (174).

Although Griffiths eventually went blind, he remained in charge of the *Monthly Review* until his death at Turnham Green in 1803. He was buried in St Nicholas's Church, Chiswick (Foster, ODNB).

Appendix C: Biography of J. F. Dreux du Radier

Jean-François Dreux du Radier (1714-1781)

J. F. Dreux du Radier (J. F. Dreux of the Foundation raft, a French commune) was born in Chateaufort-in-Thymerais, France in 1714. He worked as a lawyer in Paris after attending the military Academy of Angers, of which he became a member in 1761.

According to the *Bibliography of the French Literature of the Eighteenth Century* (1969), Dreux du Radier published thirty-eight works, the most well-known being historical and political accounts, such as *Historical and Critical Library of Poitou* (1754), *Historical and Anecdotal Shelves of the Kings of France* (1759) and *Historical Memories of the Queens and Regents of France* (1776). However, he also wrote and compiled poetical, philosophical and other literary works, including *New Fables and Other Pieces of Poetry* (1744) and *The Dictionary of Love* (1741).

In examining the literary underground of eighteenth-century France, Robert Darnton found that Dreux du Radier was "exiled 'for propos' [seditious talk]" (179). Although Darnton's book, *The Great Cat Massacre*, does not state the date or title for which the author was exiled, his *Corpus of Clandestine Literature* includes *Temple du bonheur, ou recueil des plus excellents traits sur le bonheur, extraits des meilleurs auteurs anciens et modernes*, a work credited to Dreux du Radier in 1769 and confiscated by customs in 1775. The title translates, roughly, as *The Temple of Happiness, or an anthology of the most excellent treatises on happiness, extracts of the better old and modern authors*.

It seems that Dreux du Radier was, like John Cleland, living by his pen. However, unlike Cleland, he had a family to support: Darnton writes that he was "weighed down with offspring and therefore condemned to Grub Street for the rest of [his life]" (170). Dreux du Radier died in 1781.

Appendix D: XML Tags

Each entry is a <record> that includes the header material, definition and analysis. Within each section are tags to encode specific elements, some of which only appear in one or two entries. What follows is a description of each of the tags in these three broad categories.

<dictionary>

<record>

Header Material

<number> - each entry was given a number to safeguard against overlapping or similar information among words and definitions

<mainword> - the single word for each entry, omitting infinitive constructions and multiple parts of speech; necessary for alphabetizing purposes

<altword> - this tag was only necessary for the entry 'Sick. Sickness,' which required that there be a place to record both parts of speech, although 'sick' was used as the <mainword>

<phrase> - used mainly for verbs, which are usually listed in the dictionary in the infinitive form

<syn> - synonyms listed under the main entry

<explanation> - some words include a brief explanation to differentiate them from similar words. Example: the entry for the noun 'love' includes the explanatory note 'The love-passion.'

<maxim> - some entries include a brief maxim, such as "Love levels every thing."

<ref> - some entries point readers to other entries. This tag indicates what other entry is being pointed to. Example: "Rendezvous. *See* Assignation."

Definition Material

<definition> - the parent element in this section

<context> - used to highlight words used in an exemplary context within the definition. Example: "Offer: I offer you a heart penetrated with the tenderest passion..."

<dialogue> - many entries use dialogue, as indicated by quotation marks, to explain a term's meaning. Sometimes it is set off in italics (for which I used <dialoguei>) and

sometimes it is in plain text. Example: "Indifferent: *How indifferent are you?* That is as much as to say, "I wonder you can have so little attention to my merit."

<subterm> - some entries list a main term and then described one or two variations of it. The entry for 'heart,' for example, has a basic definition and then two short, specific descriptions of a 'novice-heart' and a 'battered-heart.'

<list> - a few terms use lists, either numbered or not. The most obvious one is 'beauty,' which enumerates the physical attributes a woman should possess to be considered beautiful

<propername> - several entries use proper names: some are fictional; other refer to historical, mythological or even contemporary people and places. Example: "Coxcomb: ...Mr. Addison even thought no fine gentleman could exist without a dash of the coxcomb..."

<reference> - in a few entries, the reference appears within the body of the definition, so it must be tagged separately from the reference that appears in the header material. Example: "To Please: ...*I desire nothing but to please you*, is equivalent to saying, I love you. *See To Love.*"

<maximdef> - some entries include maxims in the body of the definition

<FLF>, **<FLG>**, **<FLI>**, **<FLS>** - these tags mark off words or phrases within the definitions that are in French, German, Italian and Spanish, respectively.

Analysis Material

<analysis> - the parent element in this section

<pos> and **<altpost>** - part of speech and alternative part of speech (for entries like "Sick. Sickness.")

<courtshipstage> - includes the children **<starting>**, which can have one or more of the words 'meeting,' 'wooing,' or 'flattering'; **<negotiating>**, which can contain one or more of the words 'dating,' 'conflict' or 'rivalry'; and **<outcome>**, which can include one or more of the words 'marriage,' 'sex' or 'breakup'.

<variation> - includes the children **<omission>**, **<addition>**, **<altwording>** (alternative wording), **<spelling>** (for spelling changes), **<notes>** (for the footnotes added in the 1777 edition) and **<other>** (for miscellaneous variations).

Within **<omission>** are the children **<missing>** and **<edition>**; within **<addition>** are the children **<new>** and **<edition>**; within **<spelling>** are the children **<original>**, **<change>** and **<edition>**; within **<altwording>** are the children **<text>** (for the section of text where

the variation occurs; without this it would be difficult to find where in the definition the alternative wording was) and within that <diff> (to encode the specific word or phrase that is different); within <other> are the children <original>, <change> and <edition>.

<litex> - this tag is designed to allow examples from literature to be added as they are discovered. It contains the children <work>, <author>, <usage>, <chapter>, <scene>, and <lines>. Note that this element is not defined to allow specific bibliographic information, such as page numbers or publication dates. This issue may need to be revisited if the tags prove insufficient.

<comment> - this tag, like it sounds, would simply hold commentary or notes for each entry

<index> - this tag is designed to hold a list of terms to cross-reference with the present term so that users searching for, for example, 'flattery' might be directed to words like 'praise.'

Formatting Tags

 - used to mark text printed in italics

<p> - used to set off paragraphs

</record>

</dictionary>

Works Cited

- Albrecht, Wilbur T. "The Monthly Review." *British Literary Magazines: The Augustan Age and the Age of Johnson, 1698-1788*. Ed. Alvin Sullivan. London: Greenwood Press, 1983. 231-237.
- Anonymous. *A Dictionary of Love: in which is Contained, the Explanation of the Most used Terms in that Language*. Dublin: 1754.
- . *A Dictionary of Love. Or the Language of Gallantry Explained*. London: Printed for J. Bell and C. Etherington, 1776.
- . *A Dictionary of Love, with Notes. Wherein is the Description of a Perfect Beauty; the Picture of a Fop...and a Key to All the Arch-Phrases and Difficult Terms used in that Universal Language*. London: Printed for J. Bew, J. Wilkie, G. Riley, and W. Caville, 1777.
- . *A Dictionary of Love. Or the Language of Gallantry Explained*. London: Printed for J. Bell, 1787.
- . *A Dictionary of Love; Wherein is the Description of a Perfect Beauty; the Picture of a Fop...and a Key to All the Arch-Phrases, & Difficult Terms, used in that Universal Language. With Notes*. London: Printed for W. Lane at the Minerva Press, 1795.
- . *A Dictionary of Love wherein is the Description of a Perfect Beauty; the Picture of a Fop or Macaroni; and the Key to All the Arch-Phrases, Difficult Terms, and Peculiar Idioms, used in that Universal Language. With Notes*. Philadelphia: Printed by James Carey, 1798.
- . *A Dictionary of Love; Wherein is the Description of a Perfect Beauty; the Picture of a Fop...and a Key to All the Arch-Phrases, & Difficult Terms, used in that Universal Language. With Notes*. London: Minerva Press, 1806.
- . *A Dictionary of Love: in which is Contained, the Explanation of the Most used Terms in that Language*. Edinburgh: Printed by R. Buchanan, 1824.
- Borsay, Peter. "The Culture of Improvement." *The Eighteenth Century*. Ed. Paul Langford. New York: Oxford University Press, 2002. 183-204.
- Boswell, James. *Boswell for the Defense*. Eds. William K. Wimsatt, Jr. and Frederick A. Pottle. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1959.
- Brown, Penelope and Stephen C. Levinson. *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Use*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

- Cioranescu, Alexandre. *Bibliographie de la Littérature Française du Dix-Huitième Siècle*, Vol. 1. Paris: Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1969.
- Cleland, John. *Fanny Hill or Memoirs of a Woman of Pleasure*. Ed. Peter Wagner. New York: Penguin Books, 1985.
- , trans. *The Dictionary of Love. In which is Contained, the Explanation of Most of the Terms used in that Language*. London: Printed for R. Griffiths, 1753.
- Congreve, William. *The Way of the World*. Ed. Brian Gibbons. New York: W. W. Norton and Company Inc., 1971.
- Darnton, Robert. *The Corpus of Clandestine Literature in France 1769-1789*. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1995.
- . *The Great Cat Massacre and Other Episodes in French Cultural History*. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1984.
- Eckert, Penelope. "The Whole Woman: Sex and Gender Differences in Variation." *Language Change and Variation* 1 (1989): 245-267.
- Epstein, William H. *John Cleland: Images of a Life*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1974.
- Fielding, Henry. *Joseph Andrews with Shamela and Related Writings*. Ed. Homer Goldberg. New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1987.
- Foster, Antonia. "Ralph Griffiths." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford University Press, 2006. Online Resource. Accessed: 13 Dec. 2006.
- Gordon, Elizabeth. "Sex, Speech, and Stereotypes: Why Women Use Prestige Speech Forms More Than Men." *Language in Society* 26 (1997): 47-63.
- Griffiths, Ralph. "Article LXXII: Review of The Dictionary of Love." *The Monthly Review* Dec. 1753: 464-470.
- Hockey, Susan. *Electronic Texts in the Humanities*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Johnson, Samuel. *The Works of Samuel Johnson*, Vol 10. Ed. Arthur Murphy. London: F. C. and J. Rivington, 1823. Online Resource.
<<http://books.google.com/books?vid=07ePoUbqGyym-jOo3eWgkk&id=1WBIRVSNhZUC&pg=PP7&lpg=PP7&dq=the+works+of+samuel+johnson+arthur+murphy+1823+volume+tenth>> Accessed: 11 Apr. 2007.

- Knapp, Lewis Mansfield. *Tobias Smollet, Doctor of Men and Manners*. New York: Russell and Russell, Inc., 1963.
- Labov, William. *The Social Stratification of English in New York City*. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1966.
- . "The Intersection of Sex and Social Class in the Course of Linguistic Change." *Language Variation and Change* 2 (1990): 205-254.
- Lavagnino, John. "Completeness and Adequacy in Text Encoding." *The Literary Text in the Digital Age*. Ed. Richard J. Finneran. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1996. 63-76.
- Lemmings, David. "Marriage and the Law in the Eighteenth Century: Hardwicke's Marriage Act of 1753." *The Historical Journal* 39.2 (1996): 339-360.
- Lillo, George. *The London Merchant*. Ed. William McBurney. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1965.
- Lloyd's Evening Post*. "Advertisement for *The Dictionary of Love*." 13 May 1776. 459.
- Lonsdale, Roger. "New Attributions to John Cleland." *The Review of English Studies* 30.119 (1979): 268-290.
- Mackenzie, Dana. "New Language Could Meld the Web into a Seamless Database." *Science*. 19 June 1998: 1840-41.
- Moxted, Ian ed. *The London Book Trades 1775-1800: A Preliminary Checklist of Members*. Great Britain: The Gresham Press, 1777.
- McIntosh, Carey. *Common and Courtly Language: The Stylistics of Social Class in 18th Century English Literature*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1986.
- Nangle, Benjamin C. *The Monthly Review: First Series 1749-1789*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1934.
- Nichols, John. "Obituary: John Cleland." *Gentleman's Magazine* 59.2, part 1 (Feb. 1789): 180.
- Richardson, Samuel. *Pamela*. Eds. T. C. Duncan Eaves and Ben D. Kimpel. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1971.
- Rockwell, Geoffrey. "What is Text Analysis, Really?" *Literary and Linguistic Computing* 18.2 (2003): 209-219.

- Sabor, Peter. "John Cleland." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford University Press, 2006. Online Resource. Accessed: 12 Dec. 2006.
- Shillingsburg, Peter. "Principles for Electronic Archives, Scholarly Editions, and Tutorials." *The Literary Text in the Digital Age*. Ed. Richard J. Finneran. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1996. 23-25.
- Short, Harold. "The Role of Humanities Computing: Experiences and Challenges." *Literary and Linguistic Computing* 21.1 (2006): 15-27.
- Sikorski, Robert and Richard Peteres. "XML is Hatching." *Science* 21 Aug. 1998: 1164.
- Sperberg-McQueen, C.M. "Textual Criticism and the Text Encoding Initiative." *The Literary Text in the Digital Age*. Ed. Richard J. Finneran. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1996 37-61.
- Staves, Susan. "British Seduced Maidens." *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 14.2 (1980-81):109-134.
- Trudgill, Peter. "Sex, Covert Prestige, and Linguistic Change in the Urban British English of Norwich." *Language in Society* 1 (1972): 179-195.
- Unsworth, John. "The Importance of Failure." *The Journal of Electronic Publishing* 3.2.(1997): Online Resource <<http://www.press.umich.edu/jep/03-02/unsworth.html>> Accessed: 4 Apr. 2006.

Curriculum Vitae

Emily K. Davis

2004-Present Student, English Master's Degree Program;
Thesis Defense, 27 April 2007;
Graduation Date May 2007.

2006 Annual Graduate Student Conference, Virginia Tech; presented paper, "Dialect in Children's Literature."

2004-2006 Graduate Teaching Assistant, Virginia Tech English Department; taught freshman English.

1999-2003 Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Bachelor of Science, Animal and Poultry Science; Bachelor of Arts, English.

DOB 1-21-81