Dramatic extraction and Polly Honeycombe’s &c.

AMELIA DALE

Polly Honeycombe (1760), George Colman the Elder’s popular afterpiece, is, according to its long title, “A DRAMATICK NOVEL OF ONE ACT.” 1 Polly Honeycombe opens with its eponymous heroine “reading and acting” (2). Polly’s situation as both a quixotic reader reading, and a gleeful performer acting, is mirrored by Polly Honeycombe’s own generic indeterminacy, it is both a dramatic work and a “novel.” While genre bending in this period is hardly unusual, Polly Honeycombe’s situation as both a satire of the novel and a performable, printed text, provides a fresh perspective on issues critical to the eighteenth-century novel, in particular the relationship between the printed page and the reader’s flesh. 2 Notions of extraction, both textual and bodily, are crucial to Polly Honeycombe’s description of quixotic reading, and potentially to eighteenth-century quixotic narratives in general. A quixote imitates the actions of characters from their favoured texts, re-situating these actions in a context vastly different, and typically hostile to their favoured books. As April Alliston writes, the “tragic error of the quixotic hero(ine) is a dramatic one: it is an insistence on acting out the exemplary character, rather than simply internalizing it figuratively.” 3


Quixotism then, can be described as a process of dramatic extraction, it involves textual elements being selected, embodied and then reframed. This article shall demonstrate how Polly Honeycombe emphatically portrays its heroine as being a dramatic embodiment of a printed extract.

Polly Honeycombe’s claim to be “A Dramatick Novel” implies a novel which uses dramatic conventions, yet the title continues, describing Polly Honeycombe as being “one Act. As it is now Acted at the Theatre-Royal in Drury Lane”, ironically contradicting its initial claim to being a novel. The phrase “As it is now Acted” appears commonly in printed plays of the period.¹ It describes a general likeness between the printed text and its staged equivalent, suggesting that the printed text is produced to replicate as closely as possible the staged version. The act of reading, it is implied, produces an imagined performance of the farce which is fundamentally connected to a similar, simultaneous performance on stage.

We see in eighteenth-century plays repeated, explicit reference to print, reading and the circulation of printed matter. According to Julia Stone Peters it was in the late seventeenth century that dramatists began to concern themselves with print as well as performance, “[t]he theatre was joining itself to the page, defining against the printed word. It would never again entirely free itself from this strange relation.”⁵ Polly’s infatuation with reading makes her a generic figure, the female quixote, familiar on the eighteenth-century stage and off.⁶ Polly

---

¹ The English Short Title Catalogue lists 86 titles with the phrase “As it is now acted” published between 1740-1770. British Library, English Short Title Catalogue (accessed June 15, 2012), estc.bl.uk.
playfully imitates the heroines of contemporary novels, speaks their language, and attempts to surpass them in plotting and courage; she claims to have “as much love and as much spirit” as any novel heroine (7) and she arguably does, outwitting her parents by thwarting their plan to marry her off to Ledger. *Polly Honeycombe’s* dramatic nature means that unlike typical eighteenth-century quixotic novels, such as Charlotte Lennox’s *The Female Quixote* (1752), the quixote’s attempt to embody written words does not merely result in further written words. When *Polly Honeycombe* is performed, Polly’s reading of novels is “staged” twice: firstly by her, through her imitation and attempts at upstaging novel heroines—she seeks to create “an excellent chapter in a new Novel” (18), and secondly through the dramatic process which produces a performance from print. Even when encountered as a printed text, *Polly Honeycombe* remains a work ostentatiously performed and performable, to read it is to envisage it being performed. The printed play perpetually reminds the reader that it is a script which has been performed and will provide the basis for future performances. This is apparent in such conventional elements as the list of “Persons” (xvi) prefacing the play which informs the reader that Miss Pope, for instance, has played the part of Polly. The stage directions, ostensibly written to guide the actress playing Polly, serve to direct the performance occurring in the reader’s imagination. Peters describes in this period a shift in printed stage directions, which involve an attempt “bring the performance to the reader – that attempt to make it vividly present in the instant.”  


Ernest Benn, 1979 [1775]). Polly Honeycombe’s ancestors are of course not solely dramatic; apart from Don Quixote himself, the character of Polly Honeycombe is undoubtedly influenced by Arabella from Charlotte Lennox, *The Female Quixote*, ed. Amanda Gilroy and Wil Verhoeven (London: Penguin Books, 2006 [1752]).
the actress playing Polly, and the reader must work out from the concise stage directions how the actress playing Polly should act. To read *Polly Honeycombe* is to stage it.

*Polly Honeycombe*, though it has received scant critical attention, was “[o]ne of the most successful farces of the entire century.”

Aside from a difficult first performance, it was a success, performed fifteen times the first season it appeared. First published in London, 11 December 1760, not only did *Polly Honeycombe* have a successful performance history, but a successful reading history. Admittedly, this was not unusual for the eighteenth century; Peters states that even “ordinary” plays generally ran into several editions while popular playwrights “could generally expect to see some dozen editions of any play.”

In this period, printed plays like *Polly Honeycombe* rivalled novels’ popularity in circulating libraries. David Brewer has described how physical traces on a first edition copy of *Polly Honeycombe* suggest it was in a circulating library, and well read. *Polly Honeycombe* ran into seven printed editions in its first three seasons, and later appeared in collections of

---

8 David A. Brewer, "Print, Performance, Personhood, Polly Honeycombe," *Studies in Eighteenth Century Culture* 41, no. (2012), 186. *Polly Honeycombe* is hardly unknown, and its historical importance is acknowledged. However, when it is mentioned, it is typically only in passing, as part of a larger discussion of eighteenth-century female novel readers and as an influence on more commonly studied quixotic texts, such as Sheridan’s *Rivals*. There has been little work done on its own literary complexities. Exceptions are Thomas Price’s introduction to George Colman, *Critical edition of The jealous wife and Polly Honeycombe*, ed. Thomas Price, Volume 30 of Studies in British Literature (Edwin Mellen Press, 1997); Brewer, "Print, Performance, Personhood, Polly Honeycombe."; Paul Stanley Varner, "The Comic Techniques of George Colman the Elder" (Doctor of Philosophy, The University of Tennessee, 1981).

9 Cross, the prompter notes in his diary after the first performance the farce was “indifferently received, partly owing [sic] to the Fright and Confusion of the Performers, who omitted some speeches on which the plot depended.” By the third night however, the prompter writes, “Polly Honeycomb [sic] goes off very well.” MS diary quoted in *The London stage, 1660-1800; a calendar of plays, entertainments & afterpieces, together with casts, box-receipts and contemporary comment. Compiled from the playbills, newspapers and theatrical diaries of the period*, 5 vols., vol. 4 (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1960-8), pt. 4, vol 2, 828.

10 Joseph Addison’s *Cato* (1713) and John Gay’s *Beggar’s Opera* (1728) were published over a hundred times during the eighteenth century. Peters, *Theatre of the Book 1480-1880: Print, Text, and Performance in Europe*, 50, 345n62.


Colman’s *Dramatick Works* (1777, 1778). Even when taking the extensive eighteenth-century consumption of printed plays into account, *Polly Honeycombe*, being the first work of an unknown playwright, was a notable success. This success was encouraged, I suggest, by the textual devices in its printed form, such as the aforementioned stage directions, and in particular, the circulating library extract, which mark it as an object to be silently, privately read, as well as a performable text.

*Polly Honeycombe* properly begins with its titular heroine walking onto the stage with a “Book in her Hand” and reading aloud. This signals the strong link between Polly’s own identity and her reading. It also establishes from the first moment of the play, the play’s concern with the transformation between book and body, between performance and print, with Polly’s pose mirroring an actor at a rehearsal, holding a script. This scene also establishes *Polly Honeycombe*’s concern with excerpts and extracts. Polly reads from a novel, begins midway through a passage, “[w]ith these words the enraptured baronet concluded his declaration of love” (1) and ends halfway through a sentence when she sees her Nurse (2-3), and the act of extraction is impossible to ignore. The passage Polly reads is ostentatiously not self-contained. Moreover, the sympathetic pleasures Polly experiences point to the larger novel. “Well said, Sir George!” are the first words Polly exclaims, and the first words of the play proper (1) – we catch Polly responding to her reading by momentarily addressing a fictional character as though he is a person of flesh and blood, capable of hearing her appreciative words. Notably, the novel Polly reads is a fictive, hyperbolic parody.

---

of a sentimental novel; Polly later mentions its title, *The History of Sir George Truman and Emilia* (8) but no such novel exists. Yet even if this excerpt was not a parody, it could not offer the captivation of a narrative or the identification with characters which a novel’s length provides. The audience cannot ignore that instead of being presented with an absorbing whole, they are proffered a fragment. The emphatic removal of the passage from its (fictive) “original” situation within *The History of Sir George Truman and Emilia* highlights its new frame: Polly’s “reading and acting” (2) of the passage, and more globally, the performance of the actress playing Polly and the way the extract is staged. According to Lisa Freeman, the eighteenth-century theatre audience was not particularly interested in character, instead they were preoccupied by the actor’s capacity to become, or at least “act” a particular character. We can see in *Polly Honeycombe* this externalisation of character—the very process of embodying the printed word constitutes a crucial part of the text. *Polly Honeycombe* paradoxically depicts on the eighteenth-century stage Polly experiencing a novelistic relation to character which both the eighteenth-century theatre and a short prose extract denies.

Polly is a character very much in the eighteenth-century sense of the word – a type of writing. Freeman has argued that character on the eighteenth-century stage should be understood in these terms, and has stressed how important genre is to considerations of character in eighteenth-century drama. Polly is produced by the novels she reads to an extent that she becomes synonymous with a dramatically embodied fragment from a novel. In the opening scene, the stage directions have Polly mimicking the gestures of the characters.

---

15 Freeman writes, “audiences did not attend performances to see how well a ‘character’ was developed but how well a particular performer played against his or her ‘line’” Lisa Freeman, *Character’s theater: genre and identity on the eighteenth-century English stage* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2002), 31.
17 Freeman, *Character’s theater: genre and identity on the eighteenth-century English stage*. 
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in the novel that she reads. She places her own hand to her chest when Sir George presses Emilia’s hand “to his bosom” (2). This placement of her own hand on her heart is not an exact reproduction of either Sir George or Emilia’s movement, instead, Polly’s body becomes the location of the love scene; Polly inscribes on her own body both Emilia’s bashfulness and George’s “tumultuous passion.” With inevitable onanistic implications, Polly’s hand takes the place of Emilia’s, her body Sir George’s. Notably, Polly’s acting out of the love scene, with all its sly masturbatory suggestiveness, does not involve Polly exclusively embodying either of the characters, instead she embodies the text she reads: an extract.

Various devices are used to suggest Polly’s interchangeableness with a piece of writing. The similarity between Polly and an extract are heightened by Polly Honeycombe’s short title. Polly Honeycombe takes a form typical for an eighteenth-century title: the name of the heroine. This suggests a congruence between Polly and the printed text which contains her. As is convention for the eighteenth-century printed page, there is a running head on the top of the pages of the printed edition. Polly Honeycombe’s running heads are as follows: PREFACE (iii-ix), EXTRACT (x-xiii), PROLOGUE (xv), POLLY HONEYCOMBE (2-44), EPILOGUE (46). On the printed page of Polly Honeycombe, Polly’s name appears in precisely the same place as words describing short pieces of writing, implying that she is equivalent to them. Within the content of the play, Polly is also suggestibly linked to written fragments. For instance, Polly mimics Pamela and Clarissa’s secretion of writing instruments and letters around her body. Polly has “an excellent ink-horn in my pin-cushion—And a case of pens, and some paper, in my fan” (24).\(^{18}\) Like Samuel Richardson’s heroines, Polly’s

\(^{18}\) Unfortunately I haven’t the space to go into Polly Honeycombe’s specific rewriting of Richardson, and Clarissa in particular, which is hilarious and pointed, Polly distinctly echoes Lovelace when she states “I have such a head full of intrigues and contrivances.” She praises Scribble as writing as well as Bob Lovelace, showing herself to be the exact kind of reader, desiring Lovelace, whom Richardson desperately worked to avoid. Lois E. Bueler notes Polly Honeycombe’s structural similarities to Clarissa and includes it in an
incorporation of paper and ink in her clothing underscores the way print, writing and paper are fundamental to her existence.

_Polly Honeycombe_’s suggestive preoccupation with extracts and excerpts is part of its engagement with its own mediation. Christina Lupton has described how mid-eighteenth century books are not only concerned with their own selves as objects, but the way they have been mediated – produced, advertised, distributed, received and republished, giving the impression of a “book sentient about its limited conditions of production and reception and resistant to human efforts to usurp its ironic, critical authority.”19 _Polly Honeycombe_ self-consciously anticipates its own circulation in extracted forms. _Polly Honeycombe_’s prologue and epilogue appeared in numerous newspapers.20 While it was not unusual for newspapers to publish plays’ epilogues and prologues, they certainly did not publish those of every play, and it reflects both _Polly Honeycombe_’s popularity, and the way _Polly Honeycombe_ is a text which lends itself to being extracted. _The London Magazine, Or. Gentleman’s monthly intelligencer_ (December 1760) published “A Humourous [sic] Scene” from _Polly Honeycombe_ sandwiched between commentary on the sale of Dunkirk and Methodism.21 _Polly Honeycombe_ invites extraction because it itself is barely a whole play to begin with, it is an “afterpiece” written to be placed alongside other works, a fragment of a night’s theatrical performance. On the night of its premiere, _Polly Honeycombe_ was performed after

---


20 The Prologue and Epilogue were published in _The London Chronicle_ December 9-11, 1760; _The Public Advertiser_, December 12, 1760; _The Public Ledger or The Daily Register of Commerce and Intelligence_, December 15, 1760.

21 _The London magazine_, December, 1760. Again, the publication of scenes from plays was not unusual, _The London magazine_ also published extracts from Colman’s _The Jealous Wife_, for instance. _The London magazine_, February, 1761.
Aaron Hill’s translation and alteration of Voltaire’s *Meropé*, a classical tragedy. Though *Polly Honeycombe* was often paired with similar, self-conscious comedies like *The Beggar’s Opera* or *The Rehearsal*, it was equally likely to follow tragedies such as *The Fair Penitent*.\(^{22}\) James Boswell enjoyed a performance of *Polly Honeycombe* following *King Lear*.\(^{23}\) *Polly Honeycombe* is written to succeed when situated amongst disparate items. More generally, it is a text which thrives on the comedy coming from placing conflicting genres alongside each other, it is a “Dramatick Novel” which features Polly quixotically imitating the behaviour of sentimental novel heroines within a farce. *Polly Honeycombe* both resembles an extract and encourages extraction.

Notions of extract and extraction are clearly pivotal to the interpretation of an extract from a circulating library list, contained in *Polly Honeycombe*’s printed edition. The Extract is inserted between the playful preface and before the printed play properly begins (fig. 1, 2, 3). It is introduced in *Polly Honeycombe*’s preface, which participates in the play’s self-consciousness about its generic situation, circulation and critical reception. The bulk of the preface is an extract from a letter purportedly by Colman’s mother. She describes the way *Polly Honeycombe* deviates from particular eighteenth-century dramatic conventions, “the *Catastrophe*. . . is directly contrary to all known rules. . . the whole Piece, instead of concluding bluntly with a sentence in Prose, should have been tagged with a Couplet or Two” (vi-vii). The device of incorporating his “mother’s” criticism into the play allows Colman to anticipate, effeminise and trivialise potential criticisms; to critique *Polly Honeycombe* is to risk comparison with the garrulous, uneducated and pedantic character of Colman’s mother. She writes how she found a circulating library catalogue amongst clothes and “much

---

\(^{22}\) *The London stage, 1660-1800; a calendar of plays, entertainments & afterpieces, together with casts, box-receipts and contemporary comment. Compiled from the playbills, newspapers and theatrical diaries of the period*, 5 vols., vol. 4 (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1960-8), 828-34.

thumbed” books (viii). Here the Preface prefigures Polly Honeycombe’s material manifestations. As Lupton writes, Polly Honeycombe anticipates “its own place in the register of carelessly arranged possessions and half bound books.”24 Colman’s mother then includes in her letter an “Extract from the Catalogue” (ix). The circulating library extract is represented as an overtly mediated, extracted object – Colman’s mother has extracted it from the original catalogue, Colman has extracted it from the letter his mother has sent him before incorporating it into Polly Honeycombe. The circulating library extract necessarily draws our attention to the production, distribution and consumption of printed works. We see in the circulating library extract Polly Honeycombe sharing mid-eighteenth century fiction’s self-consciousness about its reception and circulation. Polly Honeycombe strikingly prefigures its own appearance in circulating library catalogues.

The Extract is an unperformable object in the printed play. It is ostentatious about its dependence on print and paper; it is impossible to look at the extract and not see how its meaning depends on the layout of the printed page and the act of silent reading. Unable to be acted, arduous to read aloud, it is a plotless, narrativeless list, long and repetitive enough to make reading it as we would read prose or the script of the play, a task. It demands to be looked at, for the arrangements of the titles of the page and the patterning in the columns to be noted, for our eyes to pick out as we scan the page the longer titles and the italics. Its meaning comes from print devices, the patterning of the listed titles, the repetition, the columns, and the few, well-chosen italics. All the titles in the Extract are genuine eighteenth-century titles, arranged in alphabetical order.25 The bulk of the works in the Extract belong to the 1750s, as William Scott has noted. This lends the play topicality – it is modern novels,
published and distributed while the play is being performed and sold in print, with which
Polly Honeycombe is most concerned with. The form of the Extract, an alphabetical list,
results in repetitions and humorous conjunctions, highlighting the conventional nature of the
eighteenth-century novel title, parodied in the play proper by the Nurse’s words, “[t]he Ventures of Jack this, and the history of Betsy t’other, and sir Humphrys, and women with hard Christian names” (5). The circulating library page serves as the printed equivalent of her words.

It is necessary to go into this detail about the Extract to demonstrate how the Extract corresponds to Polly’s own character. As Cynthia Wall writes, “[t]o consider lists as verbal collections standing in for a series of objects, it makes sense to pry into those commas for other kinds of significance.” In Polly Honeycombe, the list that is the Extract not only mocks the eighteenth-century novel, but describes the reading subject; the Extract is as much a portrait of its bookish, quixotic heroine, as the “Polly” in the play proper. This white page, overlain with print of advertised novel titles describes a frivolous novel reader. John Locke’s An Essay Concerning Human Understanding (1690) repeatedly uses the figure of white paper being printed to describe human experience, ideas are “printed” or “imprinted” on the mind by experience, (and occasionally nature and God). As Christopher Flint asserts, during the eighteenth century “paper and ink . . . served as primary symbols of a new form of subjectivity . . . A page whether empty or filled, became a powerful emblem of human potential, a surface to be imprinted by the defining characteristics that personal experience

26 Ibid.
Moreover, as Scott Paul Gordon writes, the Quixote’s mind is not a blank sheet of paper, but a paper which has been marked by the Quixote’s favourite texts, “Don Quixote’s mind has been inscribed by the romances he has consumed”, and similarly, Polly’s mind is imprinted with contemporary sentimental novels. The Extract represents the Lockean *tabula rasa* overlain with contemporary novel titles.

Eighteenth-century descriptions of ideas imprinting the mind are more than just figures of speech. Novel reading, like other experiences and memories, were believed to leave physical impressions on the individual; René Descartes’ *Regulae ad directionem ingenii* (1628) proposes that the five senses receive external stimuli as an imprint or impression, which is then instantly conveyed to the *sensorium commune* (common sense). The impression then makes its mark on the fancy or imagination, seated in the brain. The figure of print becomes crucial to describing the interaction between the material body and the immaterial mind or soul when the subject responds to experience. It is present in Joseph Addison’s “Pleasures of the Imagination”, he writes about “the fancy” receiving the “print of those images it has received from outward objects.” It is in David Hume’s *A Treatise of Human Nature* (1739-40), which, as Lupton observes, draws upon “his reader’s association with ‘IMPRESSION’ with the technology of print.” Isaac Watts’ *Philosophical Essays on Various Subjects* (1733) talks of traces on the brain in detail. The imprints, like printed

---

32 No. 416, *Spectator*, Friday, June 27, 1712.
works themselves, are corporeal according to Watts, but they have the potential capacity to affect the soul.  

Part of the Extract’s ostentatious dependence on print for meaning comes from the subtly chosen italics which work to reinforce the relation between the Extract and a quixotic subjectivity. Italics are used in the full title of *Clidanor and Cecilia*, describing the text as being “adapted to form the Mind to a just Way of thinking, and a proper Manner of behaving in Life” (x). The emphasised words represent a work which has been specifically written with the purpose of changing the reader’s way of thinking and behaving; the reader quixotically learns what is “a just Way of thinking, and a proper Manner of behaving” from a novel. The only other italicised words on the page, and indeed the page opposite, are part of the full title of the *Bubbled Knights*: “Folly and Unreasonableness of Parents laying a restraint upon their Children's Inclinations in the Affairs of Love and Marriage” and “sentimental” (x). Numerous other long titles refer to the importance of love. The clear implication is that novels form young minds to oppose their parents in marriage, and to associate such disobedience with fashionable sentimentality. We have the famous full-title of *Clarissa*, which concludes, “and particularly shewing the Distresses that may attend the Misconduct both of Parents and Children in relation to marriage” (x), and the full title of the *Impetuous Lover* “shewing to what Lengths Love may run” (xii). The titles of the novels pre-figure Polly’s behaviour in the play, and describe their own impact on her character. The moral, pedagogical imperative is advertised in the eighteenth-century novel title; the titles proclaim the way they are going to “form the Mind” (x). Sarah Raff has demonstrated how

35 Whether the italics are Colman’s or not I am unable to determine. According to the English Short Title Catalogue there are no copies of *Clidanor and Cecilia* in existence (or at least in libraries), though it certainly existed, *Thelamont* (1744) advertises itself as “by the author of *Clidanor and Cecilia.*” British Library, *English Short Title Catalogue* (accessed June 15, 2012), estc.bl.uk.
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“although the seduced, quixotic reader was the most degraded figure that anti-novel discourse could imagine, she was also the secret ideal reader of orthodox novels.”

Both the quixotic reader and the ideal reader of conventional novels have a mind which, in Locke’s words, is “unwary and as yet, unprejudiced understanding,” a sheet of paper which receives “any characters.”

However, at least in the Extract, there seems to be little secret about the correspondence between Polly, the seduced novel reader, and the ideal reader of *Clarissa*. The choice of long titles in the Extract describes how “[b]oth the orthodox and the quixotic models of reading envision fiction’s radical influence upon its receiver.”

Fiction’s alteration of the reader in the Extract is proclaimed in the novel titles, and through print itself, with the titles imprinted on the page symbolising the novels’ imprint on the reader. The Extract has individual subjectivity overlain with the titles of modern novels; selfhood or at least that of the frivolous circulating library reader, is reduced bathetically to a circulating library catalogue.

The Extract, of course, equates reading and consumerism. As well as the book titles signifying definitive impressions on an individual, the books are also blatantly commodities. The very eighteenth-century titles quoted promote the books as commercial objects, promising particular experiences, for instance “Sedan, in which many new and entertaining Characters are introduced” (xiii), proffers entertainment and diversion. The alterations of the reader’s character is part of the advertised experience of reading novels; the books’ ability to “*form the mind*” of their reader is part of what makes them desirable objects to be consumed.

Deidre Lynch observes how mid-century fiction implements “Locke’s model of the self-made

---

consciousness, which aligns the acquisition of knowledge with the acquisition of property.”

The Lockean individual, Lynch states, is “[c]ast as a collector. . . the cumulative product of his private stockpile of sensations and reflections.” This cumulative nature of Lockean individual consciousness is portrayed in the Extract’s list form, each book title simultaneously represents both an object to be consumed and an educational experience to be impressed on the reader’s mind. Cynthia Wall argues that during the eighteenth century, things could be “interpreted as intertwined with person, objects with subjects.” Similarly, Julie Park writes that that “[s]o central did the acquisition and display of objects become to forming the self – and invariably a feminine self – that objects threatened to displace the subject as a locus for selfhood in eighteenth-century England.” In this extract from a circulating library catalogue, objects do displace the subject, a library list doubles as both an enumeration of acquirable objects and a description of Polly’s (feminine) subjectivity.

The main body of Polly Honeycombe begins after the Extract ends, in a series of twenty “&c.” (fig. 3). The numerosness of the “&c.” in Polly Honeycombe not only matches the profusion depicted in the Extract, but draws the reader’s attention to the “&c.” themselves. “&c.” had a specific suggestiveness in the eighteenth century. Patrick Spedding and James Lambert have argued that contrary to established belief, “&c.” was not specific slang for female genitalia, but rather it has an elliptic function like the dash, “alert[ing] the reader to the fact that an obscenity has been used or has been narrowly avoided.” Admittedly, “&c.” was used to stand for a variety of obscenities, but it was primarily used as a substitute for the

---

40 Ibid.
vagina.\textsuperscript{44} There are numerous examples in this period overlooked by Spedding and Lambert, where “et caetera” or “&c.” is used to mean female genitalia.\textsuperscript{45} For instance, John Cleland’s \textit{Memoirs of a Woman of Pleasure} (1749) describes Fanny Hill being caressed on her “breast, belly, thighs, and all the sweet \textit{et cetera}, so dear to the imagination.”\textsuperscript{46} “Et caetera” is used in Henry Fielding’s \textit{Shamela} (1741) in a similar formulation. In \textit{Shamela}, Richardson’s Squire is described as being “naked in Bed, with his Hand on her [Pamela’s] Breasts, &c.,” with “&c.” printed identically to the et caeteras which end the Extract in \textit{Polly Honeycombe} (xiii).\textsuperscript{47} Later in \textit{Shamela}, Shamela asks what “et caetera” means and is told by the laughing male characters that they are referring to Mr Booby’s – Shamela’s master’s “Borough,” punning on “burrow” and characterising Shamela’s vagina as Booby’s property.\textsuperscript{48} Also in \textit{Shamela}, “&c.” features in a parody of Aaron Hill’s response to \textit{Pamela}. Fielding’s Parson Tickletext remarks, “[t]he Comprehensiveness of his [Richardson’s] Imagination must be truly prodigious! It has stretched out this diminutive mere Grain of Mustard seed (a poor Girl’s little &c.) into a Resemblance of that Heaven which the best of good Books has

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{44} Gordon Williams defines “et caetera” as “a substitute for vagina or other supressed indelicacy.” Gordon Williams, \textit{A Dictionary of Sexual Language and Imagery in Shakespearean and Stuart Literature} (London: Athlone Press, 1994), 448.

\textsuperscript{45} Randle Cotgrave’s \textit{A dictionarie of the French and English tongues} (1611) repeatedly uses “a womans &c.” as equivalent to vagina. A 1693 comedy has “Et Caetera” defined as “a very Aenigmatical Word. and cannot be open’d till the Marriage-knot is ty’d.” Roger Boyle Orrery, \textit{Guzman a comedy: acted at the Theatre-Royal} (London: Printed for Francis Saunders at the Blue Anchor, 1693). There is also a seventeenth-century poem entitled “Et Caetera” where the speaker says “On Corinna’s Breast I panting lay, / My right Hand playing with Et Caetera.” The most famous example, in \textit{Romeo and Juliet}, when Mercutio states “O that she were / An open et caetera, thou a pop’rin pear!” Though many modern editions substitute “arse” for “et caetera” Mark Morton asserts that through using the “et caetera” Mercutio is “mocking those who used it [et caetera] as a genuine euphemism” for vagina. Mercutio continues, mentioning the medlar tree. Medlar, according to Morgan, was used in the sixteenth century as slang synonym for vagina, though the original name for the fruit was open-arse. Mark Morton, \textit{The Lover's Tongue: A Merry Romp Through the Language of Love and Sex} (Toronto: Insomniac Press, 2003), 136.


\textsuperscript{47} Henry Fielding, \textit{An apology for the life of Mrs. Shamela Andrews. In which the many notorious falshoods and misrepresentations [sic] of a book called Pamela, are exposed and refuted} (London: printed for A. Dodd, 1741), 7.


\textit{Amelia Dale}
Spedding and Lambert assert that “&c.” in this context is deliberately oblique, and that its humour comes from this obscurity. This is clearly false, especially given the other uses of “et caetera” in Shamela. The humour comes from the accuracy of Tickletext’s description of the plot of Pamela, which centres on the accessibility of Pamela’s vagina. Fielding compares the generation of a commodious work to the stretching out of a vagina. Pamela’s dilated “&c.” comes to signify the “Comprehensiveness” and “prodigious[ness]” of Richardson’s work. Patricia Parker writes that dilation, as well as describing a “sexual and obstetrical ‘opening’ and the production of a generative increase,” was used in the Renaissance to mean an abundant textual increase, an “‘opening’ of a closed text to make it ‘increase and multiply.’” Parker writes that this “link between sexual opening and the opening of a closed or difficult text also continues well beyond the Renaissance.”

Though Parker does not mention Shamela, she describes how “Richardson’s Pamela [is] a ‘dilated novel’ in the sense of a shorter novella form extended” something which is associated with Pamela’s “prodigious textuality.” Fielding’s use of “&c.” builds on this established trope of female sexual opening and prodigious textual production. The series of twenty “&c.” at the end of Polly Honeycombe’s circulating library extract functions similarly. The series of “&c.” serves as an extensive fleshly bridge between the Extract and the play proper. They are, both structurally and bawdily an opening: the opening of the main body of Polly Honeycombe, and the opening of Polly Honeycombe’s body.

49 Fielding, An apology for the life of Mrs. Shamela Andrews. In which the many notorious falshoods and misrepresentations [sic] of a book called Pamela, are exposed and refuted, 3.
52 Ibid., 33.
53 Ibid., 32.
54 Eighteenth century examples linking female reproduction to copious textual generation are too numerous to list. Perhaps most famously, the monstrous mother figures of Dulness and Criticism appear in Alexander Pope’s Dunciad (1728) and Jonathan Swift’s Battle of the Books (1704) respectively, and are associated with uncontrollable textual reproduction. As Marilyn Francus writes, Pope and Swift make “extended punning on reproduction, in which literary production is fused with its theological and biological counterpart.” Marilyn Francus, "The Monstrous Mother: Reproductive Anxiety in Swift and Pope," ELH 61, no. 4 (1994), 834. For a broad overview of the metaphor of procreation and literary creativity see Susan Stanford Friedman, "Creativity and the Childbirth Metaphor: Gender Difference in Literary Discourse," Feminist Studies 13, no. 1 (1987).
The Extract associates the open “&c.” with a copious generation of novels. Circulating libraries were associated with the creation as well as the distribution of corrupting novels. For example, a letter by “T. Row” in the Gentleman’s Magazine (1767) writes,

There is scarce a month passes, but some worthless book of this kind. . . appears in the form of two volumes 12mo. Price five or six shillings, and they are chiefly the offspring, as I take it, of the managers of the circulating libraries, or their venal authors. . . the whole together are an horrible mass of hurtful insignificance. . . The author of Polly Honeycomb made a commendable attempt to stop the progress of this growing evil, and parents might learn. . . from thence.55

This letter in the Gentleman’s Magazine overwhelmingly portrays “worthless book[s]” as distastefully commercial items, material entities of “two volumes” manufactured with no other motive but monetary profit. Row uses the language of diseased reproduction – circulating libraries both generate polluted texts and corrupted readers. In Polly Honeycombe, that the Extract is but an extract, a mere selection from the circulating library catalogue, suggests the entire catalogue is so enormous it defies transcription, while the Extract’s aforementioned unreadability and unperformability emphasise its length. Contributing to this sense of enormous proliferation is the way the word “Extract” itself describes production, the primary definition of “Extract” in Samuel Johnson’s dictionary is “[t]o draw out of something.”56 The “&c.” at the end of the Extract signals both the potential sexual “corruption” of novel readers, and the material generation of “worthless” novels. Row is correct to note Polly Honeycombe’s satiric commentary on the “mass” of contemporary novels, but fails to note how Polly Honeycombe situates itself amongst the commercial generation it parodies. Polly Honeycombe proper begins immediately after the circulating library catalogue ends, suggesting the farce itself is another product of the circulating library catalogue. Appearing after the et caeteras, Polly Honeycombe becomes another title in the

55 Gentleman’s Magazine, December 1767.
circulating library extract, or as the bawdy meaning of the “&c.” suggests, *Polly Honeycombe* is birthed by the circulating library catalogue. In both cases, *Polly Honeycombe* playfully implicates itself in the textual proliferation and circulation it parodies.

The twenty “&c.” which end the Extract signal the sexual vulnerability and potential bodily corruption of the female novel reader. Novels, as Polly later proclaims in the Epilogue, “change and win us” (45) and the Extract depicts novels both altering and seducing their readers. The imprinting of titles on the page describes a reader’s subjectivity being altered, and the series of “&c.” at the end suggests that this imprinting ends with the novels’ sexual conquest of their female readers. On the page immediately following the Extract, the Prologue describes this act of seduction:

```
Plot, and elopement, passion, rape and rapture,
The total sum of ev’ry dear – dear – Chapter.
’Tis not alone the Small-Talk and the Smart,
’Tis NOVEL most beguiles the Female Heart.
Miss reads – she melts – she sighs – Love steals upon her –
And then – Alas, poor Girl! – good night, poor Honour!” (xiv-v)
```

The proximity of the series of “&c.” and the Prologue heighten each other’s suggestiveness. Both the Prologue and the Extract describe the reader reacting to novels with her body in a sexual manner. The dashes in the Prologue signal breathy pauses, and “Chapter” is significantly rhymed with “rapture.” Novel reading is immediately followed by physical responses, “Miss reads – she melts – she sighs” (xv). “[G]ood night, poor Honour!” implies that the suspect private reading has resulted in a public loss of reputation. Both the Extract and the Prologue draw on familiar anti-novel tropes of the period, depicting novels as both directly seducing their readers, and rendering their female readers more sexually vulnerable.
and liable to be seduced. Private reading, in the Extract, in the prologue, and in the play proper, leads to sexually suspect, bodily acts.

The circulating library extract in *Polly Honeycombe* uses the printed page as a scene of satiric exposure. Katherine Mannheimer notes how early eighteenth-century satirists define their satirical task as an exposure of their subject in particularly visual terms, “as an act of ‘exposing,’ ‘stripping,’ ‘baring,’ ‘flaying.’” As a list of existent novels, the Extract uses typographical devices to dryly reveal the frivolity and proliferation of contemporary literature. The Extract also functions as a brutal exposure of the novel reader. The quixotic novel reader is stripped and flayed, or extracted, until she is revealed as being merely an enumeration of novels appended by her genitalia. The Extract functions as a blazon of the female quixotic reader, with each novel title on the reading list functioning as an itemisation of a particular segment of the infatuated reader’s inscribed brain, and concluding with her vagina, which, it is implied, is affected by her reading as much as her mind. Notably, in Johnson’s dictionary the word “extract” itself is correlated with female flesh. To illustrate the third definition of “extract”, ( “[t]o take from something of which the thing was a part”), Johnson quotes Adam’s description of Eve from John Milton’s *Paradise Lost* (1667):

```
Bone of my bone, flesh of my flesh, myself
Before me: woman is her name, of man
Extracted.  
```

In the *Dictionary* and in *Paradise Lost*, Eve, the archetypal woman is an extract. Extraction becomes metonymically linked not only with generation, but with female flesh itself.

---

59 Given that *Polly Honeycombe* is an “afterpiece” it is potentially relevant that “piece” was also used in this period to describe a woman or a girl. Oxford English Dictionary, s.v. “piece”. This and the association of
Mannheimer argues that in the eighteenth century, women’s bodies were specifically linked to “the page as visually-navigated-object.” The Extract’s aforementioned ostentatious resistance to being read like a piece of prose, means it highlights the act of looking at the printed page, and consequently looking at the quixotic reader, laid bare on paper. The theatre audience’s gaze on the actress’ body on stage, as she performs Polly, is mirrored by the reader’s gaze on the quixotic reader stretched out on the page.

Colman’s “mother” closes the Preface by wishing that “your Farce may do some good on the Giddy Girls of this Age!” (ix). *Polly Honeycombe* satirises female novel reading, but it resolutely resists being read as a straight forward lesson to “giddy girls” on how not to read. Throughout the Preface, Colman treats “my good Mother’s talents for Criticism” with amused contempt (vii), omitting the greater part of her letter, so we should be wary of following Colman’s “mother” and characterising *Polly Honeycombe* as a conventional pedagogical eighteenth-century text, which attempts to do “good” and reform its readers. Tellingly, the “mother’s” words are immediately followed by the circulating library extract which, I have demonstrated, draws analogies between the desired reader of orthodox novels and the quixotic reader. *Polly Honeycombe* provides not the transformative, absorbing experience which eighteenth-century novels purport to offer, but a giddying complex, self-conscious exploration of print and imprinted bodies, of excerpts and quixotic performances, and ultimately of quixotism as dramatic extraction.

---

woman with “Extract” can be seen as part of a tradition of characterising women as being incomplete and lacking. Unfortunately this is beyond the breadth of this article to explore.


PREFACE.

"dirion, indeed, for the perusal of such fine lays) the first volume of the Adventures of Mr. Loveil, the third volume of Betty Thoughts, the New Atalantis for the year 1760, and the Catalogue of the Circulating Library. The books I was too well acquainted with to be tempted to any further perusal of them; but (on Mrs. Lutestring's being called into the shop to speak to a particular customer) I made the enclosed Extract from the Catalogue, which, as it falls exactly in with your design, I now send for your consideration. Heaven bless you, My Dear Child! and send that your Farce may do some good on the Giddy Girls of this Age!

EXTRACT

A Compleat Rake, or the modern fine Gentleman. Adventures of Miss Polly B—ch—rd and Samuel Trel, Esq.

Figure 2
Page x from first edition of *Polly Honeycombe* (1760)
EXTRACT

Memoirs of a Man of Pleasure.
Memoirs of a young Lady of Family.
Memoirs of Sir Charles Goodville.
Modern Characters illustrated by Histories.
Modern Lovers.
Modern Story-Teller.
Mother.
Mother-in-Law.
New Atlantis for the Year One thousand seven hundred and fifty-eight.
New Atlantis for the Year One thousand seven hundred and fifty-nine.
New Atlantis for the Year One thousand seven hundred and sixty.
Nominal Husband.
Pamela.
Polydore and Julia.
Profligates of Quality, or Adultery a la Mode; being authentic and genuine Memoirs of several Persons of the highest Quality.
Reformed Coquet.

REVOLUTIONS OF MODENDY.
Rival Mother.
Rofalinda.
Roxana.
School of Woman, or Memoirs of Constantia.
Sedan, in which many new and entertaining Characters are introduced.
Sisters.
Skimmer.
Sophia.
Spy on Mother Midnight, or F——'s Adventures.
Stage-Coach.
Temple-Beau, or the Town-Rakes.
Theatre of Love, a Collection of Novels.
True Anti-Pamela.
Widow of the Wood.
Zadig, or the Book of Fate.
Zara and the Zarazians.
Zulima, or Pure Love.
&c. &c. &c. &c. &c.
&c. &c. &c. &c. &c.
&c. &c. &c. &c. &c.
&c. &c. &c. &c. &c.
&c. &c. &c. &c. &c.

PRO-

Figure 3

Page xiii, the final page of the Extract from the first edition of Polly Honeycombe (1760)
Bibliography


