

Goldsmiths Research Online

*Goldsmiths Research Online (GRO)
is the institutional research repository for
Goldsmiths, University of London*

Citation

Joncus, Berta. 2022. 'The Black Servant and Kitty Clive: Unsettling Relations in the Playhouse'. In: Department Colloquium. Mead Witter School of Music, University of Wisconsin-Madison, United States 22 February 2022. [Conference or Workshop Item]

Persistent URL

<https://research.gold.ac.uk/id/eprint/35477/>

Versions

The version presented here may differ from the published, performed or presented work. Please go to the persistent GRO record above for more information.

If you believe that any material held in the repository infringes copyright law, please contact the Repository Team at Goldsmiths, University of London via the following email address: gro@gold.ac.uk.

The item will be removed from the repository while any claim is being investigated. For more information, please contact the GRO team: gro@gold.ac.uk

The Black Servant and Kitty Clive: Unsettling Relations in the Playhouse

Berta Joncus. Paper presented 22.02.22 to the Department Colloquium Mead Witter School of Music, University of Wisconsin-Madison

(slide 1)

In 1747, the reputation of first songstress Kitty Clive was in free fall. “Once esteem’d the Phaenix of the Age”, Clive was now said to be “of little Consequence; her Laurels are all wither’d; her Friends grown cold”; in the playhouse, “the repeated Acclamations that us’d to welcome her Appearance, are now no more”. To salvage Clive’s career, and then to boost it, many productions were mounted. Two in particular, in 1749 and 1759, concern us here: both relied on song and *in propria persona* roles for Clive, both aimed at a public target by deploying (semi-) private knowledge, and both depicted Black servants. In 1749, to promote Clive as the outrageous gaming lady Mrs Riot in *Lethe*, an ‘in character’ portrait of her with a Black pageboy was created. In 1759, the comedy *High Life below Stairs* featured ‘Kitty’ among its seven servants, two of whom were identified in the play text as Black, and staged in blackface.

The differences between how Clive’s semi-fictional selfhood was defined against fictional Black servants in 1749 and in 1759 reveal changes in how audiences were expected to apprehend Clive’s persona and that of the Black Servant. They show also how hidden stories could furnish stage action. In 1749, the hidden story was about Clive’s gaming and likely same-sex desire; in 1759, it was about the excesses of a family of sugar merchants, the Lovells. In each case, the Black Servant helped guide the viewer’s reading of stage action. In 1749, the Black pageboy of Clive’s portrait enlisted viewers to jeer at her; in 1759, Black *dramatis personae* strengthened the charges levelled in song by ‘Kitty’ against Lovell and his class.

Let's start with the 1749 portrait of Clive as Mrs. Riot. Two years earlier, the roguish Samuel Foote – a comedian who, after squandering his wife's fortune, had twice been confined to Fleet Prison – advised Clive how to recover from her career crash, which had resulted from public revelation of her high wages and press tattle about her supposed bossiness and self-importance. In an open letter (slide 2), Foote instructed Clive that ‘when the Public are assured, that [your] Vehemence is assumed[,] in order to procure a more decent Entertainment for themselves ... they will convert their Resentment to Approbation” . With the help of Drury Lane manager David Garrick, Clive took up the path Foote advised, using Garrick's *in propria persona* role of Mrs Riot to restart her career. Garrick's support of Clive was hardly selfless: several Drury Lane principals had recently crossed over to the rival house of Covent Garden, so salvaging Clive's box-office draw made good business sense. Doubtless for the sake of expediency, Garrick recycled his 1740 Clive vehicle, also called *Lethe*, which he had based on another Clive vehicle, James Miller's *An Hospital for Fools* of 1739. So Mrs Riot grew out of two earlier Clive *in propria persona* parts, updated to match her now-derided person. The episodic action of Miller's original made it easy: in all versions of this farce, a series of characters descend to the underworld, where Aesop exposes their foolishness through witty repartee; the only cure for their folly is to drink the waters of Lethe, the river of forgetfulness.

Even in a theatrical market that Garrick partly controlled – the Licensing Act of 1737 allowing only two playhouses in London – his 1749 *Lethe* took hold only after a publicity offensive heavily reliant on portraits of Mrs Riot. Drury Lane Prompter Richard Cross reported that *Lethe* ‘was but indifferently receiv'd’ at its opening on 2 January 1749, and that it met with ‘some little Hiss’ on its second night. On 1 February, a 52-page anonymous puff appeared. Now known to be by Garrick, this pamphlet contains many seemingly empirical observations about

what *Lethe* teaches its audiences. Regarding Clive, one comment stands out (slide 3): ‘Mrs. Riot’s is not a Character but a *Caracatura* ... all Outrage, Insolence, and Distortion [of] ... Liberties of Women in a superior Sphere, who enjoy their Freedom and take such Liberties as keep the Cares of Life at a Distance’. That is, Riot *was* Clive who, having risen to a ‘superior Sphere’ – professionally, socially, and financially – was now despised for it.

From this onstage *Caracatura* sprang a series of Clive-as-Riot portraits taken from an oil by Peter van Bleeck (slide 4). In this painting, as in his earlier portrait of Clive in *Damon and Phillida*, Van Bleeck superimposed her stage character onto her person while adding details he invented from beyond the playbook. To her *Lethe* scene on pages 27 to 29 of Garrick’s 1749 playbook, Van Bleeck added a small dog that wasn’t in the production. He also created a new character for Riot’s scene: a Black pageboy (slide 5), whose depiction strayed from period conventions of Black portraiture in telling ways.

David Bindman and other art historians have detailed how, in the eighteenth century, Black subjects were most often depicted as servants within a household. This fashion grew out of the global trade in enslaved Africans, some of whom were brought back to England by traders, plantation owners, and sea captains. Keeping a Black servant connoted the wealth of a household, its colonial reach, and its false claim to the ‘civilizing’ effects of forced servitude. Black servants appeared in pictures to convey the same associations. From the seventeenth century onwards, portrait artists generated conventions (slide 6) – luxurious props, contrapposto posture, exoticized dress – for depicting the Black Servant. In the eighteenth century these conventions sometimes curdled into satire. Hogarth broke new ground in this regard, deploying the Black Servant to represent gentry as corrupt (slide 7). In several works he took particular aim at the stereotypical Fine Lady, making her Black pageboy represent her wanton taste.

In his 'Mrs Riot' painting of 1749, Van Bleeck extended Hogarth's experiments (slide 8). Here, instead of fixing his gaze on the portrait's subject, the Black servant rolls his eyes, inviting the viewer to share his open-mouthed laughter at Clive/Riot. The Black pageboy's scorn in Van Bleeck's painting contrasts the Black pageboy's conventional pose, dress and gaze in a 1766 fabric design with *Lethe* scenes (slide 9). In Van Bleeck's version, the page's bare-bones Orientalized dress – unadorned turban, plain frock coat and waistcoat, open linen shirt – signals rather Mrs. Riot's failed taste in exotic styling. This Black pageboy in fact enacts the agency of the cheeky servant, the kind of role in which Clive had first made her fame. The servant judges the celebrity and finds her wanting, and the mockery of his gaze invites the viewer to see her as he does.

Garrick's 1749 *Lethe* did something similar, giving Mrs. Riot lines that paraded the failings with which Clive was popularly credited: vanity ('I am so perfectly satisfied with myself, that I will not alter an Atom of me'), arrogant ill-temper – she rants about her 'Liberties' being trampled on, and calls Charon a 'filthy Boatman' – and, above all, defiance of male authority. Asked whether she has a husband, Riot responds, 'Yes – I think so – an Husband and no Husband ... if I must forget something, I had as good forget him'.

Mrs. Riot's song 'The Card invites' is stuffed with other improprieties. Invoking the virgin huntress Diana, Riot rejects men and consorts only with women. Her effusions about the 'hunt' of the gaming table ('we fly', 'jovial Rout, full Cry', 'Hark-away') pervert wholesome masculine outdoor pleasures into those of the midnight parlour, where female rule is absolute. Composer Thomas Arne set Garrick's verse as a hunting song (slide 10), a genre well-known to London audiences from tenor concert performances [audio file] (slide 11):

The Card invites, in Crouds we fly

To join the jovial Rout, full cry:
 What joy from Cares and plague all day
 To hie to the Midnight Hark-away ...
 When tir'd with sport, to Bed we creep
 And hide the tedious Day with sleep
 Tomorrow's welcome Call obey,
 Sing again again to ye Midnight Hark, away.

Arne's use of the hunting song's triple meter and his lively continuo part propel the song forward. Clive's melody is trumpet-like, imitating the hunting-horn calls Arne scored to precede her opening words, 'The Card invites, in Crouds we fly'. Interjections by the strings likewise emphasize hunting motifs. At the words 'Hark-away', voice and band join in braying flourishes. Here is a musical 'Caracatura' of the loud, proud, man-hating Clive.

Were Mrs. Riot's gambling, and the song's masculine associations, explicit references to Clive's private life? I think so. After 1769, when she retired to Horace Walpole's estate at Twickenham, Clive's gaming at cards would become legendary, and by that time she had been socialising with Walpole for twenty years. As I show in my monograph *The Fair Songster*, the former Kitty Raftor's supposed marriage to George Clive, scion of an ancient Shropshire family, was almost certainly a sham. Advantages were mutual: Kitty won respectability while protecting her earnings from any husband's claims, while George concealed his passionate interest in men. Clive may also have wished to hide her own same-sex desire, a subject hinted at in the 1749 *Lethe*, whose production was preceded by Clive's abrupt termination of her 15-year protection of her protégée Mary Edwards. Period theatre historians William Chetwood and Tate Wilkinson each wrote cryptically of this break-up, hinting that Edwards enjoyed a 'plurality of lovers', as

Wilkinson put it, which included both sexes. Shortly after *Lethe* opened in 1749, a pamphlet reported sensationally on ladies who indulged in cards and same-sex love at Twickenham. Clive, in retirement, would go on to write guardedly passionate letters to her later protégée Jane Pope.

In his portrait of Clive as the mannish Mrs. Riot, Van Bleeck seems to wink at some of these secrets (slide 12) – and, as in Hogarth’s satires, the Black pageboy seems to have private knowledge that he might share with the viewer, courtesy of his access to the Lady’s intimate domestic spaces. This portrait proliferated over the next two years: as a stipple etching by Charles Mosley (slide 13), as a medallion print miniature and watch-paper, as porcelain figurines from three different factories, and as a watercolour. Of all these, only the watch-paper (slide 14) – perhaps the most select product tie-in, watches being something only a rich gentleman would wear – reproduced the figure of the Black pageboy.

Lethe helped Clive recapture the approval of audiences by giving her the opportunity to humiliate herself in front of them. Clive did however carve one moment of dignity out of the playbook, by weaponizing her skills in musical improvisation. When Mrs. Riot discovers that no Italian operas are available in the Underworld (‘What! no Operas! eh! no Elysian then!’), she ‘Sings fantastically in Italian’. This stage direction cued Clive’s mimicry of Regina Mingotti, then London’s reigning Italian soprano. Clive had first taken off an Italian *prima donna* in 1742; following the 1749 *Lethe*, her ‘Mimic Italian song’ became a stage staple and an independent solo number for her, with its own billing (slide 15). Although no notation survives of Clive’s mimic airs, author Frances Brooke described her extemporization in *Lethe* (slide 16):

I was particularly diverted by her Italian Song, in which this truly humorous actress parodies the air of the Opera, and takes off the action of the present favorite female at the Hay-Market [Mingotti], with such exquisite ridicule that the

most zealous partisans of both, I think, must have applauded the comic genius of Mrs. Clive, however they might be displeased with this application of it.

Clive's voice won audiences over. Inserted into *Lethe*, this mimic aria allowed Clive to deflect her public's opprobrium of 'Insolence, and Distortion [of] ... Liberties of Women in a superior Sphere' onto another soprano, and to reclaim, at least in part, her earlier musical legacy.

Ten years later, in *High Life below Stairs* (slide 17) Clive revived her line in smart, defiant chambermaids. Joining her in defiance were the play's Black servant characters. The representations of Clive and the Black Servant in *High Life* were very different from those resulting from *Lethe*. Unlike his representation in the Clive-as-Riot portrait, the Black Servant in *High Life* was onstage and, as David Worrall discusses, enacted by blacked-up white actors playing the parts of 'Kingston' and 'Chloe'. Garrick almost certainly mounted the comedy with the intent of provoking servants in the audience, as their ensuing protests gave him grounds to stop granting servants free admission. Similarly, Scottish country estate owners used servant protests against an Edinburgh production of *High Life* to justify barring their guests from tipping servants. In and beyond London and Edinburgh, productions of *High Life below Stairs*, including domestic stagings by amateurs, multiplied contemporaneously with increasingly insulting representations of the play's servants, especially its Black servants.

Why did Townley, a clergyman and headmaster, write *High Life below Stairs*? The clue is the name Townley gave its chief protagonist: 'Lovel', as in Robert Lovell, a leading Bristol West India sugar merchant (slide 18).¹ Michael Lovell – I have yet to identify his relationship to Robert – had in the late 1720s gone to Antigua and married into one of the island's oldest sugar dynasties, the Langfords.² In 1758 Michael died, leaving his estate to his son Langford Lovell, then 26. In his list of *dramatis personae*, Townley called Lovel a 'young West-Indian of

Fortune’ – a striking parallel with the real Langford Lovell.³ But even without audiences knowing about the Lovells, Townley’s characterization resembled that of earlier critics of West Indies merchants, who had been charged with greed, laziness, vanity, and profligacy, all of which Townley had ‘Lovel’ enact.⁴ With *High Life below Stairs*, Townley argued that wealth from the sugar trade corrupts society.

Obscuring this *ad hominem* attack, Townley asserted on his title page that he wished only to furnish examples of good and bad servants to teach society to distinguish between them. A press puff for the work (slide 19) explained that it was about ‘young Gentlemen who [keep] a great Number of Servants, merely for Pomp and Parade’, as well as ‘those Servants who ... pocket his Money or squander his Property’.⁵ It then summarized the comedy’s action: ‘Lovel, a young West-Indian of great Fortune is informed ... that he is cheated by his Servant ... He contrives to be introduced into his own House [disguised as a servant] and there sees the Roguery, Drunkenness, and Extravagance of his Servants ... [yet] is agreeably surprized with the Honesty of another of his Servants ... The story ends with rewarding good Servants, and disgracing the Bad’. Over the next year Townley published a series of comments about how Lovel’s poor example as head of household should be seen as the source of his servants’ misconduct.⁶

Audiences never warmed to this reading, as Garrick seems to have anticipated. For servants in the audience, Townley’s comedy was just another character attack on them – which, as Oliver Goldsmith noted in his criticism of *High Life below Stairs*, was typical of playhouse farces.⁷ Drury Lane prompter Richard Cross recorded that audiences hissed *High Life* on its opening night, and also on its second night.⁸ Perhaps due to the hand of Garrick, the press didn’t

report the disruption. Only in 1826, with the memoirs of the playwright John O’Keeffe, do we get some account of what happened (slide 20):⁹

The whole race of the domestic gentry, on the first night of this excellent little piece, were in a ferment of rage ... from the upper gallery, to which they were admitted gratis, came hisses and groans, and even many a handful of halfpence was flung on the stage ... This tumult went on for a few nights, but ultimately was a good thing for all theatres, as it gave Garrick, then manager, a fair occasion to shut the galleries from the servants, and ever after make it a pay place, which to this day it has continued.¹⁰

Before the riots that Townley’s farce provoked, ‘the upper gallery was free for the servants of those who had places in the boxes’; after being ‘forced’ to close the gallery, Garrick could charge all servants entry.¹¹

Townley wrote that he had committed his farce to the ‘Care and Judgment of Mr. Garrick’, implying that Garrick had been free to change the playbook in rehearsal. The casting was certainly Garrick’s call, and it fixed attention on the servants, rather than on Lovel.¹² No fewer than three servant parts were given to celebrities *in propria persona* (slide 21): Frances Abingdon as ‘Bab’; Clive as ‘Kitty’; and the blacked-up Irish actor John Moody as the Black Servant ‘Kingston’. As the founder-leader of the first playhouse company in Jamaica,¹³ Moody was an exotic novelty in Garrick’s troupe that season.¹⁴ This strong celebrity presence meant not only that servant characters overshadowed Lovel on the boards, but also that, however much the gallery protested, audiences in the pit and boxes would want to watch *High Life*. Goldsmith reported this: ‘people of fashion seemed more pleased in the representation than the subordinate ranks of people’.¹⁵ In commending the actors, Goldsmith singled out Clive (slide 22):

Mr. Palmer and Mr. King were entirely what they desired to represent; and Mrs Clive (but what need to I talk of her, since, without the least exaggeration, she has more true humour than any actor or actress upon the English or any other stage I have seen;) she, I say, did the part all the justice it was capable of.

‘All the justice it was capable of’: Goldsmith clearly disliked Townley’s farce, but loved Clive, who had, as so often in the past, turned a weak part into a dazzling performance. Her song (slide 23), the only one in Townley’s farce, strengthened her hand by reaching back to Clive’s ballad-opera finales. As in, for instance, Henry Fielding’s *The Virgin Unmasked* of 1735,¹⁶ various stereotypes are mocked in turn, concluding with a refrain. To match Kitty’s French manners in the farce, the precocious twenty-one-year-old playhouse music director Jonathan Battishill fit Townley’s words to a sprightly *gigue*.¹⁷ Clive, who for the last twelve years had been denied the pert, stinging airs through which she had established her stardom, now commanded musical wit once more. (slide 24)

Kitty: I am really hoarse; but—Hem—I must clear up my Pipes——Hem——This is Sir Harry’s Song; being a new Song, entitled and called, *The Fellow Servant, or All in a Livery*. [Kitty Sings.] [audio file <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Z8MWUIRlaOE>]

Come here, fellow Servant, and listen to me,

I’ll show you how those of superior degree

Are only dependents, no better than we.

Both high and low in this do agree,

Chorus

’Tis here, fellow servant, and there fellow servant,

And all in a livery.

'Tis here, fellow servant, and there fellow Servant,

And all in a livery.

See yonder fine spark, in embroidery dress'd

Who bows to the great, and, if they smile, is blest;

Who is he? i'faith, but a servant at best,

Chorus

Nature made all alike, no distinction she craves,

So we laugh at the great world its fools and its knaves;

For we are all Servants, but they are all slaves.

Chorus

The fat shining glutton looks up to his shelf,

The wrinkled lean miser bows down to his pelf,

And the curl-pated beau is a slave to himself

Chorus

The gay sparkling belle who the whole town alarms,

And with eyes, lips and neck, sets the smarts all in arms,

Is a vassal herself, a meer drudge to her charms

Chorus

Then we'll drink like our betters, and laugh, sing and love,

And when sick of one place, to another we'll move,

For with little and great, the best joy is to rove.

In this song, Clive voiced two radical ideas. First, that her fellow servants, Black or white, were ‘all in a Livery’ – that is, united as equals in the same social drama. Second, that employers are worse off than their servants because they are slaves to their own folly.

The message of Clive’s song went unheard by the liveried. Servants not just in London but also in Edinburgh felt that Townley’s farce libelled them – and rioted. David Worrall and Gillian Russell discuss how Scottish estate holders, witnessing or reading about the riots, stopped the habit of letting guests gift ‘vails’, or tips, to servants. Due to wage discrimination, if not hidden enslavement, this source of income was likely more crucial for Black domestics than for white.¹⁸ Pamphleteers in England soon recommended that English estate owners do the same.¹⁹

Beyond this, the farce triggered at least four illustrations titled *High Life below Stairs*, three of which Temi Odumosu discusses in her important monograph, *Africans in English Caricature 1769–1819*. Placing all four pictures in order allows us to see how representations of Black servants grew more and more racialized, and – adding to Odumosu’s readings – how depictions of music-making in the *High Life* pictures changed the roles of their Black subjects. In 1763 John Collet painted a *High Life Below Stairs* scene (slide 25), which was engraved in 1772. Here an (apparently) Black music master instructs a white domestic in guitar-playing. The physical intimacy between Black music master and white domestic – his left arm encircles her shoulders, while he beats time with a scroll of music in his right hand – suggests lust on his part, but also consent on hers; together the pair embody the temerity of servants appropriating arts practiced by their social superiors. This charge is revisited in the next *High Life below Stairs* scene (slide 26), from 1770. It shows a Black dancing master teaching a fat cook to dance, as other domestics watch. The dancing master’s movements and posture excite the white domestics, who may be this satire’s chief target.

A *High Life below Stairs* scene from 1772 (slide 27) was subtitled *or Mungo, addressing my Lady's Maid*. 'Mungo' stood for Charles Dibdin's black-face character of that name in his hit *The Padlock*, and the many insulting iterations of this character that followed.²⁰ Unusually, this image features two Black servants: one is seducing a lady's chambermaid, and the other is playing the *trompe de chasse*, or French hunting horn. The overt sexualisation of the first Black servant is balanced against the satirical messaging of the second. Besides interrupting the love tryst, the Black footman, by blowing his horn, implies both the lovers' cheating ('tromper') and the cuckold's horns soon to be worn by the maid's partner. The final *High Life below Stairs* image (slide 28), by caricaturist Isaac Cruikshank, is from 1799. Cruikshank inverts Townley's action: whereas in Townley's farce the head servant Philip pours out the wine, here the Black servant Nicholas does so at the head of the table, spilling it on both the table and the floor. The racialization of Nicholas's features and speech, which is shown in a bubble, represented a new low in *High Life* illustrations.

Did Clive's song embed music-making in the first three of these *High Life* pictures? Maybe, particularly since from 1764 she added her 'Mimic Italian Song', whose advertisement I showed earlier (slide 29). But the transmission of Battishill's song, in Britain at least, appears to have been limited. Only one engraved song sheet, one notated song insert in *The London Magazine* of 1760,²¹ one manuscript copy of c1780,²² and the words of the song in one verse collection have survived.²³ Whether later *High Life* productions, which proliferated rapidly – in British playhouses, country home amateur theatrics, and colonial stages from India to Jamaica – included Clive's song is often impossible to say. But evidence suggests that her air was a favourite among American playhouse audiences (slide 30).

In fact, afterpieces beloved by American audiences were usually Clive-derived: according to stage calendars, of the eight most-performed afterpieces in American colonies, seven were Clive vehicles, of which four – *The Devil to Pay*, *Damon and Phillida*, *Lethe*, and *High Life below Stairs* – contained song.²⁴ This take-up may have been due to companies containing strong female vocalists; certainly the two principals cast as Kitty in Philadelphia's production of *High Life*, Margaret Cheer and Maria Storer, were both trained sopranos.²⁵ Cheer, who debuted on stage in 1764, earned praise for her 'fine person' and 'Voice',²⁶ and will have strengthened the premiere of *High Life below Stairs* at Philadelphia's Southwark Theatre on 26 January 1767.²⁷ Storer, whose mother Elizabeth had been principal soprano at Covent Garden and Ranelagh Gardens,²⁸ led operas as well as spoken dramas and took 'Kitty' over from Cheer on 8 February 1769. When, in 1972 (slide 31), John Molnar chose music for his collection of *Fifty Songs Performed on the Stage in Williamsburg in the Eighteenth Century*, Clive's *High Life* song made the cut.²⁹

(slide 32)

As we have seen, the figure of the Black Servant joined Kitty Clive in the public eye at two critical points in her career. In 1749, as she and Garrick fought desperately to win back her public, the Black pageboy of the Clive-as-Riot portrait had his own role as a stand-in for the audience. His derisive gaze judges Clive and invites the viewer to share his disregard. Onstage, Clive encouraged this rebuke, enacting as farce what audiences thought they knew about her, even as Samuel Foote had advised. Clive's self-mockery assured audience members that they had been right to criticise her; in the 1749 *Lethe* she submitted to their disdainful view – and, by extension, to the disdain of the Black pageboy in Van Bleeck's painting. In performance,

however, Clive's improvised mimic Italian song vindicated her musical arts, and the power to mock others that she yet retained.

This was Clive's first step to reclaiming, with Garrick's aid, lost comedic lines which included the 'smart chambermaid'. By 1759, armed with Clive's latest successes, Garrick and James Townley could make 'Kitty' the spokesperson for the 'race of domestics' to which the putatively Black 'Kingston' and 'Chloe' also belonged. As in Clive's earlier ballad operas, 'Kitty' conveyed the farce's moral in song; in *High Life below Stairs* the lesson was that 'Nature made all alike'. Sadly, servants in the audience found Townley's farce offensive – as Garrick, to his profit, seems to have anticipated. *High Life* fed employers' fears that servants, and Black servants especially, might get above their station, and this backlash manifested itself over the years in increasingly racialized *High Life* pictures about transgressions below stairs.

While both *Lethe* and *High Life below Stairs* borrowed their action from reports of real events, only the borrowing in *Lethe*, fuelled as it was by misogynist celebrity gossip, actually strengthened the credibility of the work. Townley's allusions in *High Life* to the sugar merchant Lovell and his ilk had no impact. In colonial America, however, 'The Fellow Servant, or All in a Livery' seems to have become a favourite. Perhaps Townley's liberating message had finally found its audience.

¹ 'Between 1728 and 1732, for instance, some 513 men imported sugar at Bristol each year... the number of firms had fallen to an annual average 163'.

² <https://sugarmills.blogs.bucknell.edu/langfords/>

³ <https://www.geni.com/people/Michael-Lovell-Sr/6000000025228571019>: "Michel Lovel of Antigua, merchant. Will dated 24 Sep. 1744. Bouud [sic] on a voyage to the Northern Colonies of America. To my wife Isabella a horse & saddle. To my niece Mehitable Lovel £10. To my son Michael Lovell my estate, title, & rights in a public house known by the name of the Lying [? Lion] in Bishopgate Street, London. All residue to my children living at my decease ... Before his Excellency George Thomas was sworn Thomas Warner, Esq., 10 Jan. 1759. Recorded 20 Jan. 1759. On the Thomas family's history as governors of the Leeward Islands, see <https://www.historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/1790-1820/member/thomas-sir-george-1748-1815>https://archive.org/stream/historyofislando02oliv/historyofislando02oliv_djvu.txt and

4

⁵ "News." Whitehall Evening Post November 6, 1759 - November 8, 1759. Issue 2128. Seventeenth and Eighteenth Century Burney Newspapers Collection (accessed February 19, 2022). <https://link-gale-com.gold.idm.oclc.org/apps/doc/Z2001657388/BBCN?u=gold&sid=bookmark-BBCN&xid=df8da060>

⁶ Townley issued his commentary anonymously in a series he placed in the Public Ledger before 12 June 1760, collecting these into a pamphlet issued 1760. Townley used the pseudonym of 'servant Oliver Gray'; Roscoe identifies Townley as the real author (Roscoe [add ESTC note]. David Worrall erroneously ascribes the pamphlet to Townley's invented 'Oliver Gray' [add Worrall citation])

⁷ Cited in LS 31 Oct 1759, Oliver Goldsmith, *The Bee*; Townley admitted this, see his pamphlet [p. 1]

⁸ LS 31 Oct 1759 (p. 252); LS 1 Nov 1759 (p. 253)

⁹ John O'Keefe, *Recollections of the Life of John O'Keefe*, 2 vols (1826), vol. 1, p. 161-2.

¹⁰ John O'Keefe, *Recollections of the Life of John O'Keefe*, 2 vols (1826), vol. 1, p. 161-2.

¹¹ *Ibid*, p. 161

¹² Townley stated on the playbook's titlepage that he was 'happy in recommending the Performance' to the 'Care and Judgment of Mr. Garrick' – in other words, the production's casting, and alterations in rehearsal.

¹³ Errol Hill, *The Jamaican Stage, 1655-1900: Profile of a Colonial Theatre* (University of Massachusetts Press, 1992)

¹⁴ Moody ODNB

¹⁵ Goldsmith, *The Bee*, p. 157.

¹⁶ Air 12 'The Yorkshire Ballad', p. 128-29; on the music see

¹⁷ Peter Ward Jones, 'Battishill, Jonathan' Oxford Music Online Betty Matthews, 'The Rise and Fall of Jonathan Battishill' *The Musical Times*, Sep., 1992, Vol. 133, No. 1795 (Sep., 1992), pp. 477-479. Graham Pont has delved into Battishill's facility for extemporizing, said to have preserved Händel's mature style of improvisation. See for instance, Graham Pont, 'Händel's extempore', *Ad Parnassum: A Journal of Eighteenth- and Nineteenth-Century Instrumental Music*, 16(31), April, 2018, 1-33.

¹⁸ Worrall et al; 'Low Life above Stairs'

¹⁹ Worrall et al; 'Low Life above Stairs'

²⁰ TO, p. 68

²¹ *The London Magazine, Or, Gentleman's Monthly Intelligencer* Volume 29 (1760) p. 44 [Google digitized Harvard copy skips from p. 43 to 47, suggesting this song was cut out; according to the index it should be on p. 44]

²² Sung by M|r|s Clive in the Farce of High life below Stairs | Set by M|r Battershill in the y.e January London Magazine of 1760. Material: 1 parts - V - f.28v Manuscript copy. Notes on material: bc missing Glasgow, University Library, Euing Music Collection (GB-Ge) N.b.23 RISM ID no.: 800070330. GB 247 MS Euing N.b.23/38

²³ Songsheet is held in the BL and digitised (RISM A/I B 1320 Local number: B 1320). The song verse collection is *The Bullfinch*,

²⁴ Odai Johnson and William Burling,

²⁵ Rather, Susan (June 2010). "Miss Cheer as Lady Rosehill: a real-life drama in late-colonial British America". *Theatre Notebook*. 64: 2.

²⁶ *Calendar* pp. 234-35

<https://research.colonialwilliamsburg.org/DigitalLibrary/view/index.cfm?doc=ResearchReports%5CRR0057.xml&highlight=>

²⁷ *Calendar*, p. 260

²⁸ 'Storer, Mrs Charles' BDAA, vol. 14, pp. 311-14;

²⁹ John W. Molnar, *Songs from the Williamsburg Theatre. A Selection of Fifty Songs Performed on the Stage in Williamsburg in the Eighteenth Century* (1972). Compiling his card catalogue of playhouse song, noted in 1960, 'There is conclusive evidence that the company used the music in those plays that called for it in the script or by tradition; they also followed the London pattern in using, on occasion, only part of the music, or substituting other music for that which was traditional. The evidence is overwhelming, however, that music was a very important part of their presentations.' For his entry on Battishill's song 'Come here Fellow Servant', Molnar's source was *Thalia. A Collection of Six favourite Songs ... which have been ... Introduced in several Dramatic Performances at the Theatre Royal in Drury Lane. The Words by D. Garrick, and the Musick compos'd by Dr. Boyce, Dr. Arne, Mr. Smith, Mr. M. Arne, Mr. Battishill and Mr. Barth[e]lemon.* (erroneously ascribed this collection's publisher as John Walsh). Molnar work with the copy held at the Folger Library. Music in the Colonial Period John W. Molnar 1962 Colonial Williamsburg Foundation Library Research Report Series – 0117 Colonial Williamsburg Foundation Library

Williamsburg, Virginia, 1990.

<https://research.colonialwilliamsburg.org/DigitalLibrary/view/index.cfm?doc=ResearchReports%5CRR0117.xml&highlight=>