



Project
MUSE[®]
Scholarly journals online

“The Manufacture and Lingua-facture of *Ballad-Making*”: Broadside Ballads in Long Eighteenth-Century Ballad Discourse

Paula McDowell
Rutgers University

1.

As Tessa Watt has observed, “Any study of the impact of printing in England must take account of the fact that one of the first widespread and widely affordable forms of the printed word was the song.” Ballads were among the earliest products of the press, and they were also among the largest classes of printed materials. Some three thousand distinct ballads were printed between 1550 and 1600, and the number of ballads circulating during this period may have reached as high as “between 3 and 4 million.”¹ In 1557, the Stationers’ Company received its royal charter of incorporation, and from about 1586, a small number of stationers began buying up newly created rights to copy ballads. In 1612, the printing of ballads became the exclusive right of five printers, and in 1624, this consolidation of rights culminated in the formation of a syndicate called the “ballad partners.”² Because it was more profitable to reprint ballads for which one already held the copyright than to acquire new materials, economic imperatives in effect made these stationers “custodian[s] of tradition.”³ Their warehouse of stock ballads would “influence the ballad market . . . for the next three hundred years.”⁴ By the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, when ballad scholars first began collecting ballads from oral recitation rather than from print and manuscript sources, many of the ballads that they transcribed from “the mouths of the people” may have “owe[d] their survival to the reinforcement of the printed word.”⁵

The eighteenth century saw the vast expansion of the print trades throughout Britain. It also saw the emergence of a substantial printed discourse about ballads. In commentaries in periodicals, in prefaces to printed collections of ballads, in essays printed in these collections, and elsewhere, a wide variety of authors commented both negatively and positively on balladry as a hybrid oral and textual practice. Today, many ballad scholars follow the great nine-

teenth-century scholar Francis James Child (1825–1896) in dividing ballads into two principal categories, traditional (or “popular”) and broadside ballads, but in the early eighteenth century this conceptual division did not exist. As Albert B. Friedman observes:

The traditional ballads (“Sir Patrick Spens,” “Edward,” and the like) . . . canonized in Professor Child’s monumental collection . . . [were] not even tentatively differentiated from other ballads until well along in the eighteenth century. Before that time, a ballad, so far as either men of letters or plain citizens were concerned, was a doggerel poem written to a familiar tune, printed on a folio sheet or long slip, and sold at bookstalls or hawked about the streets by ballad-singers.⁶

For many eighteenth-century commentators, the term “ballad” implicitly referred to a broadside ballad. In a 1735 letter to *The Grub-street Journal*, one “Democritus” condemned the “scandalous practice of *ballad-singing*” as:

the bane of all good manners and morals . . . a continual nursery for idlers, whores, and pick-pockets; a school for scandal, smut, and debauchery; where our youth of either sex (of the lower class especially) receive the first taint, which by degrees so contaminates the mind, that, with every slight temptation, they become abandoned, lewd, and strangers to all shame.

He then argued that the *printers* of ballads (that is, broadside ballads) should have to pay stamp taxes as newspaper printers had to do:

I am not so much of a lawyer, as to determine, whether ballads come under the stamp act, tho’ it seems reasonable to suppose it. . . . And pray, what reason can there be, that your *Journal*, and all other news-papers, should pay a duty to the government, and yet every filthy ballad, that tends to nothing but poisoning the minds of our youth, should pay no duty at all?⁷

For “Democritus,” “ballads” are a hybrid oral and textual form linked to commercial printing. They are also associated with “the middle sort” and “the lower class especially” rather than with elites. But by the end of the century, the “ballad revival” (or polite rediscovery of ballads) and especially the rise of ballad scholarship had forged significantly new ways of conceptualizing ballads. Among other shifts, one detects the crystallization of a new *confrontational* model of balladry, whereby an earlier, more “authentic” tradition of “minstrel song” is seen as having been displaced by commercial print. In compiling his phenomenally influential anthology *Reliques of Ancient English Poetry* (1765), clergyman and antiquarian Thomas Percy (1729–1811) took many of his ballads from broadsides, but in his ambitious “Essay on the Ancient Min-

strels in England," appended to the *Reliques*, he represented the "Old Heroic Ballads" in his anthology as the "select remains of our ancient English bards and minstrels": "oral itinerant poet[s]" who "probably never committed [their rhymes] to writing."⁸ Percy reconceived the more than 200-year-old phenomenon of broadside balladry in England as a relatively late, degenerate phase in a much longer, more illustrious history. He suggested that ancient minstrels served an important sociocultural function and were generously rewarded by those in power, but that by the end of the sixteenth century their status had dramatically declined. Attempting to account for this decline, and for the inseparability of ballads and commercial printing from the Elizabethan period onwards, he modeled a heroic confrontation (a battle to "extinct[ion]") between these dignified "oral . . . poets" and "an inferior sort" of "ballad-writers . . . for the press":

So long as the minstrels subsisted, they seem never to have designed their rhymes for literary publication, and probably never committed them to writing themselves; what copies are preserved of them were doubtless taken down from their own mouths. But as the old minstrels gradually wore out, a new race of ballad-writers succeeded, an inferior sort of minor poets, who wrote narrative songs merely for the press. (1:380–81, emphasis added)

In Percy's history, ancient minstrels and modern balladmongers are not participants in one continuous artistic tradition; rather, "a new race of ballad-writers" and their abundant offspring, broadside ballads and "little miscellanies," contributed to the "extinct[ion]" of an earlier (and superior) cultural practice based on voice. Percy never asserted that minstrel art was wholly separate from writing, but he did separate out an older tradition of minstrel song and distinguish it sharply from broadside ballads. Percy's harshest critic, fellow antiquarian and ballad collector Joseph Ritson (1752–1803), virulently disputed his scholarship (and, as we shall see, his taste). But significantly, in his own "Observations on the Ancient English Minstrels," prefaced to his anthology *Ancient Songs and Ballads* (1790; *recte* 1792), Ritson agreed with Percy that the sixteenth-century spread of printing (and so broadside ballads) was responsible for the decay of an earlier, fundamentally oral tradition: "The art of printing was fatal to the Minstrels who sung; people begun to read, and, unfortunately for the Minstrels, their compositions would not bear reading."⁹

In the early nineteenth century, ballad collectors such as Walter Scott (1771–1832) and William Motherwell (1797–1835) would go on to conceptualize a distinct "oral tradition" of balladry that was separate from and undermined by print, and they would model themselves as working to rescue this tradition before it was too late.¹⁰ Scott and Motherwell proposed that traces of minstrel traditions still survived in remote environments, and they increasingly aspired to collect ballads from living voices rather than from texts. Whereas

earlier ballad scholars such as Percy and Ritson viewed print and manuscript sources as indispensable to accurate transmission, Motherwell theorized that oral "tradition" could in certain circumstances be relied on as a "safe and almost unerring guide."¹¹ But although Motherwell's editorial theory and practices differed sharply from Percy's, in attempting to reconstruct the *history* of balladry he readily adopted Percy's ideological model of a dramatic sixteenth-century displacement of minstrelsy. In the Elizabethan period, he concurred, minstrel compositions were "superseded in vulgar affection" by (inferior) broadside ballads. By the end of nineteenth century, this "confrontational" paradigm of oral minstrelsy versus print balladmongering had evolved into Child's classificatory (and evaluative) distinction between traditional and broadside ballads. Like Ritson, Scott, and Motherwell, Child readily adopted Percy's model of the sixteenth-century spread of commercial print as a key turning point in the history of balladry. He suggested that in contrast with more valuable (and still traceable) ballad traditions transmitted primarily by the human voice, "the vulgar ballads of our day, the 'broadsides' which were printed in such huge numbers in England and elsewhere in the sixteenth century or later," belong to an entirely "different genus."¹²

In 1722, *Applebee's Journal* published a letter to the editor from one "Jeffrey Sing-Song," titled "The Ballad-maker's Plea."¹³ Mr. Sing-Song openly praised the "Manufacturers," or printers, of ballads as contributing to "British Trade" and the "Publick Good." The following year, the anonymous editor of the first collection of broadside ballads published as an anthology, *A Collection of Old Ballads* (3 vols., 1723–1725), acknowledged his own economic motives for publishing ballads, and like Mr. Sing-Song, he suggested that the "Business of Ballad-making" did not preclude higher goals (or valuable results). Yet for later eighteenth-century ballad scholars, redefining balladry as an appropriate object of genteel study and polite enjoyment meant defining their own learned anthologies away from the "trash" of the commercial press. It meant separating "authentic" ballad traditions (especially those associated with aristocratic culture, rural, agricultural communities, and the "organic society" of a presumed stabler past) from irreverent and subversive ballad practices associated with the politicized populace of urban modernity. For Mr. Sing-Song in 1722, balladry was a *contemporary* practice with real social, political, and economic implications. While he argued for the contribution of ballad "Manufacture" to British trade, he also reviewed the history of political balladry since the Restoration, noting in particular the apparent efficacy of ballads in contributing to revolutionary change. He observed that a well-known "Manufacturer" of ballads had recently been arrested: "the greatest Merchant in that kind of Goods has been taken up lately for something done *in his Way*, a little out of the Way, &c," and he offered to write some protest ballads himself. While Mr. Sing-Song's own name emphasizes the oral dissemination of ballads, he does not concern himself with preserving a distinct "oral tradition" of balladry, for

he does not see the print "Manufacture" and oral "Lingua-facture" of ballads as competing, and he certainly does not see worthwhile oral practices of balladry as "lost." Well into the nineteenth century, the singing of topical political ballads like those mentioned by Mr. Sing-Song would remain an important form of popular expression, but these types of materials are almost never included in later eighteenth- and nineteenth-century scholarly collections, for their often libelous, seditious, and/or bawdy contents are not part of the legacy genteel scholars wished to preserve. Yet for this very reason, and because topical or journalistic ballads are an irreplaceable register of what seventeenth-century lawyer and historian John Selden (1584–1654) called "the complexion of the times,"¹⁴ journalistic commentaries on ballad singing such as those of Mr. Sing-Song and "Democritus" are a crucial counterweight to early ballad scholars' often rarified reconstructions of the ballad tradition. Our survey of representative examples of different *kinds* of long eighteenth-century ballad discourse—from Mr. Sing-Song's aggressive "Plea" to Thomas Percy's idealized account of "ancient minstrelsy"—will serve as a valuable reminder of what kind of ballad traditions eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century scholars did and did not wish to recover. Perhaps it will also suggest to scholars of balladry today how early scholars' tastes, values, and motivating concerns continue indirectly to shape the study of ballads.

2.

Writing to the editor of *Applebee's* in 1722, Jeffrey Sing-Song opens his "Plea" by declaring: "Sir, I am very much discontented in my Spirit, and am afraid if you do not find me out some Remedy, I shall Plot and Rebel, and what not, *not against the KING tho', pray Mark that!*" He identifies himself as "by Trade a British Manufacturer" and observes, "I have often heard wise Men say, that all our Manufactures should be encouraged." He notes that the "Manufacture" he is "Master of" is "generally for a home Consumption," yet he appeals to the reader "whether it is not as useful in its kind, as any Manufacture of them all; in a Word . . . I am a *Ballad-Maker*." Echoing the language of the Stationers' Company Charter, which describes printing as an "Art and Mystery," he refers to the "Ancient Art and Mystery of *Ballad-Making*," and he describes the oral practitioners of this art—the hawkers and ballad singers who cried or sang broadside ballads in marketplaces, taverns, and streets—as the "Corporation of *Ballad-Singers*." He laments that this "Ancient Art" or "Trade" has "suffer'd deeply in the Calamities of the Times, and is of late very much, and more than ever discourag'd." Convinced of the great virtue, not degradation, of commerce, he states that his goal is to "prove the Usefulness of this noble Manufacture," and to help "rais[e] . . . its drooping Condition for the Publick Good" (3:57–58).

Mr. Sing-Song then proceeds to argue in support of the "Dependants" of this

“Manufacture”: the ballad singers (whom he calls “Lingua-facturers”) who used their voices to orally advertise their printed wares.¹⁵ In sharp contrast to Percy’s later representation of minstrels as privileged singers who were “once greatly respected by our ancestors” (*Reliques*, “Preface,” 1:7), Mr. Sing-Song describes contemporary “*Ballad-Singers*” as nearly destitute. Without the “Manufacture of *Ballad-Making*,” this “great numerous Corporation” would starve:

[B]efore I proceed upon the Merit of the Manufacture itself, you are to understand, that there is another Thing belongs to it, as most Manufactures have their Dependants, and this is the great numerous Corporation of *Ballad-Singers*; this, *tho’* it be a Lingua-facture, rather than a Manufacture, yet employs a very great Number of Poor, who, *may it please your Honour*, are like to be utterly undone, if this Manufacture be not supported, and must of Necessity be maintain’d by the Parish; *that is to say*, in the Gaols or the Houses of Correction. (3:58)

Echoing the language of petitions for release from jails (“*may it please your Honour*”), he rightly observes that broadside ballad selling could be dangerous work. Ballad singers were commonly arrested for distributing libelous or seditious materials, and they could also be arrested at any time for vagrancy and committed to a bridewell for ten days. As “Democritus” also observed, “the law . . . looks upon . . . ballad-singers as vagrants; and any magistrate may punish them as such.”

Legal records of press prosecutions in the years surrounding Mr. Sing-Song’s “Plea” provide ample evidence for his claim that broadside ballad singers cycled in and out of “Gaols or the Houses of Correction.” (Indeed, most of the little information we have about actual hawkers of broadside ballads in this period comes from records of their prosecution.¹⁶) About a year before Mr. Sing-Song published his “Plea,” the Secretary of State’s office received a packet of ballads with a note from a justice of the peace: “the parish officers brought me this morn. one Elizabeth Smith for singing the inclosed balletts, I have sent her to Bridewell, and have taken her Confession upon oath.”¹⁷ The ballads that Elizabeth Smith was selling included “The Highland Lasses Wish,” a Jacobite ballad praising James Francis Edward, the Old Pretender, and contrasting his virtues and virility with the inferior personal qualities of George I:

He does not make his Country poor,
Nor spend his Substance on a Whore,
His loving Wife he does adore,
For he is brisk and Lordly.

He looks not like a Country Clown,
Nor their grows no Thorns upon his Ground,

Nor keeps no Whore of Forty Stone,
For he is brisk and Lordly.¹⁸

Smith was also caught with "The Old T——p M——'s Letter to his Son, concerning the *Choice* of a New P——t. With his Son's Answer," in which a father urges his son not to vote for the Whigs, and the son responds: "Dear Father, sure I hope you think, / I'll never be for those who stink."¹⁹ (Elizabeth Smith's fate after her commitment to Bridewell is unknown.) Only seven months after Mr. Sing-Song published "The Ballad-maker's Plea," we find another female ballad singer (this time unnamed) arrested for publishing treasonous ballads. The messenger of the press described the oral/aural details of this woman's crime as follows:

Such Scandallis Libels as the Inclosed was cryed thorow our Streets and Sung in every Corner. which caused great Lafter and many people gatherd together and the person who publisht it I apprehended and caryed it with the person to a Justiss of peace who bound her to the assizes hold att Kingson.²⁰

One of the "Scandallis Libels" in question was "A Dialogue between an ancient Citizen's Horse and a Country Plow-man's as they met together in *Old-street Square*." In this ballad, "King Charles's black Nag" comes upon "a strange Beast" whose "Rider . . . look'd like a Clown but was drest like a King." The Stuart horse advises the Hanoverian horse—implicitly carrying George I—to carry its master to Tyburn and "there let him swing":

Put on his bob Whig [*sic*] piss-burnt with the weather
And his grogerum Coat in which he come hither
With his——[crown?] in his hand he will look very smart
And so drive him back in an old Turnip Cart.²¹

The irreverence of these ballads is entirely typical of much popular balladry in this period. (This woman's fate after her commitment is also unknown.)

In Mr. Sing-Song's "Plea," printers ("Manufacturers") and ballad singers ("Lingua-facturers") are indispensable to one another. Each oral advertising of a printed ballad is in a sense a new "making," for ballad singers routinely tailored their oral performances to different audiences—even orally altering the words (and especially titles) of printed ballads to increase sales. Four years before Mr. Sing-Song published his "Plea," the Secretary of State's office worked to prosecute five female ballad singers for the manner in which they orally advertised broadside ballads. The women were taken up for crying "Honour and Glory, or a Poem On her late Majesty Queen Ann's Birth-day *February the 6th*" and "A New Song Commemorating the birth day of her late Majesty Queen Ann of ever blessed Memory To the tune of *General monks march*." At first glance, these ballads

appear to be harmless, but in 1718, four years into the Hanoverian reign, the singing of ballads celebrating the late Stuart queen could be interpreted as an expression of Jacobitism. And indeed, four of the women confessed that they had heightened the Jacobite innuendos in these texts by orally advertising them with new titles. Hester Watts advertised "A New Song"—a drinking song with the refrain, "Then in Spight of her Enimies, malice & Spleen,/We'll drink to the memory of *Ann* our good Queen"—with the pointedly oppositional title "the High Church Ballad" and was "sent to the House of Correction for 10 Days."²² Elizabeth Robartson (or Robinson) retitled the same ballad with the even more politicized title, "You may sing it but I dare not," and shared Watts' fate. Meanwhile, Susan Shrewsbury and Mary Prior advertised the other ballad, "Honour and Glory," by the title of "the High Church Ballad you may sing it but I dare not" and were "com[mit]ted to Bridewell in _____ [Smithfields?] for 10 Days."²³ But the fifth ballad singer, Frances Karver (or Carver), wisely denied any intention of retitling the ballad (or what Mr. Sing-Song would have called creative "Lingua-facture"). She "declared she did nt intend to cry it by any false Title [and] she was discharged."²⁴

Not surprisingly, given the omnipresence of these types of ballads (and ballad-singing practices) on London streets, Mr. Sing-Song suggests that one reason for the "sensible Decay" of the ballad trade in 1722 was the arrest of one of its chief participants: "the greatest Merchant in that kind of Goods has been taken up lately for something done *in his Way*" (3:59). While he does not specify the suspect's name or alleged crime (no doubt already known to *Applebee's* readers), it appears that the offending ballad-maker has been arrested for distributing Jacobite ballads. For suddenly, Mr. Sing-Song assures the reader that he himself is not a Jacobite but a "Whig *Ballad-Maker*" (that is, a supporter of George I). The most likely candidate for this "Merchant" of dangerous ballads was Francis Clifton—the same printer whose initials appear on one of the ballads for which Hester Watts and Elizabeth Robartson were arrested. ("A New Song" shows the imprint: "F. C. near the Ditch-side 1718.") Between about 1718 and 1724, Francis Clifton and his wife Catherine were almost constantly under investigation or arrest, and accordingly, they frequently changed the location of their printing operation. Dirt poor, they managed to keep their press in operation even when one or the other was imprisoned. In 1720, when Catherine Clifton was taken up for printing Jacobite ballads, she gave her name, address and occupation as "Catherine Clifton living in the Old Baily in the City of London Printer."²⁵ The messenger of the press in charge wrote to the Undersecretary of State enclosing one of the offending ballads: "the enclosed Ballad was brought me this morning, and is at this time printing at Cliftons in the Old Bayly up 3 pair of staires in the Store garret."²⁶ When Mrs. Clifton was examined she stated that she had reprinted this ballad from a previously printed copy: "it was done by a printed Copy which was delivered to her together with a written Copy of the same by one Ann a Ballad Singer

whose Surname she does not know . . . and gave her in Exchange a hundred other printed Ballads."²⁷ "The Tory's Wholsome Advice" is a seventy-line Jacobite ballad lamenting the fate of John Matthews, a nineteen-year-old printer's journeyman recently hanged for his role in printing the Jacobite pamphlet *Vox Populi, Vox Dei*.²⁸ Other Jacobite ballads confiscated from Catherine Clifton's clandestine printing operation include: "Sir James King's KEY to Sir George Horn's Padlock," on the Pretender's access to King George's "padlocked puss."²⁹

The remainder of Mr. Sing-Song's own "Plea" is an overview of political balldry since the Restoration. Mr. Sing-Song especially notes the role played by the famous Whig ballad "Lillibulero" in helping to remove James II from his rightful throne in 1688: "Did not the famous Ballad of *Lilly-burlero* sing King James out of his three Kingdoms?" He then allows that "other . . . Parties of Men in this Nation" have also gained "particular Advantages" from political ballads; for instance, "who can forget of what Universal Benefit that important Song (tho' since turn'd to an ill use,) was at the Restoration of King Charles II., viz., *The King shall enjoy his own again*" (3:58–59). His parenthetical phrase "tho' since turn'd to an ill use" is a reminder of one of the most important characteristics of ballads: the speed with which they could be adapted to new causes. "The King shall enjoy his own again" was a royalist ballad dating to the Civil War period, but after 1688 it was also commonly sung by Jacobites, who implicitly referred to another "King." Mr. Sing-Song describes the Jacobite recontextualization of this ballad as an "ill use." Nonetheless, he then rather gleefully recounts the role played by other ballads in contributing to national political crises, such as the Sacheverell riots of 1710 or the Jacobite riots of 1715–16:

How many Operations have since been wrought by the Force of *Ballad-Singing*, I need not go far to recollect. The Riots in *Scotland* were usher'd in with a Song, call'd *AWA, Whigs, AWA*. The Mobs of Dr. *Sacheverell's* Time had *Down with the Round Heads*, an old Ballad reviv'd. The Hurries of the late Reign had the reviv'd Ballad of *Chevy Chace*; nay, even the Solicitations for the late *Callico Bill* were introduced with the Ballad of a *Callico Madam*. (3:59)

Mr. Sing-Song concludes his "Plea" with a threat, offering to write some protest ballads himself should the offending "Merchant" and his "Fellows" be put to death for treasonous publication:

[S]hall the jolly Fellows that may chance to Swing upon this Occasion, have never a *Passing Song* for them, as well as they have a *Passing Bell* at *St. Sepulchre's*?

Never fear it, I can furnish you with something suitable to every Occasion, and you shall perhaps have a Test of my Performance very speedily. (3:59)

Ballads were among the most “speedy” and mobile discursive forms, for they were rapidly composed and disseminated by voice, manuscript, and print.³⁰ Broadside ballads were highly portable even in large quantities—as we have seen in the example of Catherine Clifton, who gave “Ann a Ballad Singer” “a hundred other printed Ballads.” Remarkably, the same day that Catherine Clifton was examined, the Secretary of State’s office also received information “That a Bale or large Parcel of Seditious and Treasonable Ballads and other Libels, particularly one ent^d [entitled] *The Oxford Loyalty*, directed to Mrs. Eliz^a Cole als Green, is bringing to Town.”³¹ (Secretary of State James, 1st Earl of Stanhope promptly gave the messenger warrant to seize the said “Eliz^a Cole als Green.”) Socially and politically oppositional ballads were everywhere in Mr. Sing-Song’s London: in table drawers, trunks, women’s “pockets,” and even shops selling children’s toys. In 1718, an informant told the government that one “Ann Barnham Junr Living in pelican Court in Little Britain” had a collection of treasonous broadsides and pamphlets hidden “in [a] little Table under the Window up one pair of Staire.”³² Barnham’s premises were searched, and libelous and seditious ballads were found in “the drawer in Ms Ann Barnhams Rooms.” Another ballad, “When Dames of *Britain*,” urging greater female involvement in the Jacobite cause, was “taken out of Ms Ann Barnhams pocket.”³³ When one “Anne Barnwell” (possibly the same woman) was examined the following year concerning illicit ballads in her possession, she stated that she had bought them from “a Woman who keeps a Shop in the Strand”—a shop that sold a wide variety of political broadsides and pamphlets along with childrens’ toys:

The Papers now produced marked by her entit^d *Ex Ore tuo Te Judico, Vox Populi, Vox Dei, A Ballad in honour of the present Regency, An Imitation of the 5th Ode of Horace, A Letter from a Whigg at Rome &c.*^a and a new Ballad to the Tune of King John &c.^a were bought by her of a Woman who keeps a Shop in the strand within two or three doors of Essex Street, where Pamphlets are sold, one half of it being put to that use, and the other a Toy Shop, and that she believes there are large quantitys of the s^d Pamphlets to be publicly vended there.³⁴

Not surprisingly, given so many press prosecutions for “publishing” ballads (whether in voice or in print), Mr. Sing-Song represents balladry as a powerful *living* practice. Alongside the world of authorized ballad “Manufacture” in eighteenth-century England, a lesser-known subculture of printers and distributors continued to produce a stream of libelous, seditious, treasonous, and otherwise oppositional materials. The adaptability of broadside ballads made them “suitable to every Occasion,” and their hybrid textual and oral form (both “Manufacture” and “Lingua-facture”) made them an especially threatening mode of popular protest. In contrast with later eighteenth- and

nineteenth-century ballad scholars, who excluded these types of ballads from their collections, Mr. Sing-Song was proud, not disdainful, of the inseparability of broadside balladry and print commerce. Ballad "Manufacturers" and "Lingua-facturers" were, unashamedly, "Merchant[s] . . . of Goods," and "it is by the Success of our Manufactures that our Nation is made happy, rich, powerful, and great" (3:59, 57).

3.

One year after Mr. Sing-Song published "The Ballad-maker's Plea," an anonymous editor published the first two volumes of *A Collection of Old Ballads. Corrected from the best and most Ancient Copies Extant. With Introductions Historical, Critical, or Humorous. Illustrated with Copper Plates* (3 vols., 1723–1725).³⁵ The genesis of this collection still remains uncertain. At least half of the 159 ballads included were already circulating individually as broadsides,³⁶ and indeed, it has recently been suggested the collection was "commissioned by the then intellectual property owners made from printed versions held in their Ballad Warehouse."³⁷ The editor is unusually cognizant of copyright issues; while he includes some songs by Abraham Cowley and Sir John Suckling, he explains that he "would gladly oblige my Readers with more of their Songs, but must beg to be excused, for fear of being thought an Invader of other Men's properties" (2:195). Yet the most noteworthy aspect of *A Collection* may be neither the particular ballads it contains nor the circumstances of its publication, but rather the way that these ballads are presented to the reader. In a series of three lively Prefaces, the editor asserts the historical and educative as well as entertainment value of ballads. He foregrounds his own economic motives for publishing ballads, but he does so without suggesting that his need for cash precludes the production of a work of lasting value. Acknowledging the position of the "Modern Author" as one of "grating" dependence on the purchasing public, he rejects "servile Fawning"—but without also rejecting the reader's money:

As for my Part, I have not been accustomed to servile Fawning, and begging the Question; and am fully determin'd not to begin now. I would always put my self upon the Level with a Reader, and think my self under no manner of Obligation: I have his Money, and he has my Works; and I am sure he may keep this one in his Study, much longer than I shall the other in my Pocket. (1:ii)

Unlike later ballad editors, he makes no attempt to identify or theorize an especially valuable "oral" tradition of balladry that is separate from commercial print. Indeed, he associates "ballads" so closely with print that he touts the usefulness of the longer narrative "Songs" in teaching children to read: "The Use of these Songs too is very great. I have known Children, who never would

have learn'd to read, had they not took a Delight in poring over *Jane Shore*, or *Fair Rosamond*" (1:vi–vii).

As this editor himself points out, however, the *tone* of these Prefaces is open to multiple interpretations. While he certainly works to elevate the status of ballads (as Addison had tried to do in 1711³⁸), he also sometimes seems to satirize his own attempts. The engraved frontispiece to the first volume depicts busts of ancient poets such as Homer, Pindar, and Horace alongside the modern poets Cowley and Suckling. Constructing an extraordinarily dignified lineage for ballads, he asserts that "the very Prince of Poets, old *Homer*" was "nothing more than a blind *Ballad-Singer*, who writ Songs of the Siege of *Troy*" (1:iii). Like Mr. Sing-Song, he describes contemporary "*Ballad-Makers*" as if they were a livery company in themselves: the "Worshipful Society" of "*Ballad-Makers* [is] . . . a more ancient, more numerous, and more noble Society than the boasted *Free-Masons*" (1:vi). (Given the controversial status of freemasonry in London in the 1720s, this remark may well be satiric.) Yet after the commercial success of the first two volumes of *A Collection*, the editor's confidence in his project seems to grow. In the Preface to the third volume (1725), he appears to abandon his self-satirizing style in favor of an earnest assertion of the "real value" of ballads: "our old Songs I think ought to be preserv'd, and some of them are really valuable" (3:iii). With a remarkable degree of self-consciousness, he now explicitly acknowledges his own unstable self-positioning in relation to his project. Acknowledging his different "Stile[s]" of address, he states, "My two former Prefaces I wrote in a ludicrous manner; but wou'd willingly take leave of my Readers in a more serious Stile; I am not very fond of the Title of a Buffoon" (3:ii).

Ultimately, the editorial framing and contents of *A Collection* suggest a desire to attract the widest possible variety of readers. The editor aims to cater to diverse public tastes, and he makes no concerted attempt to create a hierarchy of different types of ballads. As the full title of *A Collection* makes clear, this editor especially values "Old Ballads" printed from "Ancient Copies." But contrary to what we might expect given this title, he is surprisingly uninterested in preserving "Old Ballads" for their own sake. Indeed, he notes that he has omitted "a great number of old Songs" because they were "written in so old and obsolete a stile that few or none of my Readers wou'd have understood 'em" (3:vi–vii). While he argues for the usefulness of old ballads as sources of historical information, he does not privilege historical ballads. In fact, he assures the reader that "those who have no Relish for these antique Pieces, may, in the other half of the Book, meet with Variety of Entertainment; there are serious and humourous Ballads, Scotch Songs; and something I hope to hit every Taste. . . . I have used my utmost Endeavours to please" (2:v–vi). Alongside historical narratives such as "The Battel of Agincourt" and sentimental favorites such as "The Children in the Wood," one finds courtship songs and "Drinking songs" such as "The Triumph of Tobacco," "The Praise of Sack," and "The Answer of Ale" (3:148–54).

Also in 1723 was the publication of the first volume of another highly influential ballad collection, *The Tea-Table Miscellany: A Collection of Choice Songs, Scots and English*, edited by the poet and print trade entrepreneur Allan Ramsay (1684–1758).³⁹ A wigmaker by training, Ramsay began writing and publishing verse in 1715. His first publications were broadside ballads and collections of ballads: "thin collections of *Scots Songs* . . . printed in such a way that they could also be sold by the leaf."⁴⁰ Like Mr. Sing-Song, Ramsay described the production of verse as "Manufacture." In one of his own earliest poems published as a pamphlet, he observed that although his home town of Edinburgh was "the Scene of many Adventures, which may be proper Subjects for both Poet and Philosopher," nonetheless "the Humour of undervaluing **Home-Manufactory** discourages publications."⁴¹ Despite this partly self-serving pronouncement, Ramsay's own early publications were so successful that by the early 1720s he had abandoned his earlier manufacture of wigs. *The Tea-Table Miscellany* would become an important commodity in its own right, reprinted in at least fifteen editions before his death.⁴² While (as its title suggests) it was aimed at a polite market, *The Tea-Table Miscellany* was, as Sigrid Rieuwerts has pointed out, "simply the de-luxe edition of the songs sold for a couple of pence individually or in small groups on separate song sheets or as chap-books. Thus we see Ramsay aiming at both ends of the market . . . with the same material in different bindings and at different prices."⁴³

4.

Later publishers ransacked both *A Collection of Old Ballads* and *The Tea-Table Miscellany* for songs to publish individually as broadsides. In 1765, Thomas Percy also drew on them in compiling *Reliques of Ancient English Poetry: Consisting of Old Heroic Ballads, Songs, and Other Pieces of Our Earlier Poets, Together With Some Few of Later Date*.⁴⁴ In contrast with the miscellaneity and playfulness of these earlier anthologies, the *Reliques* proclaims its own selectivity and high seriousness. Published by James Dodsley, a major literary publisher rather than a trade publisher, and edited by a learned curate with literary aspirations who assured his readers that "great care has been taken to admit nothing immoral and indecent" (Preface, 1:15), the *Reliques* definitively established *certain types* of balladry as worthwhile objects of genteel appreciation and scholarly study.

In gathering his relics, Percy made exhaustive studies of major archival and printed collections of ballads. As an antiquarian, he valued documents; he "sought his songs in archives and libraries, not in fields or streets."⁴⁵ As is well known, one of Percy's most important sources was his fortuitously found "old Folio M.S. Collection of Historical Ballads &c." (which he especially valued as noncommercial). But as is somewhat less well known (in part because Percy downplayed the extent of his debt to these sources), he also consulted huge

numbers of broadside ballads. In 1761, he visited Cluer Dicey, the most prolific ballad printer of the day, who had graciously promised to “romage into his Warehouse for every thing curious that it contains.”⁴⁶ In the 1720s, Cluer’s father, William Dicey, had begun publishing ballads and chapbooks, and by mid-century, the Dicey printing house and warehouse in Bow Churchyard (later Aldermary Churchyard) had become the center of “a broadside and chapbook empire that dominated the cheap literature market until the last decades of the century.”⁴⁷ Ironically, given Percy’s disdain for commercial publishing (and his own debt to Dicey broadsides), “[William] Dicey began this ballad-printing enterprise with an obvious indebtedness to *A Collection of Old Ballads*: he derived a good part of his early ballad stock from the anonymous 1723 collection, whose contents he liberally filched.”⁴⁸ Upon Percy’s visit to the Dicey premises, Cluer Dicey presented him with more than eighty ballads, several of which Percy had never seen before. Percy would go on to reprint many of these broadsides in the *Reliques*, but he never publicly acknowledged Dicey’s assistance.⁴⁹ Although *both* men were involved in publishing ballads (and sometimes the same ballads!), Dicey was in Percy’s view a mere balladmonger—a huckster of commodities rather than a scholar. In a letter to a genteel friend, Percy described Dicey as “the greatest Printer of Ballads in the Kingdom”—but also, significantly, as “an Acquaintance . . . of a much lower stamp.”⁵⁰ Percy also consulted major archival collections of ballads, but he only briefly acknowledged his debt to the Pepys Collection of Broadside Ballads at Cambridge University and he scorned the similar group of broadside ballads which would later form part of the Roxburghe Collection as “Such as are still sold on stalls; not one in a hundred of them fit to be republished.”⁵¹

It cannot be overemphasized that Percy valorized only *certain types* of ballads. In his view, only select ballad traditions were worthy of being saved. One does not find in the *Reliques* the sort of topical political ballads that Jeffrey Sing-Song viewed as central to the ballad tradition, nor the “humourous Ballads” and “Drinking Songs” touted by the 1723 *Collection* editor as likely to appeal to many readers’ tastes. As the full title of the *Reliques* suggests, Percy especially favored “Old Heroic Ballads” such as “The Battle of Otterbourne,” “Sir Lancelot du Lake,” and “Chevy Chase.” He extensively revised the language of many ballads to make them acceptable to genteel tastes, and he later described these revisions as “conjectural emendations . . . without which the collection would not have deserved a moment’s attention.”⁵² Percy drew heavily on broadsides as well as manuscript materials, but he represented his “reliques” as the written traces of originally oral compositions dating back to a sophisticated courtly society long before commercial print. (Samuel Johnson defined “relick” as “that which remains after the loss or decay of the rest” [*Dictionary*].) He stated that these ballads were the “select remains of our ancient English bards and minstrels, an order of men, who were once greatly respected by our ancestors” (“Preface,” 1:7). In his “Essay on Minstrels,” he sought to

link the history of English song to nobler origins than a printer's warehouse. In his account, minstrels were historians of their times rather than mere entertainers. It was their position of prestige to record honorable feats and aristocratic genealogies in songs which "tended to . . . encourage and foment a martial spirit." They were supported by a culture of patronage in a society where the arts were cherished: "their skill was considered as something divine; their persons were deemed sacred; their attendance was solicited by kings; and they were everywhere loaded with honours and rewards" (1:346).⁵³ As late as the reign of Henry VIII, aristocratic patronage was generous: "In all the establishments of royal and noble households, we find an ample provision made for the minstrels; and their situation to have been both honourable and lucrative" (1:373). But by the end of the sixteenth century, "this profession had fallen into such discredit that it was considered in law as a nuisance" (1:363). Referring to the 1597 statute, "An Act for punishment of Rogues, Vagabonds, and Sturdy Beggars" (39 Eliz. c. 4. f.2), Percy observes:

Towards the end of the sixteenth century this class of men had lost all credit, and were sunk so low in the public opinion, that in the 39th year of Elizabeth, a statute was passed by which 'minstrels, wandering abroad,' were included among 'rogues, vagabonds, and sturdy beggars,' and were adjudged to be punished as such. This act seems to have put an end to the profession. (1:377)

What caused this relatively rapid "extinct[ion]" of an ancient cultural practice in Percy's view? As we have seen earlier, Percy traced the decline of minstrelsy to the reign of Elizabeth (1558–1603). Not coincidentally, this was immediately after the Stationers' Company received its royal charter of incorporation (granted by Queen Mary in 1557 and ratified by Elizabeth in 1558). The same period to which Percy dated the "extinct[ion]" of "the genuine old minstrelsy" also saw the institutionalization of the commercial press and a steep rise in the number of printed books. Percy's "Essay on Minstrels" ends abruptly (and rather bathetically) with the royally authorized retailing of cheap printed goods:

Towards the end of Queen Elizabeth's reign . . . the genuine old minstrelsy seems to have been extinct, and henceforth the ballads that were produced were wholly of the latter kind, and these came forth in such abundance that in the reign of James I. they began to be collected into little miscellanies, under the name of Garlands, and at length to be written purposely for such collections. (1:380–1)

With their royally granted privileges and their ephemeral products circulating "in such abundance," it is members of the Stationers' Company, not worthy "oral itinerant poets," who now have a "lucrative" situation. Percy ends his

narrative with the decay of minstrelsy—but not without pausing to assert that the situation of modern broadside ballad singers was even worse. For even the Elizabethan minstrels, who had “lost much of their dignity, and were sinking into contempt and neglect . . . still sustained a character far superior to anything we can conceive at present of the singers of old ballads” (1:375).

The *Reliques* was a huge commercial success, and it also established Percy’s reputation as a gentleman of learning. Yet by 1794, Percy had virtually “disown[ed]” this massive scholarly endeavor, referring to it slightly as “the amusements of my youth.”⁵⁴ There are many reasons why Percy (now Bishop of Dromore) may have distanced himself from the *Reliques*, but ironically, the work’s phenomenal sales may have been a significant factor. In his Preface to the *Reliques*, Percy had worked to define his anthology away from marketplace imperatives, claiming that “to prepare it for the press has been the amusement of now and then of a vacant hour amid the leisure and retirement of rural life” (1:14). As he was well aware, previous printed ballad collections had tended to originate from within the book trade rather than the rural scholarly studies of “gentlemen of taste.” In his disavowal of economic motives or even literary ambitions (“the amusement . . . of a vacant hour”), Percy attempted to situate both himself and his “reliques” outside of the realm of print commerce, even in the act of publication. He was not, he assured his readers, a Grub Street compiler looking to pick the reader’s pocket of his money, but a learned gentleman of leisure in the country.

Percy’s chief scholarly antagonist Joseph Ritson virulently disagreed with his account of ancient minstrelsy. Yet he too modeled his own collections of ballads as “impelled by no lucrative or unworthy motives.”⁵⁵ Ritson was himself one of the most prolific ballad editors of the eighteenth century, but as a scholar, he insisted that he was the preserver of an “inestimable possession,” not a “needy retainer . . . to the press.”⁵⁶ He situated his *Select Collection of English Songs* (3 vols., 1783) above the “ocean” of the print marketplace, proposing that in collecting ballads, he had braved the swelling tide of Grub Street anthologies only to rescue ballad “pearls” that would otherwise be lost in the “multitude of collections” now “annually hashed up”:

So long as these beauties, this elegance, continue to be . . . buried alive, in a multitude of collections, consisting chiefly of compositions of the lowest, and most despicable nature; one or more being annually hashed up (*crambe repetita*) by needy retainers to the press, and the most modern being, always, infinitely the worst . . . the greater part of this inestimable possession must, of course, remain altogether unknown to the generality of readers. . . . Every one who wishes to possess a pearl, is not content to seek it in an ocean of mud.⁵⁷

Ritson was clearly ambivalent about print commerce just as Percy was, yet he was unwilling to adopt the latter’s idealizing theories of minstrelsy. In his own

ambitious historical essays on balladry, Ritson suggested that there were much stronger links between "ancient minstrels" and modern-day ballad-mongers than Percy was willing to admit.⁵⁸ The primary function of both minstrels and modern broadside ballad singers was entertainment:

That there were men in those times, as there are in the present, who gained a livelihood by going about from place to place, singing and playing to the illiterate vulgar, is doubtless true; but that they were received into the castles of the nobility, sung at their tables, and were rewarded like the French minstrels, does not any where appear.⁵⁹

Ritson quoted Percy's statement that the minstrels "continued down to the reign of Elizabeth; in whose time they had lost much of their dignity"—only to scoff, "As to dignity; it is pretty clear they never had any to lose."⁶⁰ While he agreed with Percy that the sixteenth century was a key turning point in the history of minstrelsy, he saw this as a shift to celebrate rather than lament. For Ritson, this era marked the welcome "origin of the modern English song; not a single composition of that nature, with the smallest degree of poetical merit, being discoverable at any preceding period."⁶¹

Ritson argued that the vast majority of Percy's "reliques" were *never* separate from commercial print: "That these ballads were originally composed for public singers by profession, and perhaps immediately for printers, booksellers, or those who vended such like things, is highly probable." Tracing the history of "modern English song" not only to "the earliest ages of mankind" but also to seventeenth-century "writers by profession of amusing books for the populace," he named as "famous ballad-makers about this period" several authors whom many of his contemporaries would have considered Grub Street hacks, such as Martin Parker, Richard Johnson, Thomas Deloney, and Aphra Behn.⁶² Even more provocatively (and perhaps reflecting his own republican leanings), Ritson expressed a strong preference for broadside ballads over "minstrel compositions." He suggested that even in the sixteenth century, "minstrel songs" did not stand a chance against the products of the press:

These songs, from their wild and licentious metre, were incapable of any certain melody or air; they were chanted in a monotonous stile to the harp or other instrument, and both themselves and the performers *banished by the introduction of ballad-singers without instruments, who sung printed pieces* to fine and simple melodies, possibly of their own invention, most of which are known and admired at this day.⁶³

In the particular case of broadside ballads, Ritson allowed, "the people at large" could be relied on as an example of unbiased critical judgment. Broad-

side ballads, with their comparative regularity and simplicity, were thought by the masses to be more “poetical” than earlier forms, “and though critics may judge otherwise, the people at large were to decide; and in some respects at least not without justice.”⁶⁴ Significantly, these *printed* ballads were “the favourite compositions” of “the people” because they could be more easily *sung*: “the songs used by the ballad-singers . . . were smooth and regular, were all printed, and what was much more to their advantage, were generally united to a simple but pleasing melody, which . . . any one could sing.”⁶⁵

Nonetheless, it was not Ritson’s superior scholarship but Percy’s romantic narrative of “Ancient Minstrels” that caught the imagination of a generation and set the agenda for later scholarly collectors of ballads. Percy’s theories of minstrelsy contributed to many later ballad editors’ conviction that certain *living* practices of ballad singing were surviving traces of feudal oral traditions. Walter Scott seized on Percy’s figure of the minstrel and developed it in his own *Minstrelsy of the Scottish Border: Consisting of Historical and Romantic Ballads, Collected in the Southern Counties of Scotland; With A Few of Modern Date, Founded Upon Local Tradition* (2 vols., 1802). He argued that until “very late[ly],” a figure like Percy’s “ancient minstrels” could be seen in the pipers of Scottish border towns: “it is certain that till a very late period the pipers, . . . whose office was often hereditary, were the great depositories of oral . . . tradition.”⁶⁶ In a later essay titled “Introductory Remarks on Popular Poetry” (1830), Scott echoed Percy in suggesting that minstrel ballads were an innately oral form displaced by print—especially, by “sheafs of [broadside] ballads” aimed at low “class[es] of readers” and hearers:

It is probable that the minstrels, seldom knowing either how to read or write, trusted to their well-exercised memories. . . .

The press, however, at length superseded the necessity of such exertions of recollection, and sheafs of ballads issued from it weekly, for the amusement of the sojourners at the alehouse, and the lovers of poetry in grange and hall, where such of the audience as could not read had at least read unto them.⁶⁷

Like Scott, Glasgow journalist, civil servant, and ballad collector William Motherwell saw himself as preserving a distinctly Scottish cultural heritage in his groundbreaking anthology *Minstrelsy, Ancient and Modern* (2 vols., 1827). In his lengthy “Introduction,” Motherwell described his subject as “the Ancient Romantick and Historick Ballad of Scotland.”⁶⁸ While Motherwell initially followed Scott in collecting ballads from oral, manuscript, and printed sources, he increasingly became convinced of the survival of a distinctly oral tradition of balladry and set out to transcribe songs directly from performance and recitation in and around his area of Paisley. He opened his printed collection with the bold claim: “This interesting body of popular poetry, part of which, in point of antiquity, may be fairly esteemed equal, if not superior, to

the most ancient of our written monuments, has owed its preservation principally to oral tradition" (1:3). Motherwell's practice of collecting ballads from oral performance led him to resituate authenticity in the voices of the "unlettered and the rude." In contrast with the standard view of eighteenth-century men of letters (such as Samuel Johnson, who had argued in the *Preface* to his *Dictionary of the English Language* that written records are the only way to stabilize language), Motherwell proposed that

Language, which in the written literature of a country is ever varying, suffers no material changes nor corruptions among the lower and uneducated classes of society by whom it is spoken as their mother tongue. With them, primitive forms of speech, peculiar idiomatick expressions, and antique phrases are still in use. . . . It is not, therefore, with the unlettered and the rude that oral song suffers vital and irremediable wrong. (1:4)

Motherwell argued that scholars looking to preserve "traditional" ballads—an emergent category now distinguished from, but intersecting with, broadside ballads—needed to dramatically rethink their text-oriented editorial practices. It was the (oral) tradition of the "uneducated," not the corrupt written and printed texts of the lettered, that was a "safe and almost unerring guide" (1:4).

Today Motherwell is known as one of the earliest "field collectors" of ballads.⁶⁹ Despite his groundbreaking editorial practices, however, there are telling continuities between his *history* of balladry and Percy's now sixty-year-old "Essay on Minstrels." In the "Introduction" to *Minstrelsy, Ancient and Modern*, Motherwell cites Percy frequently, in general treating his highly ideological "Essay" as if it were a primary historical source. Like Ritson and Scott, he readily adopted Percy's model of a sixteenth-century confrontation between minstrelsy and printed ballads. He quotes Percy's statement that the "old minstrels" were displaced by "a new race of ballad-writers" (1:24–25), and he later reiterates this argument with a telling citation: "In the reign[s] of Elizabeth and James the Sixth, the Minstrel ballads of England began to be superseded in vulgar affection by a more ambitious class of similar compositions, written purposely for the press, by sundry indefatigable small poets of that prolifick day. The chief balladmongers of said period have been enumerated by Percy and Ritson" (1:56). But unlike his predecessors, Motherwell admitted to having no firsthand familiarity with the major archival collections of broadside ballads. Of the Pepys and Roxburghe collections painstakingly consulted by Percy and Ritson, he observed, "The editor regrets that he knows none of the collections now enumerated by personal inspection, but he believes that they contain few, very few, of what are the real ancient minstrel ballads of the country, and this opinion he forms from the great quantity of sad trash found in works whose materials are professedly derived from these sources" (1:57–58n).

Motherwell's editorial practices and theories influenced the great American ballad scholar Francis James Child, who rigorously sought to minimize what he viewed as the "distorting" effects of print on the orally circulating songs he now explicitly categorized as traditional or "popular" ballads. Child described his earliest collection of ballads, *The English and Scottish Ballads*, as containing "all but two or three of the *ancient* ballads of England and Scotland, and nearly all those ballads which, in either country, have been gathered from oral tradition—whether ancient or not."⁷⁰ Child drew heavily on broadside ballads in his collections, and he acknowledged that broadsides sometimes preserved and even enriched "oral tradition." But he also made a clear, forceful distinction between orally circulating "traditional" ballads (which he favored) and "vulgar" printed ballads (which he largely disdained): "the true popular ballads, the spontaneous products of nature" are "widely different" from "the works of the professional ballad-maker, which make up the bulk of Garlands and Broad-sides."⁷¹ Ironically, in striving to gain respect for ballads as a true democratic poetry, Child repeatedly condemned most broadside ballads—a print form which as we have seen had a longstanding association with the broadest possible spectrum of social ranks. Child published *The English and Scottish Ballads* as part of a commercial reprint series, *The British Poets*, and while he included broadside ballads that may never have circulated in "oral tradition," he emphasized that he did so chiefly to please his publishers: "as many ballads of this second class have been admitted as it was thought might be wished for, perhaps I should say tolerated by, the 'benevolent reader.'"⁷² For the next ten years, he apologized to the Danish ballad scholar Svend Grundtvig for having had to make this collection "saleable" to a general readership. He vowed, "I shall make no concession to such a consideration in the [collection] which I hope to make."⁷³ (In the same letter to Grundtvig he described both the Roxburghe and the Pepys Collections of broadside ballads as "veritable dung-hills, in which, only after a great deal of sickening grubbing, one finds a very moderate jewel.")

Even more significantly for the later scholarly conceptualizing of broadside ballads, in categorizing "true popular ballads," Child gave a special meaning to the term "popular," one which effectively excluded a great proportion of broadside ballads. Child defined "popular" ballads in such a way as to assert their fundamental incompatibility with "book-culture" and the art of printing. In his schema, "popular" ballads were those which circulated in oral tradition and indeed, originated chiefly under sociocultural conditions no longer extant in literate society: "the condition of society in which a truly national popular poetry appears . . . is a condition in which the people are not divided by political organization and book-culture into markedly distinct classes." But "increased civilization, and especially the introduction of book-culture" undermined this unity and the "popular" ballad, once a common inheritance, was abandoned by literate elites and fell to "the people in the lower sense":

"the educated classes took a direction of their own, and left what had been a common treasure to the people in the lower sense, the ignorant or unschooled mass."⁷⁴ In his encyclopedia entry on "Ballad Poetry," Child indirectly echoed a long line of ballad scholars from Percy onward in identifying the sixteenth-century spread of print as a key turning point in the history of balladry. But in his version of this now-familiar narrative, an earlier confrontational model of oral "minstrelsy" versus print balladry has evolved into a powerful classificatory distinction between "traditional" and "vulgar" broadside ballads:

The vulgar ballads of our day, the 'broadsides' which were printed in such huge numbers in England and elsewhere in the sixteenth century or later, *belong to a different genus*; they are products of a low kind of *art*, and most of them are, from a literary point of view, thoroughly despicable and worthless.⁷⁵

According to Child's redefinition of "popular" ballads, the sort of topical and journalistic broadside ballads widely sung by the populace (in Ritson's phrase, "the people at large") since the sixteenth century were no longer to be seen as "popular" ballads. Furthermore, the type of ballad singers that Mr. Sing-Song praised as contributing to national trade and the "Publick Good" were to be seen as the destroyers, not creators, of authentic ballads. Child argued (with good cause, given the examples we have seen of street-criers' practices of "Lingua-facture") that "the professional ballad-singer or minstrel, whose sole object is to please the audience before him, will alter, omit, or add without scruple." In this model, authentic ballad traditions are associated with relative stasis, and the overly adaptive practices of modern commercial culture are associated with contamination and decay. Somewhat ironically, given his status as a tutor and later Professor at Harvard, Child also linked "unscrupulous" practices of adaptation to "learning," or literacy: "If the transmission has been purely through the mouths of unlearned people, there is less probability of willful change, but once in the hands of professional singers, there is no amount of change which they may not undergo."⁷⁶

5.

From Thomas Percy onward, the type of topical political ballads that eighteenth-century journalistic commentators identified as central to the ballad tradition have been marginalized in ballad scholarship.⁷⁷ Four years after Percy published the *Reliques*, the anonymous author of an "Essay on Ballads" published in the *London Magazine* remarked the "great . . . influence" of broadside ballads and used political ballads as his example:

We are told that the old song, "Ye monks, ye must be married," contributed more towards the reformation in England, than the sermons of the best

divines, and that Lullabalero forwarded the Revolution more than the reasonings of the ablest politicians. We remember how Mr. Glover's ballad of Hosier's Ghost roused us against Sir Robert Walpole. Dr. Smollett's Mourn, hapless Caledonia, mourn, made every tender-hearted Whig feel himself for moments a Jacobite. And Mr. Garrick's Hearts of Oak warmed our British seamen with the love of glory, made them look upon the French as beings utterly contemptible, and persuaded them that they were all volunteers, when, perhaps, half the crew of many ships had been pressed.⁷⁸

Yet later eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century editors typically excluded these types of ballads from their collections—even as they themselves articulated the category of “songs on political topics.” Even Ritson, a meticulous historical scholar who explicitly acknowledged the “force” of topical political ballads in their own time, argued that these songs were too ephemeral to preserve for posterity: “The insertion of songs on political topics, the best of which are not only too temporary, but too partial to gain much applause when their subjects are forgotten, and their satire has lost its force, has been studiously avoided.”⁷⁹ In his “Historical Essay on National Song,” Ritson acknowledged the omnipresence of political ballads at moments of national crisis such as 1688: “The Revolution, one may be certain, did not take place without giving rise to numbers of songs and ballads both for and against that important event.”⁸⁰ Elsewhere, he remarked the importance of political ballads to “underground” or oppositional causes: “It is believed to be a fact, that nothing fed the enthusiasm of the Jacobites, down almost to the present reign, in every corner of Great Britain, more than ‘The King shall enjoy his own again.’” (Ritson did allow himself to include “The King shall enjoy his own again” in his *Ancient Songs*, for by the 1790s this 150-year-old royalist ballad was a nostalgic favorite as much as a daring political expression. Like Mr. Sing-Song—though for entirely different reasons—he foregrounded it as “the most famous and popular air ever heard of in this country.”⁸¹) Yet as if trying to justify to himself his exclusion of so prevalent a variety of balladry, he repeatedly argued that topical political ballads were too partisan for preservation. In a remark that sounds somewhat disingenuous coming from one of the eighteenth century's most vituperative critics, he states, “all of them are too strongly tinctured with the venom of party, to retain the least appearance of merit.”⁸²

Despite the “studious avoidance” of early ballad scholars, however, political broadside ballads remained a key vehicle of popular expression well into the nineteenth century. In the 1790s, the singing of political ballads was still so common a practice that leading conservative authors resorted to producing and circulating new ballads in an attempt to counter the spread of republican ideas. Hannah More's *Cheap Repository Tracts* (1795–98), published only a few years after Ritson's *Ancient Songs*, includes ballads such as “Patient Joe; Or the Newcastle Collier.” In this ballad, More attempted to win over supporters of

reform movements to Joe's trust in providence: his viewpoint, expressed in the ballad's refrain, that "all work'd together for good."⁸³ The idea of attempting to "sing" the unruly populace by "into good humour" by distributing ballads "of a proper tendency" had occurred to earlier authors. In 1769, the anonymous author of the aforementioned "Essay on Ballads" queried why the government did not try to quell popular discontent by circulating conservative ballads:

Such being the influence which ballads may have, I wonder that no administration in this country for their own good, or no worthy magistrates for the public good, have been at pains to have ballads of a proper tendency circulated among the people. I am sure money could not be better employed, and I am certain that no placemen, or pensioners, can be of so much service as a set of well-chosen balladsingers might be. We might have the discontented and turbulent populace sung into quietness and good humour, as froward children are by their nurses.⁸⁴

In the eighteenth century, political ballads were a genre of "the people" in the abstract sense employed by this author, but as we have seen, they were also produced and circulated by real men and women of a wide variety of social ranks and motivations who were sometimes harshly punished for expressing their views (or attempting to make a living). Broadside ballads were perhaps the most "democratic" of all print forms, for they could be composed, printed, and circulated orally *and textually* by persons on the margins of literacy (such as printer Catherine Clifton, who could not write). Yet by the nineteenth century, scholarly models of worthwhile or "authentic" ballad traditions had largely excluded the singing of topical ballads, for this aspect of what we might now call "popular oral culture," tainted by print commerce and associated with social and political unrest, was not the legacy that genteel or professional scholars wished to preserve. Today, persons interested in an inclusive history of balladry need to be alert to the ways that eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century ballad scholarship has shaped our assumptions about what ballads are and what kinds of ballad traditions are worthy of our attention. By examining long eighteenth-century ballad discourse in all of its many genres and varieties—from scathing journalistic condemnations of the "scandalous practice of *ballad-singing*" to idealized narrative accounts of "ancient minstrels"—we can broaden our understanding of the diverse cultural roles of balladry—and especially, the hybrid textual and oral nature of broadside ballads.

NOTES

1. Tessa Watt, *Cheap Print and Popular Piety, 1550–1640* (Cambridge, 1991), 11.
2. Watt, ch. 3, "The 1624 stock"; see also Robert S. Thomson, "The Development of the Broadside Ballad Trade and its Influence upon the Transmission of English Folksongs,"

unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Cambridge, 1974, ch. 1: "The beginnings of the trade."

3. Watt, 74.

4. Thomson, "Development of the Broadside Ballad Trade," 48. As influential as the stock ballads were, however, we cannot base generalizations about broadside balladry on these commercial favorites or even on copyrighted ballads more generally. Most broadside ballads were never copyrighted, whether because they were too bawdy or socially or politically risky or simply because most ballads were topical productions unlikely to warrant reprinting.

Thus when William St. Clair suggests in *The Reading Nation in the Romantic Period* (Cambridge, 2004) that "by the high monopoly period [1710–1774], the popular print sector had become almost completely monopolised in the hands of a single London firm of Dicey, which held the intellectual properties . . . in all the favourite titles" (341), what he means is that the particular sector of the popular print marketplace that had been *copyrighted* was monopolized. While the importance of the Dicey firm (discussed below) to ballad printing in this period is indisputable, the Diceys specialized in reprinting stock ballads rather than in the riskier venture of printing new ballads (especially topical and political ballads). Other printers did continue to print popular broadside ballads that were never registered (and so never part of any "monopoly").

5. Watt, 78.

6. Albert B. Friedman, *The Ballad Revival: Studies in the Influence of Popular on Sophisticated Poetry* (Chicago, 1961), 7.

7. "Democritus," Letter to *The Grub-street Journal*, no. 270, February 27, 1735.

8. Thomas Percy, *Reliques of Ancient English Poetry: Consisting of Old Heroic Ballads, Songs, and Other Pieces of Our Earlier Poets, Together With Some Few of Later Date*, 3 vols. [London, 1765], ed. Henry B. Wheatley (London, 1910), "Preface," 1:7; "Essay on the Ancient Minstrels of England," 1:345–81, 348, 380.

9. Joseph Ritson, "Observations on the Ancient English Minstrels," *Ancient Songs and Ballads From the Time of King Henry the Third, to the Revolution* (London, 1790 [sic; recte 1792]), i–xxvi, xvii. The title page of this work shows the date 1790, but it was printed in 1787 and not published until 1792, according to the English Short Title Catalog.

10. I discuss the role played by ballad scholars in the crystallization of the modern secular concept of "oral tradition" in "'The Art of Printing was Fatal': Print Commerce and the Idea of Oral Tradition in Long Eighteenth-Century Ballad Discourse," *Ballads and Broad-sides 1500–1800*, ed. Patricia Fumerton and Anita Guerrini, forthcoming (Ashgate, 2008), as well as in my current book project, "Print Culture and the Idea of Oral Tradition in Eighteenth-Century Britain."

11. William Motherwell, *Minstrelsy, Ancient and Modern*, 2 vols. (Glasgow, 1827; reprinted, Boston, 1846), 1:4.

12. Francis James Child, "Ballad Poetry," *Johnson's Universal Cyclopaedia*, vol. 1 (New York, 1875–80), 365–68, reprinted in *Journal of Folklore Research* 31 (1994): 214–22, 218. Child died before writing a comprehensive introduction to *The English and Scottish Popular Ballads*, 10 vols. (Boston, 1882–98), but many of his key ideas are articulated in this essay.

13. "Jeffrey Sing-Song" [Daniel Defoe?], "The Ballad-maker's Plea," *Applebee's Journal*, 13 Oct. 1722, reprinted in *Daniel Defoe: His Life and Recently Discovered Writings*, vol. 3, ed. William Lee (London, 1869), 57–60. Subsequent references will be to this edition and will appear in the text.

14. As Selden observed, "You may see by them how the wind sits; as, take a straw, and throw it upp into the aire, you shall see by that which way the wind is, which you shall not doe by casting up a stone—More solid things doe not shew the complexion of the times so well as ballads and libells" (*Table Talk of John Selden*, ed. Frederick Pollock [London, 1927], 72).

15. Samuel Johnson defined "ballad-singer" as "One whose employment it is to sing ballads in the streets" (*A Dictionary of the English Language* [London, 1755]). By the eigh-

teenth century, most persons "employed" to sing ballads did so chiefly in order to sell broadsides.

16. For examples in addition to the ones I provide below, see my *The Women of Grub Street: Press, Politics and Gender in the London Literary Marketplace, 1678–1730* (Oxford, 1998), 58–62 and 82–90. Most of the hawkers of political broadsides and pamphlets whose names I have discovered in the State Papers in this period were indigent women. They were frequently elderly, and often disabled or blind, and all of them signed their name with a mark—suggesting that they were unable to write (and perhaps also to read). Most claimed that they were unable to read the papers that they were selling, and many endured repeated arrests and periods of detention.

The destitution of ballad singers was thematized in a number of broadside ballads presumably then sung and sold by the women and men themselves. See for instance T. P., "The Ballad Singer. A New Song," ([London?], [1800?]), whose language seems almost a retort to Percy:

. . . need you gentlefolks be told
How hard it is when wet and cold.
And hunger round the minstrel cling,
How very hard it is to sing.

Then O incline to gentle pity,
Come buy, oh buy, the beggar's ditty. (ll. 13–18)

17. Great Britain, Public Record Office, State Papers Domestic, 35/29/60, f 268, n.d. [1721], hereinafter cited as SP.

18. SP 35/29/60, f 270. This ballad praising "J—ry's" virility was most likely published to capitalize on the recent birth of Charles Edward Stuart, the Young Pretender, on Dec. 31, 1720.

19. SP 35/29/60, f 271, n.d. [1721]. "The Old T—p M—" implies a turnip farmer. The turnip was a well-known anti-Hanoverian symbol. For another example, see "A Dialogue between an ancient Citizen's Horse and a Country Plow-man's," quoted below.

20. SP 35/43/50, f 147, 22 May 1723.

21. SP 35/43/50, f 148B, n.d. [1723].

22. SP 35/11, f 59, 11 Feb. 1717/18.

23. SP 35/11, f 57, 11 Feb. 1717/18.

24. SP 35/11, f 59, 11 Feb. 1717/18.

25. SP 35/21/77, f 210, 25 May 1720.

26. SP 35/21/75, f 205, 23 May 1720.

27. SP 35/21/77, f 210, 25 May 1720.

28. SP 35/21/77, f 212, 25 May 1720.

29. SP 35/24/75, f 241, n.d. [1720]. In 1724, the Cliftons were still printing Jacobite ballads commemorating Stuart monarchs. Five days before the May 29th anniversary of the Restoration of Charles II, a messenger of the press sent government officials a ballad titled "A Hymn to the Restoration," endorsed "Clifton." The refrain of this song urges loyal Britons to:

Drink one Brave Boys to CHARLES's Name,
Toss off the other one to ANNA's Fame;
Then Drink once more to Church and King,
He's a Rogue [w]on't say Amen.

The messenger rightly interpreted this ballad as an expression of anti-Hanoverian sentiment, urging: "such like as the enclosed stir up the mindes of pepell to be Enemyes to his Majesty" (SP 35/49/74, ff 265–69, 24 May 1724).

30. Relatively few eighteenth-century commentators discuss the continuing scribal circulation of ballads. Their concern is with what they see as the greater reach of ballads by voice and print. On the widespread scribal circulation of ballads in earlier periods, see Alastair Bellany, "'Rayling Rymes and Vaunting Verse': Libellous Politics in Early Stuart England, 1603–1628," *Culture and Politics in Early Stuart England*, ed. Kevin Sharpe and Peter Lake (Palo Alto, 1993), 285–310; and Adam Fox, *Oral and Literate Culture in England 1500–1700* (Oxford, 2000), esp. ch. 6, "Ballads and Libels."

31. SP 44/79a, f 330–1, 25 May 1720.

32. SP 35/11/82, f 196, 10 Apr. 1718.

33. SP 35/11/85, ff 200–201, 11 Apr. 1718.

34. SP 35/16/119, f 298, 13 June 1719.

35. [Anon.], *A Collection of Old Ballads. Corrected from the best and most Ancient Copies Extant. With Introductions Historical, Critical, or Humorous. Illustrated with Copper Plates*, 3 vols. (London, 1723–1725). Subsequent references will appear in the text.

36. Thomson, 108. Thomson further states that these broadsides "are, without exception, to be found amongst the Ballad Partners' stock." *A Collection* has traditionally been attributed to Ambrose Phillips, but Thomson persuasively argues that this is an improbable attribution (109–10). The first volume was published by James Roberts, a prolific trade publisher who also published works by Eliza Haywood and Daniel Defoe. For a helpful discussion of the work's antiquarian contexts, see Dianne Dugaw, "The Popular Marketing of 'Old Ballads': The Ballad Revival and Eighteenth-Century Antiquarianism Reconsidered," *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 21 (1987): 71–90.

37. St. Clair, 345.

38. For Addison's well-known *Spectator* papers on ballads, see nos. 70 (May 21, 1711), 74 (25 May 1711), and 85 (June 7, 1711).

39. Allan Ramsay, ed., *The Tea-Table Miscellany: A Collection of Choice Songs, Scots and English*, 4 vols. (Edinburgh, 1723–1737).

40. Friedman, 140–41.

41. "Advertisement" to *The Battel: Or, Morning-Interview. An Heroi-Comical Poem* (Edinburgh, 1716), sig. A2; black letter type in original.

42. Sigrid Rieuwerts, "Allan Ramsay and the Scottish Ballads," *Aberdeen University Review*, LVIII no. 201 (Spring 1999): 29–41, 31.

43. Rieuwerts, 32.

44. Thomas Percy, *Reliques of Ancient English Poetry: Consisting of Old Heroic Ballads, Songs, and Other Pieces of Our Earlier Poets, Together With Some Few of Later Date*, 3 vols. (London, 1765). Subsequent references will appear in the text.

45. Nick Groom, *The Making of Percy's Reliques* (Oxford, 1999), 4.

46. Percy, Letter to William Shenstone, July 19, 1761, *The Percy Letters*, Cleanth Brooks and A. F. Falconer, gen. eds., vol. 7: *The Correspondence of Thomas Percy and William Shenstone*, ed. Brooks (New Haven, 1977), 109.

47. Dugaw, 75. The Dacey firm has been extensively discussed by others: see Dugaw; Victor E. Neuburg, "The Diceys and the Chapbook Trade," *The Library*, 5th Series, XXIV (1969): 219–31; and Thomson, ch. 3: "Eighteenth-century ballad printing in London and the provinces." By 1763, Cluer Dacey had transferred the business to new premises in Aldermary Churchyard, which may have been acquired "as early as 1757" (Thomson, 106).

48. Dugaw, 75; see also Thomson, 107.

49. As Thomson states, "it is clear . . . that a sizeable proportion of the famous *Reliques* . . . derives from these Dacey sheets which in turn come from the old Ballad Stock or from the pages of *A Collection of Old Ballads*" (125–26).

50. Percy, Letter to Shenstone, 109.

51. Percy, Letter to George Paton, Sept. 11, 1773, *The Percy Letters*, David Nichol Smith and Cleanth Brooks, gen. eds., vol. 6: *The Correspondence of Thomas Percy and George Paton*, ed. A. F. Falconer (New Haven, 1961), 69.

52. Percy, Letter to Robert Jamieson, April 4, 1801, reprinted in John Nichols, *Illustrations of the Literary History of the Eighteenth Century*, vol. 8 (London, 1858), 341.

53. As Susan Stewart and others have suggested, Percy modeled the situation of ancient minstrels as antithetical to that of writers in the modern literary marketplace (*Crimes of Writing: Problems in the Containment of Representation* [Durham, N.C., 1994], esp. ch. 4: "Scandals of the Ballad," 102–31); see also Groom. Maureen N. McLane also touches on these issues in "The Figure Minstrelsy Makes: Poetry and Historicity," *Critical Inquiry* 29 (Spring 2003): 429–52; and "Ballads and Bards: British Romantic Orality," *Modern Philology* 98 (2001): 423–43.

54. Groom, 8; Percy, Letter to Charles Rivington, June 13, 1794, reprinted in Nichols, 8:309; see also 336.

55. Ritson, "Preface," *Select Collection of English Songs*, 3 vols. (London, 1783), 1:xiv, xiii.

56. Ritson, "Preface," *Select Collection*, 1.i. On Ritson's output, see Bertrand H. Bronson, *Joseph Ritson: Scholar-at-Arms*, 2 vols. (Berkeley, 1938), esp. 2:751–802, "A Ritson Bibliography."

57. Ritson, "Preface," *Select Collection*, 1.i.

58. See especially Ritson's "A Historical Essay on the Origin and Progress of National Song," prefaced to his *Select Collection*, 1:i–lxxii, and his "Observations on the Ancient English Minstrels" and "Dissertation on the Songs, Music, and Vocal and Instrumental Performances of the Ancient English," prefaced to *Ancient Songs*, i–xxvi and xxvii–lxxvi.

59. Ritson, "Historical Essay," 1:lii.

60. Ritson, "Observations on Minstrels," x.

61. Ritson, "Historical Essay," 1:lvi.

62. Ritson, "Historical Essay," 1:lvi–lix.

63. Ritson, "Observations on Minstrels," xxiii; my emphasis.

64. Ritson, "Observations on Minstrels," xxiii. Ritson's statement echoes Addison's *Spectator* issues on ballads, but also Samuel Johnson's praise for "the common sense of readers uncorrupted with literary prejudices" in his *Prefaces, Biographical and Critical, to the Works of the English Poets* (London, 1779–81), 10:35. This is ironic given that Johnson thought that most ballads were infantile productions unworthy of serious attention.

65. Ritson, "Dissertation on the Songs," lxxiii; "Observations on Minstrels," xxiii, xvii. Unlike Percy, Ritson included the "airs" to the songs that he reprinted whenever they were known. Volume Three of his *Select Collection* consists entirely of airs to the songs.

66. The first edition of Walter Scott's *Minstrelsy of the Scottish Border* was published in two volumes (Edinburgh, 1802). Quotations here are taken from the one-volume reprint edited by Thomas Henderson (London, 1931); this quotation appears on page 65. Subsequent references will refer to the Henderson edition.

67. Scott's "Introductory Remarks" was first appended to the 1830 edition of *Minstrelsy* and is reprinted in Henderson, ed., 501–32. This quotation is at 512–13.

68. Motherwell, "Introduction," 1:1. The introduction runs pages 1–136. Subsequent references to this work will appear in the text.

69. See William B. McCarthy, "William Motherwell as Field Collector," *Folk Music Journal* 5 (1987): 295–316.

70. Child, "Preface," *The English and Scottish Ballads* (8 vols., Boston; 2nd. edn. 1860), vii. The first edition, also in eight vols., was published by the same publisher in 1857–58. Subsequent references will be to the second edition.

71. Child, "Preface," *The English and Scottish Ballads*, viii.

72. Child, "Preface," viii.

73. Child, Letter to Svend Grundtvig, 25 Aug. 1872, reprinted in Sigurd Bernhard Hustvedt, *Ballad Books and Ballad Men: Raids and Rescues in Britain, America, and the Scandinavian North since 1800* (Cambridge, Mass., 1930), 252–55; 255, 254.

74. Child, "Ballad Poetry," 214–18.

75. Child, "Ballad Poetry," 218.

76. Child, "Ballad Poetry," 218.

77. For some valuable exceptions addressing the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, see W. Walker Wilkins, *Political Ballads of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries*, 2 vols. (London, 1860); Rocco Lawrence Capraro, "Political Broadside Ballads in Early Hanover-

ian London," *Eighteenth-Century Life*, 11 no. 2 (1987): 12–21; Michael Scrivener, *Poetry and Reform: Periodical Verse from the English Democratic Press, 1792–1824* (Detroit, 1992); Bellany; and Fox, esp. ch. 6, "Ballads and Libels." I also discuss political balladry in *The Women of Grub Street*, esp. 58–62 and 81–90.

The reprint series *Poems on Affairs of State: Augustan Satirical Verse, 1660–1714* (7 vols., [New Haven, 1963–75]) is indispensable but nonetheless reprints only a small percentage of the extant verse. For Volume 7 alone, the editor admits, the seventy-five poems included "were chosen from more than 1,000 possibilities" (*Poems on Affairs of State: Augustan Satirical Verse*, vol. 7: 1704–1714, ed. Frank H. Ellis [New Haven, 1975], xxxix). Even more crucially, this series edited by literary scholars focuses only on the most accomplished, "literary" verse—especially works by authors well known today, such as Andrew Marvell, John Dryden, George Etherege, John Wilmot, Earl of Rochester, Jonathan Swift, Matthew Prior, and Daniel Defoe. These selections should not be mistaken for a representative sampling.

Today, the prospect of digital collections of extant topical political ballads seems especially promising. For an example of what has been done with topical materials surviving in manuscript form, see Alastair Bellany and Andrew McRae, eds., "Early Stuart Libels: an edition of poetry from manuscript sources," *Early Modern Literary Studies Text Series I* (2005), <http://purl.oclc.org/emls/texts/libels>.

78. "Essay on Ballads," *The London Magazine; Or, Gentleman's Monthly Intelligencer; For November, 1769*, 580–81, 580.

79. Ritson, "Preface," *Select Collection*, 1:viii.

80. Ritson, "Historical Essay," 1:lxii.

81. Ritson, *Ancient Songs*, 229.

82. Ritson, "Historical Essay," 1:lxii.

83. Hannah More, *Cheap Repository Tracts, Published during the Year 1795, Forming Volume 1* ([London], [1797]), 16–17.

84. "Essay on Ballads," 580.