The Power of Imagination in the Eighteenth-Century Coffeehouse

Naoki Yoshida

I

The coffeehouse has been a place for social gathering where people come to drink coffee, read books, and talk with friends. In the late seventeenth and the early eighteenth century of England, this public space had a significant role in making the new community which would lead to English nationalism afterwards. This is not to say that the coffeehouse has brought about nationalism, but that the discursive arrangement of the coffeehouse could be one of the origins of nationalism. As nationalism is a historical ideology, we should examine its significance from a diachronic point of view. In general, modern nationalism is thought to emerge at the end of the eighteenth century: French Revolution marks a turning point. A century earlier, however, we could find a similar epoch-making movement: the formation of the coffeehouse public sphere. The coffeehouse has a power to invent an imagined community, which is one of the substantial aspects of nationalism.

In this essay I will discuss the historical significance of the coffeehouse as public sphere. A nation, if we follow Benedict Anderson's definition, is "an imagined political community" in people's minds.[1] It does not matter whether the nation exists in front of them. The point is whether anyone can conceive or believe in their group affiliation. Thus the power of imagination is essential to the birth of this community, and the coffeehouse communication would be helpful for developing imagination. As we know, the new type of communication had been grown out of the coffeehouse: critical thinking with novel reading. The main purpose of this essay is to examine how the national imagination has been fostered around the coffeehouse.

First, I will overview the brief history of the modern coffeehouse. When coffee was introduced to England for the first time, it was desired because of its medical advantage. Together with its cheapness, coffee became quite popular, and the number of coffeehouses increased rapidly. The coffeehouse offered the chances of discussion, too. Many people, regardless of social status or sex, could enjoy free discussion. With the lapse of time, the coffeehouse has been changed into a club or a society in which people could get a feeling of belonging to a community. Next, I will focus on the criticism against the coffeehouse. If we look into the rhetoric of satirizing the coffeehouse, we can see the rise of modern consciousness of gender and sexuality. It gives us aspects of misogyny, homophobia, and disgust for French. Besides the negative campaign, there was a reform movement of the coffeehouse communication, and the main purpose for this reform is to

establish the politeness among the members of this new social group. The bourgeoisie should polish themselves so as to come into political power in the coming age. The coffeehouse journals have produced a modern subject whose homosocial affiliations would lead to the later nationalism. In the end, we realize that there is a certain ambiguity of the modern public sphere and that English people have created an imaginary community in this fuzzy space.

II

In 1650, a Jewish entrepreneur opened the first English coffeehouse in Oxford. Two years later, Pasqua Rosee, Greece merchant, opened another coffeehouse. As for Rosee's, Richard Bradley, a botanist and writer, notes, "[t]hey set up their *Coffee-House* in *St.Michael's Alley* in *Cornhill,* which was the first in *London.*"[2] Then a habit of coffee drinking started a boom and thousands of coffeehouses flourished throughout the country by the end of the century.

How did coffee become so popular among contemporary people? Indeed, coffee was first introduced into England as a drug.[3] Rosee, in his pamphlet *The Vertue of the Coffee Drink,* writes, "[i]t is very good against sore Eyes," as well as "the Headach." Coffee was said to be a sort of antiphlogistic analgetic. It was also thought to be "excellent to prevent and cure the Dropsie, Gout, and Scurvy."[4] Furthermore, Bradley claimed the following:

> Now whether the Hypothesis of venomous Animalcula brought by the Air, or that of Aerial Atoms, poison'd and rendred unwholesom, be the Cause of the Pestilence, will be examin'd in another Work; but at present I shall only say, That most of the Physicians, of both Sects, prescribe the same Methods of Prevention, and of Cure.[5]

Bradley recommended coffee as an effective drug for pestilence by which London was visited in 1665. One of the advantages of coffee was found in its medical effect. Besides, coffee was a relatively cheap beverage. As the price of beer became more expensive in the latter half of the century, people preferred cheaper alternative.[6] When people paid one penny, they could enjoy coffee and news in Gazettes as well.[7] Another reason for its popularity lies in a chance of free discussion. Regardless of their social status, people could enjoy talking as much as they liked. It was neither class nor gender exclusive institution. In fact, female customers were often witnessed there.[8] Thus the coffeehouse became a new communication site which was in principle open to public.

In subsequent decades, each coffeehouse had a particular group of people as a target clientele. John Macky, a writer and spy, has shown his favorite coffeehouses as follows:

> If it is fine Weather we take a turn in the *Park* till Two, when we go to Dinner; and

if it be dirty you are entertained at *Picket* or *Basset* at *White*'s, or you may talk Politicks at the *Smyrna* and St.*James*'s. I must not forget to tell you, that the Parties have their different Places, where however a Stranger is always well received; but a *Whig* will no more go to the *Cocoa-Tree* or *Osinda*'s, than a *Tory* will be seen at the Coffee-House of St. *James*'s.[9]

In order to attract customers, the coffeehouse became the place for the political discussion. As Macky writes, he often went to the coffeehouse to "talk Politicks" over a cup of coffee. People's political affiliations led them to particular places. Therefore, the coffeehouse was sometimes regarded as power base for politics. Both the Whig and the Tory gathered at their coffeehouses for politics. In addition, the coffeehouse could be classified according to customer's occupation or hometown. The famous example is the Lloyd's which was mainly for bankers and underwriters. Macky writes, "The *Scots* go generally to the *British*, and a Mixture of all Sorts to the *Smyrna*. There are other little *Coffee-Houses* much frequented in this Neighbourhood, *Young-Man's* for *Officers, Old-Man's* for *Stock-Jobbers, Pay-Masters* and *Courtiers,* and *Little Man's for Sharpers*."[10] Therefore, the name of people's favorite coffeehouse revealed their profiles. The coffeehouse gradually came to be a club or a society, in which people could have consciousness of belonging to a certain community.

Despite its ubiquity, most coffeehouses were set in metropolis and they became an essential part of urban life. What impact was made on the people living in this area? In *Leisure Hours Amusements for Town and Country,* we see that people living in the political center of England should have rational minds for discussion.

> The Persons to whose Behaviour and Discourse the most Regard out to be had, are such as have not Spirits too active to be happy and well pleas'd in a private Condition, nor Complexion too warm to make them neglect the Duties and Relations of life. . . . In *London* the *Coffee-house* is the Place of Rendezvous to all that live near it, who are thus turn'd to relish calm and ordinary Life.[11]

This passage tells us that the sober mind is important for the rational discussion at the coffeehouse. If a person's spirit were "too active," it might be "producing wandering thoughts and idle imaginations" which may lead to "loss of memory, apprehensions of death from diseases which are not present."[12] One demand for rational conversation comes from *Spectator* No.49, in which we can find the original argument available for the later literature.[13]

Jürgen Habermas argues that the coffeehouse enabled the emergent bourgeoisie to enhance their political influence on the society. Until the eighteenth century, the court and the church had been dominant in the political world. However, the aristocracy was gradually eroded by the new civil order in which critical abilities both in literature and

politics narrowed the gaps of class distinction.[14] This is not to say that the modern public space has taken over the aristocratic society, but that the co-existence or mixture of two distinct social values was to be found in this period.

As for gender distinction, the coffeehouse might be regarded as a place to blur any difference between two sexes.[15] Nevertheless, here again, the existence of women at the coffeehouse does not necessarily mean that it was a subversive institution for breaking down the gender-role in the eighteenth century. Rather, we should see here an emergent awareness toward a gender distinction. As we shall see, the gender consciousness would be clearer between 1680 and 1730. Thus English category of gender has been formulated behind the prosperity of the coffeehouse.

III

Although the coffeehouse seemed to be an ideal place for all modern people to enjoy their leisure time, we can find a negative attitude toward the coffeehouse as early as the Restoration era. Lawrence E. Klein points out the difference between alehouse and coffee house as follows: "Unlike the alehouse, then, the coffeehouse was associated with the disruption of the restorative goals of the 1660s and 1670s."[16] The court was afraid of serious discussion of the coffeehouse. Drunken quarrels were harmless however vehement they were, but the rational criticism at the coffeehouse could lead to an actual rebellion against government. Charles II worried about the open political discussion of the coffeehouse, so that he issued a proclamation to suppress the coffeehouse in 1675. [17] As to this ban, Bradley writes as follows:

> We may here observe, That King *Charles* II. finding the daily Increase of *Coffee-Houses,* and that at those Places People were apt to talk too freely of the State, endeavour'd the suppressing of them: but the Judges being consulted, they declared it could not be done by Law; and only ended in laying a Tax on them."[18]

There was a stiff resistance, and a week later the proclamation was withdrawn. This is an example of political regulations against the popularity of the coffeehouse, but many criticisms were not always straightforward as such.

Many criticisms used the rhetoric of satirizing the coffeehouse patrons. First of all, they were ridiculed for effeminacy: they did not enjoy the traditional masculine pleasure of ale drinking. Their activities, especially discussions at the coffeehouse were regarded as female chatting.[19] *A Character of Coffee and Coffee-Houses* describes the male customers as follows:

> In this Age Men tattle more than Women, and particularly at the Coffee-house,

when the number hath been but six, five of them have talkt at one time. The Company here have out-talk'd an equal number of Gossipping Women, and made a greater noise than a Bake-house. Men are here born down by clamour, which resembles at times the noise of the Cataracts of *Nilus,* but always resembles a School, fill'd with Children, every one conning his Lesson aloud.[20]

The analogy between coffeehouse denizens and gossiping women shows the potential threat of talkative women to male politicians. Female tattlers were despised as minors, but they could be a rebellious mob for whom the royalists had serous apprehensions. It also suggests that female tattlers could not acquire any truth, but that their babble and chatter might break down the contemporary truth system which was based on cultural hegemony of court and church. We see here contradictory rhetoric toward the coffeehouse. Interestingly, as we shall see later, the feminization of male customer's polite conversation would be an ideal as well as a target of criticism.

In spite of these criticisms, nobody could stop the popularity of coffeehouse. As we have seen, one of the most fascinating aspects of the coffeehouse lies in the free discussion, through which the emerging bourgeoisie was acquiring more political power. Also, people were getting more conscious of gender which fueled the later discussion on the social distinction around the coffeehouse. In the next section, then, we will move to the communicative aspects of the coffeehouse.

IV

In order to attract many customers, the coffeehouse provided many reading materials. As Klein argues, the coffeehouse popularity was closely related with the development of print media such as broadsides, pamphlets, and journals.[21] Certainly, hot debates at the coffeehouse could not be realized without such a print culture. Conversation and reading were interrelated to each other: many topics of discussion came from periodicals available at the coffeehouse, and the journal articles were reporting the real discussion by some patrons. Among many reading materials, the *Tatler, Spectator,* and *Guardian,* which appeared from 1709 to 1714, got a wider readership.[22] The *Tatler* was issued three times a week from various London coffeehouses. The coffeehouse successfully functioned as a discursive institution for the next few decades. Now we shall see some reform movement of the coffeehouse: the encouragement of polite conversation through reading.

As we have seen, social mixing was quite important for the coffeehouse, but the institution should be regarded as a legitimate place to secure the stability of society. Politeness has often been urged for that purpose. Samuel Johnson defines politeness as "elegance of manners." It is a way of sociable and pleasing conversation, and it belonged

to the authoritative institution such as court and church. Brian Cowan called the encouragement of politeness as "*Spectator project*" in which free discussion was limited in order to subdue any irrational elements of argument.[23] An ultimate goal of this project was not the mere suppression of the coffeehouse's openness: it aimed at gauging how much freedom could be allowed for the traditional polite conversation. There were some restrictions about free conversation: it discouraged cursing, swearing, immoral languages.[24] Hence politeness required some sort of self-control. Michèle Cohen writes, "Politeness, a 'complete system of manners and conduct based on the arts of conversation', was at the heart of the sociability that developed in the social and cultural spaces of the new urban culture of early eighteenth-century England."[25] Politeness is thus the amalgam of the old courtly manner and the new urban rusticity. It is the convention of showing an artificial self. If the modern citizens would be polite, they should make their own unnatural self visible to the public.

Richard Steele and Joseph Addison were making the coffeehouse an ideal institution for politeness through the journal writings. Their project of politeness was emphasizing the development of reading as well as conversation. The Third Earl of Shaftesbury's *Characteristicks* of 1711 was also significant in this sense.[26] According to Klein, "there is no evidence that Shaftesbury lodged any hope that the coffeehouse would provide a venue for polite conversation," Shaftesbury felt the necessity of understanding and expressing that politeness which was essential for the sophisticated public society.[27]

As Clery has shown, the coffeehouse customers were "asked to behave as though there were ladies present" during their conversation.[28] These invisible ladies might remind us of female guardians like the coffeehouse barmaid in front of whom male customers had to make genteel conversations.[29]

An invisible moderator had a significant role in the *Spectator* project: the modern subject should often converse with fictional characters. New readership was constructed through the imaginary conversation with the editor of periodicals. As John Brewer points out, the editor makes it possible to transmit the private matter into the public domain.[30] The editor is an "observer" of the London life. He collected many stories, fictional and non-fictional, and reported from some coffeehouses. His main role is to secure authenticity of the story. The editor makes private letters or correspondence an object of reading. Privacy gets more and more important because it can be worth reading publicly. Therefore, privacy is under the circumstance of publicity and always becomes a political issue.

Anderson emphasizes the feeling of "meanwhile" in such a contemporary periodicals.[31] Modern readers could read many irrelevant events in one page. They had to sharpen the sense of grasping simultaneity of plural incidents. Indeed, a collection of correspondence provided political scandals of the parliament, while reporting the murder and robbery on the street. The *Spectator* project enabled readers to take a position from which they made a bird-eye observation of the London life. Now the *Spectator* readers were beginning to

look like Mr. Spectator himself, the editor. As for the similarity of the novel and the newspaper, Anderson writes, "these forms provided the technical means for 're-presenting' the *kind* of imagined community that is the nation."[32] Anderson also puts stress on the objective viewpoint of reading periodicals where the omniscient reader is idealized. The identification of the reader with the editor leads to the transcendental ideal, which makes people imagine the relationship with the unknown fellow beings.

Along with the embryonic nationalistic awareness, the modern readers became more conscious of their own usage of language. Cohen writes, "[l]anguage and national character were interrelated."[33] The *Spectator* project which promoted the polite conversation should be understood from the multiple points of view: class, gender, and nationalism. The national character was coined by referring to foreign countries, especially France in that period. In addition, the value judgment of national character was made on the basis of gender distinction. It intended to form a new kind of gender category. Thus the coffeehouse's discussion of politeness was not limited within the domestic but rather went so far to the outside world.

<p style="text-align:center">V</p>

As for the Englishness of politeness, Cohen writes, "[t]o achieve politeness, English gentlemen had to look to women and to the French."[34] The identification of women with the French is important because the awareness of nationalism were emerging with the demand of politeness. We can find here the ambivalent attitude toward French model of polite behavior. French way of conduct was mostly criticized as effeminacy. Yet this model was crucial for the urban civil control over the traditional institutions. Therefore, the antagonism against France was to show that the *Spectator* project needed the otherness for its completion of politeness. The question is how the old manly Englishness could be transformed into a new amalgamated Englishness, which entailed the undesired otherness.

The Women's Petition Against Coffee is one of the key texts to show how the gender issues were used in order to criticize the coffeehouse. As in *A Character of Coffee and Coffee-Houses*, the main target of this criticism lies in male customer's "Gossiping" as follows:

> Nor is this (though more than enough) *All* the ground of our Complaint: For besides, we have reason to apprehend and grow *Jealous*, That Men by frequenting these *Stygian Tap-houses* will usurp on our Prerogative of *Tatling*, and soon learn to exeel us in *Talkativeness*: a Quality wherein our Sex has ever Claimed preheminence: For here like so many *Frogs* in a *puddle*, they sup muddy water, and murmur insignificant notes till half a dozen of them *out-babble* an equal number of us at a *Gossipping*, talking all at once in Confusion. . . .[35]

The author called the male talkativeness a "*Frenchified*" behavior.[36] The satirical attitudes toward the feminization of coffeehouse patrons demand in a petition format that men regain sexual strength based on the old gender distinction.

The Mens Answer to the Women's Petition was issued for a rebuttal in the same year. It appeared to make a defense of coffeehouse male customers, but in reality it was another attack on the recent decline of masculinity. In this pamphlet, coffee was introduced as a drug increasing sexual energy:

> Coffee collects and settles the Spirits, makes the erection more Vigorous, the Ejaculation more full, adds a spiritualescency to the Sperme, and renders it more firm and suitable to the Gusto of the womb, and proportionate to the ardours and expectation too, of the female Paramour.[37]

The pamphlet insists that men could show their sexual strength in full measure with the help of coffee. In other words, it made a sarcastic answer with many sexual insinuations to reveal effeminacy of the contemporary men.

No doubt the gender distinction is one of the basic frameworks to define the self and the other. If natural masculinity can be found only in a physical toughness, men should abandon the polite femininity. However, as the *Spectator* project insists, a new masculinity needs the feminization process for its completion. As Cohen argues, in the early eighteenth century, many critics insisted on the importance of polishing both men and language.[38] When we consider the male politeness of language, we see the transformation of gender division around the coffeehouse. The man should take in some of the "female" otherness to form a "masculine" self.

In order to attain a new goal of modern masculinity, men have created the homosocial relations through public discussion. The conversation at the coffeehouse was made mainly among male customers even though women were not excluded. This homosocial space, however, could be easily misunderstood as homosexual one. As we have seen, the criticism against the coffeehouse has focused on the lack of reproductive power on the side of male customers. No doubt the coffeehouse was not the place for homosexual activities. The same sex relationships were not of sexual nature in reality but just social one. Clery argues, "Coffee drinking was understood to be primarily a homosocial experience. As such, it raised questions that were physiological and social: What was the nature of the product's effect on the male body?"[39] Therefore, the discussion on favorable and adverse effect of coffee as a drug was not medical findings but moral argument about the same sex relations in the modern period. Clery also writes, "Men were to be remasculinized by a new model of heterosexual interaction focused on the moral influence of women."[40] Why did the remasculinization assume the heterosexuality? This is because new model of masculinity has a possible danger to be referred to as homosexuality. Thus man should be much more aware of his own homosocial /

heterosexual nature to assert himself at the public sphere. The homosociality is another basis for the later imagined community as nation: it could be legitimate social value in political life because this male fraternity is always against an unproductive homosexual. Thus the infinite number of English people could be united safely under the standard of national community.

As male self-consciousness of gender became more highlighted, the establishment of the appropriate self became a topic of discussion. For example, an effeminate man, or a fop was mentioned repeatedly in a negative way because he denied his own subjection by putting on unnatural politeness. Man's masculinity was set between a stereotypical concept of manliness and a new demand of talkative politeness. It was quite difficult for man to establish his own identity in accordance with this principle. At the same time, women were in dilemma because femininity was to be changed as masculinity dictated. Thus most eighteenth-century novels have made use of the difficult path to proper subjection: men's masculinity and women's virtue are always in danger.

When Cohen writes, "women were central to the sociability and conversation constituting the main practices of this 'public' sphere," we can realize that female centrality has two meanings.[41] Women's theatrical position at the coffeehouse was necessary for men's consciousness of otherness. On the other hand, as femininity was defined by masculinity, the appearance of women was also the topic of discussion. Too much women's exposure was seen as the destructive element for the traditional gender system. Thus women's appearance at public space would become more and more controversial for the next few decades.

VI

As for the correlation of public and private, Clery writes, "[c]offee-houses raised the problem of a new-model man: an amalgamation of private passions (including the passion for acquisition) and public voice."[42] Now we can see the dualism of Habermas's concept of public sphere. He argues two aspects of the coffeehouse as follows:

> The public sphere was coextensive with public authority, and we consider the court part of it. Included in the private realm was the authentic "public sphere," for it was a public sphere constituted by private people. Within the realm that was the preserve of private people we therefore distinguish again between private and public spheres. The private sphere comprised civil society in the narrower sense, that is to say, the realm of commodity exchange and of social labor; imbedded in it was the family with its interior domain.[43]

Habermas's usage of public sphere is quite ambiguous. When he writes about the English

court, he regards it as belonging to "sphere of public authority." To be sure, the coffeehouse is set in public sphere, but this should be distinguished from the courtly "sphere of public authority." Therefore, in contrast to the traditional institutions such as court and church, the coffeehouse is thought to be positioned in the "private realm." However, in this private realm, we discern another private space such as "civil society" based on family. Compared to this private space, the coffeehouse is more public, so that it should be put back in public sphere, which is closer to the traditional authority. Thus Habermas's concept of "authentic" public sphere is fuzzy in spite of its seeming certainty, and here we realize the significance of historicity of coffeehouse.

We need a certain ambiguity to understand public nature of the coffeehouse, and so did the eighteenth century bourgeois intellectuals. Without the fuzzy authentic sphere one loses sight of historical continuity or discontinuity of the coffeehouse in the eighteenth-century England. Through the publication of many private lives in the public, people could read and talk "authentic" nature of modern man. To be sure, this authenticity should be understood from the notion of gendered separate sphere, which is ambivalent in itself.

Now we understand there is no fixed definition of public but many different definitions: there is no clear outside world for these early moderns. To put it another way, when people consider their own privacy, it is also a self-examination of their public role in the society. The boundary of the private and public is always shifting so that the modern critical mind cannot acquire an authentic self-identity. The coffeehouse public sphere, according to Habermas, is a social product unfolding at an important moment in the eighteenth century, but the coffeehouse as a movement of seeking authentic identity could lead to another coherent but imaginary desire for political independence of people, that is, nationalism. If so, nationalism is not a counterpart of the coffeehouse culture, but rather a part of the broader movement of seeking contemporary self-identity in the English long eighteenth-century.

---

[1] Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (London: Verso, 2006) 6.

[2] Richard Bradley, *The Virtue and Use of Coffee* (London, 1721) 22.

[3] As for the early reception of coffee, see E.J.Clery, *The Feminization Debate in Eighteenth-Century England: Literature, Commerce and Luxury* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004) 13.

[4] Pasqua Rosee, *The Vertue of the Coffee* Drink (London, 1652) 1.

[5] Bradley 25-6.

[6] For the price of beer, see Steve Pincus, " 'Coffee Politicians Does Create': Coffeehouses and Restoration Political Culture" *The Journal of Modern History* 67 (1995) 817.

[7] As for the cheapness of coffee, Bradley writes, "[t]he Cheapness of it, with the Conveniencies in this Way of meeting, (being preferable to those in Taverns and Ale Houses) soon increas'd its Drinkers; and other *Coffee-Houses* were set up in most Parts of the Kingdom," (22)

[8] About female customers such as Lady Ranelagh and Martha Lady Giffard, see Pincus, 816.

[9] John Macky, *A Journey through England. In Familiar Letters from a Gentleman here, to his Friend Abroad.*

(London, 1714) 108.

10 Macky 108.

11 *Leisure Hours Amusements for Town and Country* (London, 1750) 86.

12 Hugh Smythson, *The Compleat Family Physician* (London, 1781) 325.

13 *The Spectator* (London, 1713) 187.

14 For the predominance of the town in this age, see Jürgen Habermas, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society,* trans. Thomas Burger (Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT P, 1989) 32.

15 See Pincus 824.

16 Lawrence E. Klein, "Coffeehouse Civility, 1660-1714: An Aspect of Post-Courtly Culture in England" *The Huntington Library Quarterly* 59 (1996) 42.

17 As for Charles II's proclamation, see Klein 40.

18 Bradley 23.

19 As for the intelligence of the coffeehouse discussion, Klein writes, "[c]offeehouse discussion was portrayed not as the search for truth through conversation but rather as babble and chatter." (38)

20 *A Character of Coffee and Coffee-Houses* (London, 1661) 4.

21 See Klein 32.

22 For these three periodicals' influence on the coffeehouse, see Klein 33.

23 Brian Cowan, "Mr. Spectator and the Coffeehouse Public Sphere" *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 37 (2004) 346.

24 For the special rules of polite conversation, see Clery 14.

25 Michèle Cohen, "Manliness, Effeminacy and the French: Gender and the Construction of National Character in Eighteenth-Century England," in *English Masculinities 1660-1800,* eds. Tim Hitchcock and Michèle Cohen (London: Longman, 1999) 46.

26 For Shaftesbury's *Characteristicks,* see Klein 48.

27 Klein 49.

28 Clery 23.

29 As for the women's role of conversation, Cohen insists, "[b]ecause mixed conversation as the ideal social arrangement was predicated on the pivotal role of women in this 'public' sphere, it is the 'publicity' of women that has been celebrated and been the main focus of interest to historians." 20.

30 See John Brewer, "This, that and the other: Public, Social and Private in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries," in *Shifting the Boundaries: Transformation of the Languages of Public and Private in the Eighteenth Century,* eds. Dario Castiglione and Lesley Sharpe (Exeter: U of Exeter P, 1995) 14.

31 Anderson 24.

32 Anderson 25.

33 Cohen 55.

34 Cohen 20.

35 *The Women's Petition Against Coffee. Representing to Publick Consideration the Grand Inconveniences accruing to their Sex from the Excessive Use of that Drying, Enfeebling Liquor. Presented to the Right Honourable the Keepers of the Liberty of Venus* (London, 1674) 3-4.

36 In *The Women's Petition Against Coffee,* we see the following descriptions: "we find of late a very sensible *Decay* of hat true *Old English Vigour,* our *Gallants* being every way so *Frenchified,* that they are become meer Cock-sparrows, fluttering things that come on *Sasa,* with a world of Fury but are not able to *stand* to it, and in the very first Charge fall down *flat* before us." (1-2)

37 *The Mens Answer to the Women's Petition Against Coffee: Vindicating Their own Performances, and the Vertues of their Liquor, from the Undeserved Aspersions lately Cast upon them in their Scandalous Pamphlet* (London, 1674) 4.

38 Cohen also points out, "[b]y the 1780, priorities had been significantly altered." (56)

39 Clery 13.

40 Clery 21.

41 Cohen 19.

42 Clery 19.

43 Habermas 30.