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Behn and the “Epitaph On the Tombstone of a Child”

Abstract
Aphra Behn’s poems usually celebrate some form of pastoral life or love, so much so that her “Epitaph on the Tombstone of a Child” seems anomalous in her 1685 Miscellany. The same poem (with two lines crossed out) appears in Cambridge University Library MS Add. 8460, Elizabeth Lyttelton’s Commonplace Book, where it is titled simply “Epitaph on William Fairfax.” The twelve lines also appear on one other material witness: the tomb marker for young William Fairfax, who was Elizabeth Lyttelton’s nephew and Sir Thomas Browne’s grandson. This article examines the poem itself, discusses the deleted lines, considers connections that might have led Behn to compose such a piece, and suggests what this might reveal about Behn, the family of young William Fairfax, and the transmission of Behn’s poems.
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Cover Page Footnote
I owe a debt of thanks, a large debt, to Kyle Triplett, Rare Book Librarian, New York Public Library, for his extraordinary assistance. I am most grateful to Rebecca Bullard for calling the survey of St. Nicholas Church to my attention and for sending me photographs of the chapel and the tomb marker for William Fairfax.
Fourteen lines marking the death of a child, a poem entitled “Epitaph the Tombstone of a Child, the last of Seven that died before” was published in Aphra Behn’s *Miscellany* in 1685, clearly attributed to Behn (257-58). The “Epitaph” itself is a mediocre poem, not at all typical of Behn’s usual subject matter. However, it should interest Behn scholars in that the poem appears in two material witnesses other than print—in a manuscript commonplace book and on a funerary stone. In addition, this short and easily ignored poem can offer a small window into Behn’s world in 1684 and 1685, with attention to her possibly painful financial situation and to the London literary and social circles of which she may have been a part.

The first material witness, probably predating the 1685 print publication, is a fourteen-line entry in a commonplace book that belonged at the time to Elizabeth Lyttelton, the daughter of Sir Thomas Browne. Two lines of the poem have been boxed and crossed out. This entry names the child in the title, “Epitaph on William Fairfax,” with no indication that the child is the inscriber’s nephew. Since Elizabeth Lyttelton did not compose the epitaph, there had to have been an original, an exemplar for her transcription, perhaps a single manuscript page, a missing material witness. The second material witness appears on a marker above the grave of William Fairfax, with the excised lines in the manuscript also missing in the engraving. Finally, there is a twenty-first century “digital” witness to this poem, an immaterial witness, within the pages of Cambridge MS Add. 8460, which takes us back to the original transcription.

First, the poem as Behn had it printed:

```
EPITAPH
On the Tombstone of a Child, the last of
Seven that died before.

By Mrs. A. B.

This Little, Silent, Gloomy Monument,
Contains all that was sweet and innocent;
The softest prater that e’er found a Tongue,
His Voice was Musick and his Words a Song;
Which now each List’ning Angel smiling hears,
Such pretty Harmonies compose the Spheres;
Wanton as unfleg’d Cupids, ere their Charms
Had learn’d the little arts of doing harms;
Fair as young Cherubins, as soft and kind,
```
And tho translated could not be refin’d;  10
The Seventh dear pledge the Nuptial Joys had given,
Toil’d here on Earth, retir’d to rest in Heaven;
Where they the shining Host of Angels fill,
Spread their gay wings before the Throne, and smile. (257-58)

In itself, the poem with its odd title seems insignificant in Behn’s Miscellany. But as we try to determine those involved with the several unusual material manifestations of the poem, starting with the missing exemplar, we encounter what is often called the “Six Degrees of Kevin Bacon” or “Bacon’s Law,” a modern game that tries to establish six degrees of separation, and therefore connection, from one person to a well-known person. At Point X of this connection is Elizabeth Lyttelton, the keeper of the manuscript and a deeply religious member of the family of Sir Thomas Browne. At Point Y is the author of the epitaph, Aphra Behn. The lines deleted from the manuscript and missing on the stone obviously did not please someone, but the poem in its slightly shortened form did satisfy the need for a tablet marker for the child’s grave. Rarely do we have a poem in three such different material manifestations. Moreover, we begin to question why Behn wrote such a poem, how Elizabeth Lyttelton got her hands on the poem itself, who cut out the two lines and why. We also then must consider the six or fewer degrees of separation between Behn and the Browne family. In addition, the timing of the poem, between 1684 and 1685, provides a glimpse into Behn’s world during two years critical to her professional career, a time when we also have two non-literary documents that frame that time—her letter to Jacob Tonson and her IOU to Zachary Baggs.

The epitaph appears in Miscellany with the explicit attribution “By Mrs. A. B.”—one of her usual signals of authorship. Although Behn’s name does not appear on the title page of Miscellany itself, the dedication to Sir William Clifton is signed “A. Behn” (A4v), so she must have had some editorial control over the volume. Miscellany collects twelve of her poems along with sixty-five poems and poetical translations by others, generally in her circle, including Edward Howard, Tom Brown, Elizabeth Taylor (later Lady Wythens), Thomas Otway, Sir George Etherege, and the Earls of Rochester and Dorset, along with others identified or not.

Janet Todd called this poem “curious” (339). It is an outlier in that Behn usually chose pastoral modes or poems written to friends, named or implied. Moreover, Behn showed little interest in children. In terms of elegies, she marked in verse only four deaths, addressing the passing of major figures with whom she had had some connection—the painter John Greenhill (d. 1676), John Wilmot, Earl of
Rochester (d. 1680); King Charles II (d. 1685); and the poet Edmund Waller (d. 1687). Epitaphs for children are traceable in the late 1600s, but few appeared in print. A search of the Union First Line Index of English Verse for printed poems written by women on the death of a child yields few for the years 1660 to 1689. However, two prominent women poets of Behn’s era did have poems on dead children published: Anne Bradstreet and Katherine Philips. Comparing the short poems of these two roughly contemporaneous poets to Behn’s epitaph reveals Behn’s impersonal tone and baroque imagery as opposed to the simple personal and commonplace responses of Bradstreet and Philips.

Bradstreet acknowledged the deaths of three of her grandchildren, Anne, Elizabeth, and Simon, in poems reflecting Bradstreet’s own sense of loss. Written in the late 1660s in the harsh world of the Massachusetts Bay Colony, the poems express in plain language Bradstreet’s pain, though mitigated by the knowledge that these deaths are the will of the Almighty ("God" is never named). Bradstreet uses images of wilting plants and rotting trees, buds destroyed—always stressing impermanence. In the poem for Simon, the last child to die, Bradstreet entreats him “to rest with Sisters twain” in “endless joyes” (250).

Katherine Philips wrote two poems concerning the death of her son, one specifically designated an epitaph. In “Orinda upon Little Hector Philips,” Philips is secular. She first notes the long wait before she became pregnant and then the short life of the infant. She employs the imagery of the “Rose-bud” and its swift decay and seeks no comfort from “the unconcerned World” (148). The imagery is earth-bound, and Philips never mentions God or an afterlife. In her longer memorial, “Epitaph on Her Son H. P. at St. Syth’s Church Where Her Body Also Lies Interred,” an expanded title obviously added by the “editors” of the posthumous edition, Philips again mourns the length of time before she conceived this child who was “in less than six weeks dead.” She sees the infant’s promise too great to be “confin’d” and therefore “fit in Heav’n to dwell,” adding an odd reference to alchemy and “Hermes Seal” (134). This twenty-two-line poem was allegedly engraved on the child’s marker at St. Sith’s Church, also known as St. Benet Sherehog.

Behn knew of Philips’s poetry: she alludes to Philips’s collected works in her letter to Tonson (Howell 553). But in her epitaph for William Fairfax, Behn eschews the personal involvement of Philips’s conventional language. Behn’s poem is short, befitting an epitaph, but detached, and the imagery tends toward the Baroque, as Behn decorates her lines with angels, putti, cherubim, along with
a strong undertone of music. The first four lines identify the “Monument,” the actual tomb, and move to what the tomb contains, a soft “pratler,” a young boy whose voice “was Musick.” In a single period separated by six semicolons that create seven couplets, the poem in one single sentence marks the death of “all that was sweet and innocent” and celebrates the child’s requisite elevation to the ranks of angels where his sweet voice is heard and appreciated. Everything is distanced—the child, the heavens, the celestial music—and the readers’ eyes are lifted from the monument to the heavens as their ears are filled with the sacred music.

The punctuation alternates between commas and semicolons, and while this suggests that each couplet is self-contained, such is not the case. The first four lines could be read as a unit except that line 5 begins with “Which,” a relative conjunction that completes the thought at the end of line 6 by tying the child’s voice to the music of the spheres, which an “Angel smiling hears.” The sixth line can be read as an appositive to the child’s “Song” from line 4, joining the child’s celestial song to the pre-Copernican theory of the music of the spheres, an idea that heavenly bodies produce an inaudible yet ineffable sound.

Then the poem drops back to profane earth, with the switch that comes in the lines that Lyttelton excised, the two lines beginning with the word Wanton, a word with no clear antecedent and no easily identifiable part of speech. Behn used this word in her poetry over thirty times as noun, adjective, and verb. Wanton as an adjective at times for Behn connoted freedom, usually as applied to hair, birds, or breezes. Behn used this word as a noun to imply or substitute for Cupid. Although not used often as a verb by Behn, when she did use it, “wanton” carried connotations ranging from playful to unruly or unchaste, sometimes with an undertone of cruelty.

Whether Wanton functions here as a verb or as an adjective is unclear, and several possible readings depend on the word’s grammatical and syntactical function. The poem up to this point moves from the “Gloomy Monument” upward to the heavens and to the music of the spheres. Then the beginning of line seven challenges the reader to question what “Wanton” modifies or predicates and how it fits with the phrase “as unfledg’d Cupids.” The disjunction caused by lines 7 and 8 continues as the wanton/Cupid comparison in line 7 is balanced in line 9 with a similar comparison involving “Cherubins,” with the implication that the child, although “translated,” meaning carried across or dead, could not be “refin’d,” purified, perhaps because he was already purified, perhaps because there was something wanting in him, or perhaps in his innocent state he needed no purification.
In some theologies, *Cherubim* are identified as the second rank of angels. However, the classic *Cherub*, usually a small sexually undefined child with wings, has been conflated with the baroque image of the *putto*, generally a male infant with or without wings often identified with Eros/Amor, son of Aphrodite/Venus. As Charles Dempsey notes, by the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries “winged infants and youths in art had become universally understood to be representations of love gods, *amorini*, or cupids” (4). Behn offers a rank of angels and a Greek god of love in her epitaph, but no Christian deity.

Lines 11 and 12 return to more earthly matters before reverting to the “Host of Angels.” “The “Seventh dear pledge” is the result of “Nuptial Joys,” human sexuality, and introduces the siblings who have died before this child. The reference to “Seventh” seems to clarify the ambiguity of the title: that the child is the “last of Seven that died before.” While the title could imply that he is the eighth, in this line he is “The Seventh dear pledge.” Finally, the closing couplet, as expected, celebrates the child’s acceptance into heaven, where the hosts of angels, fully fledged, again smile on him. The additional implication in this final couplet involves the move to “they” who fill the heavenly choir, suggesting that the child is joined by his siblings, providing a conclusion not unlike that of Anne Bradstreet’s elegy for Simon, as Bradstreet envisions him joining his sisters. Unlike Bradstreet and Philips, however, Behn includes the sights and sounds of the afterlife, focusing on the song of the child and the music of the spheres, the choir of *Cherubim*, the transformation of the deceased children into *amorini*, fledged or unfledged—yet, cold comfort for the mourners.

Elizabeth V. Young addresses this poem in her excellent study of Behn’s elegies and attends to the unusual middle two lines. Young presents “Behn’s poetic speaker, unlike the child who is her poetic subject” as having been “exposed to the political aspects of gender, sexuality, and love” (218), thus setting up “a dichotomy between language that is free and innocent, and language that has acquired power to persuade, manipulate, ‘do harms’” (219). Young attends more closely to the lines involving the sexual implications of “Nuptial Joys” that produced the now-lost children than she does to the dissonance between *Wanton* and a heavenly choir.

Yet lines 7-8 are crucial to this poem as they juxtapose innocence and sin, purity and impurity, trust and betrayal. Behn included them in her published epitaph even as they were excised in the manuscript witness and missing from the child’s actual monument.
The manuscript witness

As described on Cambridge University Library’s web site, Cambridge MS Add. 8460, is a 174-page sheepskin-bound book, 204 x 165 millimeters, with two different hands recording contemporary poems, epitaphs, and short pious verses from the front and from the back. Geoffrey Keynes, brother of the economist John Maynard Keynes, was the first to recognize this manuscript’s relationship to the physician, philosopher, and naturalist Sir Thomas Browne (1605-1682) and his family, particularly Browne’s second surviving daughter, Elizabeth Lyttelton (1648?-1736). On the front flyleaf in a large child-like scrawl is the name “Mary Browne,” one of Lyttelton’s younger sisters, and the signature of “Ja Dodsley,” likely the eighteenth-century bookseller who was in business with his more famous brother, Robert.

According to Pedigree 3, published in Simon Wilkin’s 1836 edition of the Works, Sir Thomas Browne and Dorothy Mileham Browne had twelve children, an error since there were only eleven. At the time of Sir Thomas’s death, only four children survived: Edward (1644-1708); Anne (or Nancy, later Fairfax, 1647?-1698); Elizabeth (or Betty, later Lyttelton); and the second Frances (Fran or Frank, 1662-?). As frequently happens in genealogical studies, women and female children are overlooked. In his life of Sir Thomas Browne, Samuel Johnson, not a fan of his subject, wrote: “Besides his lady, who died in 1685, he left a son and three daughters. Of the daughters nothing remarkable is known; but his son, Edward Browne, requires a particular mention” (xl). Since Johnson relied for his account of Browne on the “Minutes” prepared by the Rev. John Whitefoot, a friend of Browne’s, Johnson’s judgment of Browne’s daughters is especially harsh. Whitefoot, after praising Browne’s wife for “the Graces of her Body and Mind,” had addressed Sir Thomas’s survivors: “a Son and Three Daughters, all of them remarkable Partakers of his Ingenuity and Vertues” (xxxii), an assessment Johnson studiously ignored.

Elizabeth Lyttelton was deeply involved in Sir Thomas Browne’s research as reader, scribe, and artist, and her marriage to George Lyttelton in 1680, when in her early thirties, must have proved a loss to both her parents. In his letters, however, Browne made few references to Anne Fairfax. In late 1669, eleven years before Lyttelton’s marriage, Anne, at age 22, had married Henry Fairfax, the grandson of Thomas Fairfax, 1st Viscount Emley (an Irish peerage). Between August 1670 and July 1684, Anne and Henry Fairfax had had seven children, with their eighth born in July 1685. By July 1684, the Fairfaxes had buried six of
their seven children, the sixth to die so young being William, the subject of Behn’s poem.

Since his chief interest was the paterfamilias, Geoffrey Keynes dismisses Elizabeth Lyttelton as simply Browne’s “serious-minded” daughter.
(Commonplace Book 7). Recording the epitaph for William Fairfax, Keynes identifies him as a son of Browne’s eldest daughter, Anne. But Keynes fails to connect the poem to Behn and assumes that “the other contents of the Commonplace Book need not be described in detail” (Commonplace Book, 16-17, 22). Fortunately, Victoria E. Burke does describe the contents in detail, carefully clarifying the role of family in Browne’s life and studying the pages that Lyttelton inscribed. Burke evokes Lyttelton, the intellectual who took this manuscript to Guernsey with her after her marriage to Captain George Lyttelton in December 1680 and continued to add to it.

Although Burke did not identify the second, older hand in the manuscript, Rebecca Bullard has shown that the writing is that of Elizabeth’s mother, Dorothy Mileham Browne (101). Dorothy Browne (1621-1685) filled close to seventy pages, sharing the commonplace book with her daughter and later giving it over to her. Bullard effectively counters Keynes’s harsh judgment of Browne’s wife: Keynes had dismissed “the bright Coelestiall Mind” recorded on Dorothy Browne’s memorial tablet by noting that her postscripts to Sir Thomas’s letters to their children showed that she “never acquired the art of spelling” and that the postscripts were “masterpieces of phonetic composition.”22 Burke’s and Bullard’s studies effectively position Dorothy Browne and her daughter Lyttelton within the tradition of learned women in the seventeenth century.23

Burke did identify many poems and fragments that Lyttelton copied into the manuscript, and both Burke (323-24) and the Cambridge website note that Behn printed this same poem in her 1685 Miscellany. As both Burke and the Cambridge website demonstrate, Lyttelton had inscribed all fourteen lines of Behn’s poem as published, with two substantive variants. At some point, lines 7 and 8 were crossed out in similar but heavier ink impressions. This excision reflects the lines as inscribed on William Fairfax’s epitaph.24

The stone witness

William Fairfax was interred in the parish church of St. Nicholas, Hurst, Berkshire, near the Fairfax home, Hurst Lodge. Only two of his siblings, the first Frances and Ann Alethea, are buried in the same church. The wall tablet for William is inscribed “DEDICATED TO YÊ MEMORY OF | WILLIAM FAIRFAX | SON TO HENRY FAIRFAX ESQ, BY ANN | HIS WIFE DAUGHTER to SÊ THOMAS | BROWNE KÊ. WHO DYED | IVLY YÊ 27.Êth 1684.” The tablet offers the twelve-line poem with the same variants present in Lyttelton’s manuscript. On the same tablet,
immediately beneath the poem, is inscribed “IN THE SAME GRAVE RESTETH ALSO | ANN ALETHEA THEIR DAUGHTER.”

In 1719, Elias Ashmole reported on the Fairfax monuments at Hurst, reproducing the twelve-line epitaph, also noting a floor tablet that indicated “Under this Stone lyeth two deare departed Children, William, and Ann Alathea [sic] Fairfax, 1684” (vol. 2, p. 417) even though Ann Alethea had died in 1679. In his 1836 edition of Browne’s works, Simon Wilkin also reproduced with minor variants Behn’s twelve-line inscription on William Fairfax’s stone. In addition, Wilkin reported
information gathered on the Fairfax and Barker families by the then-incumbent minister of the parish church at Hurst, especially noting that “tradition ascribes the poetical inscription to the pen of [Edmund] Waller, who lived there.”

Somehow, a manuscript associated with a daughter of Sir Thomas Browne intersected with an epitaph for a child who died in July 1684, a poem that within a year of the child’s death was printed as Aphra Behn’s. As Burke points out, “Lyttelton must have had access to this poem in manuscript since her nephew’s death predates the publication date” (323), a strong suggestion of the first of two missing witnesses.

The poem’s three major material manifestations are fact. The excision of the two lines is fact. But why were two lines deleted, when, and by whom? If the poem had gone to the Fairfaxes first and the excision took place at their hands, any copy of it sent then to Lyttelton would likely represent the twelve-line version. Yet Lyttelton had copied the entire poem before the deletion, and so it is more likely that it was she who first received it and she who excised the two lines. One suggestion might be that the fourteen-line poem was too long for the stone, but the photograph of the tablet shows that additional lines could have been accommodated. The reference to Ann Alethea on the stone may have been an afterthought to fill the space since her burial is also noted on the floor tablet, as recorded by Ashmole.

Although Lyttelton could have encountered the poem in Behn’s Miscellany or had a copy sent to her after the poem was published, this does not account for two substantive variants between the manuscript and Behn’s printed version. Lyttelton probably obtained the poem in a single manuscript sheet or in a letter, the first missing witness, before the poem’s publication. If Lyttelton had encountered Behn’s poem in print after William’s interment, she would have had to emend two important words as well as delete the two lines. Behn printed “Such pretty Harmonies” (line 6) and “Toil’d here on Earth” (line 12) while Lyttelton recorded, and the memorial tablet reads, “Such tender Harmony” and “Toyl’d here with Play” (line 10), readings more appropriate for a young child. While the excision is likely Lyttelton’s, the two substantive variants could be Behn’s own later changes. This supports the idea that Lyttelton’s version is the earlier of the two and that Lyttelton received the epitaph prior to the print publication. It is also unlikely that a woman commended for her spirituality would be reading Behn’s poetry or have friends or relatives who would. The few clues available indicate that Behn wrote the poem specifically for the Fairfax family whether she knew their identity or not, that Elizabeth Lyttelton had a manuscript copy before the
poem was published, and that she excised the two lines before the poem was transmitted to the Fairfax family. How she transmitted the poem to the Fairfaxes suggests a second missing material witness, a letter with the twelve-line poem or perhaps simply the original missing witness with her changes.

**Behn, six degrees, and the mid-1680s**

Behn did not circulate her poems the way Katherine Philips did with her coterie poems in manuscript. Few manuscript copies of Behn’s poems survive, and only one in her own hand.29 Behn seemed more interested in seeing her works in print than in having them socially exchanged in manuscript, and most surviving manuscript copies of Behn’s works were likely transcribed from printed copies.

Janet Todd has suggested that the epitaph for William Fairfax was commissioned,30 and Todd’s idea can help us refocus on a number of Behn’s poems that can be dated to the mid-1680s and later. While this study proposes to focus on the one poem memorializing a two-year-old, the idea of Behn writing by commission is one that remains to be examined. If Behn needed money at this point in her career, as has been suggested by Maureen Duffy (246-47) and Janet Todd (364-67), then attracting commissions is a small answer to a large problem.

Behn’s income from the theatre had largely dried up following the union of the King’s and Duke’s companies in 1682. Even before 1685, there were signs that Behn needed money although there have been recent suggestions that she was financially secure in this period.31 Sometime around the spring of 1684, perhaps a bit earlier, Behn wrote to Jacob Tonson to ask for five or ten pounds more for her *Poems upon Several Occasions.* Jordan M. Howell quotes the letter (552-53) and carefully parses most of it, arguing that Behn demonstrates a sense of her worth in a “typical negotiating tactic” to secure additional compensation (554). Granted, this sense comes through in her argument. Yet the pained voice of penury breaks through at the end as she pleads: “I have been wthout getting so long y’ I am just on y’ point of Breaking Espesiall since a body has no creditt at y’ Playhouse for money as we usd to have: fifty or 60 deepe: or more: I want Extreamly or I wou’d not urge this.”32

Tonson’s response, if any, is unknown. However, although Jacob Tonson had published four of Behn’s plays in a row between 1678 and 1682, along with her poems in 1685, what goes unremarked is that Tonson did not publish the next two volumes of Behn’s poetry: *Miscellany* (1685) and *Lycidus* (1688), even as *Lycidus* added the “Voyage from the Island of Love,” the translation to which Behn referred in her letter to Tonson.33 In fact, between the publication of *Poems upon
Several Occasions in 1684 and her death, neither Jacob Tonson nor his brother published any of Behn’s work. By 1 August 1685, Behn re-negotiated an IOU for £6 to Zachary Baggs, sub-treasurer of the United Company. The wording of this note indicates that she was “indebted to M’ Bags ye sum of six pound for ye payment of which M’ Tonson has oblegd h[im] self.” Tonson, probably Jacob, helped secure, perhaps co-signed, the loan, but in this IOU Behn was transferring the obligation from Tonson to herself and her next play: “now I do here by impowre M’ Zachary Baggs in case the said debt is not fully dischargd be fore Michaelmas next” to pay himself back with whatever money came to him from her next play, likely The Luckey Chance.

Between the time of her appeal to Tonson for additional money and her IOU to Baggs, young William Fairfax died in Berkshire, roughly thirty-five miles from London. If Behn needed money, a commission would have been most welcomed, no matter what the poetic mode. Since there is no direct connection between Behn and the family of Sir Thomas Browne, there had to be at least one intermediary. One candidate is Dr. Edward Browne, Elizabeth Lyttelton’s brother, the dead child’s uncle. Sir Thomas Browne’s only surviving son, Edward Browne was a well-to-do London physician and a member of both the Royal College of Physicians of London and of the Royal Society.

Edward Browne’s connections to London luminaries can be traced as far back as the winter of 1663-4, when he recorded in his journal that he had attended several parties and outings around Norwich given by the Howard family. The scion of this family, Henry Howard was still a child at this time but was later to become the seventh duke of Norfolk. In 1682, Henry Howard was the dedicatee of Behn’s City Heiress, addressed under his earlier titles of Arundel and Mowbray. Behn also praised Howard in her Pindarick Poem on the Happy Coronation as “MÆCENA of my Muse, my Patron Lord” in 1685, the same year that she published the “Epitaph” (16). Yet there is no evidence that after he began his medical practice, Edward Browne continued any relationship with the Howards in London.

Edward Browne was also acquainted with Sir Joseph Williamson, the spymaster of Behn’s Netherlands mission in the 1660s and later Charles II’s secretary of state. In May 1673, Browne traveled with Williamson to the Congress of Cologne, but it is unclear why. In 1684, both Williamson and Browne served the Royal Society as elected councilors (Royal Society). In addition, Edward Browne served as early as 1673 as “Physician in Ordinary” to Charles II, an appointment to the King’s household staff, although Browne made no references to this in what
remains of his letters to his father. In 1685, Edward Browne served as one of several physicians who attended Charles II as the King was dying.

A prominent member of the scientific and medical community of London, Edward Browne was also part of the literary circle. Reference to a Mr. Flatman occurs in his journal, and his father had written in January 1678/9 of a Mr. Flatman, a “cosen” of Thomas Flatman, the well-known miniaturist and poet who was part of artistic and literary circles in London. Edward Browne connected in London at some point with Thomas Flatman, and in 1685, Flatman published a ten-line poem praising Browne’s travel writings, a poem that Elizabeth Lyttelton copied into her commonplace book. Behn and Flatman had each contributed a “translation” for Dryden’s 1680 Ovid’s Epistles. After Flatman’s death in December 1688 and Behn’s in April 1689, Nathaniel Lee mourned his colleagues in a broadside, noting his special loss of “Flatman thy [Behn’s] Mate, and that dear part of me.” While this seems to be the only contemporary reference to Behn’s closeness to Flatman, the connection between the two could have provided a conduit for a request to memorialize a dead child in 1684.

Two other connections between Behn and Browne are Jacob Tonson and John Dryden. Edward Browne was known to Tonson since Browne’s translation of the lives of Themistocles and Quintus Sertorius were part of Dryden’s five-volume edition of Plutarch’s Lives, printed for Jacob Tonson between 1683 and 1686, years bracketing the period of the “Epitaph” for William Fairfax. As already noted, a rift might have developed between Behn and the Tonsons from around the fall of 1683 or spring of 1684, the probable time of Behn’s request for an additional five pounds or more for her Poems. But also, as noted, Tonson stood surety for Behn’s loan of six pounds from Zachary Baggs, even though Behn renegotiated Tonson’s involvement by signing over to Baggs the requisite proceeds from her next play when she seemed sure of her next play. Tonson could have been aware of Behn’s faltering finances and could have sought to negotiate a commission between Behn and Browne if Browne at that time had been seeking an epitaph for his nephew. However, Dryden could have been the connection between Browne and Behn since his relationship continued well after Browne’s work on Dryden’s Plutarch.

Behn’s fraught relationship with Dryden is highlighted in the opening of her letter to Tonson, in a puzzling passage. Behn speaks of a “service” Tonson performed involving Dryden and of some honor that Dryden offers her for which she “must owe it all” to Tonson if she gets it. Behn appears to have heard rumors that Dryden criticized her and this could explain her motivation for “all [she] said on that account,” perhaps some harsh comments about the Poet Laureate. She asks
Tonson to “thank him [Dryden] most infinitely for y° Hon: he offers, & I shall never think I can do any thing that can merritt so vast a Glory.”

Duffy suggests that Dryden’s service could have been a commendatory poem for Behn’s collection (228), but this remains unproved although clearly a service worth noting. Given the time frame, the honor Dryden “offers” might have been the commission to write the epitaph for the Fairfax family, without revealing the identity of the family for whom she would be writing. The phrase “so vast a Glory” does suggest a greater “honor” than a commission, but Behn did, on occasion, engage in hyperbole.

With several possibilities for intermediary, Edward Browne, however, is the obvious candidate for commissioning the poem, and while there is no direct tie between Browne and Behn, these several indirect links exist, part of the “six degrees of separation” or “Bacon’s Law.” It is also possible that Browne himself never knew that it was Behn who memorialized his nephew.

There remain the issues of transmission and of the deleted lines. Lyttelton, living on Guernsey, was at a distance her family. Family letters refer to various visits, but since the collection of these letters is incomplete, we lack direct evidence for determining the transmission. Lyttelton recorded in her commonplace book the original fourteen lines but, arguably, from a source other than Behn’s Miscellany, and then, arguably, cut lines 7 and 8. While there are several other Browne family members who might have received the poem from Edward Browne, Lyttelton had a copy of all fourteen lines. Edward Browne was known to have favored Elizabeth Lyttelton and likely stayed in direct contact with her after their father’s death. Thus, the simpler suggestion is that Lyttelton received the poem directly from her brother and was the censor who sent her sister the twelve-line form.

Where might this lead?

Behn relied heavily on print medium to transmit her plays and, after 1683, her poetic and fictional works. With opportunities in the theater dwindling, Behn saw into print three separate volumes of poetry with three different booksellers: Poems upon Several Occasions (1684), forty-six of her own poems along with her translation of the Abbé Paul Tallemant’s “A Voyage to the Isle of Love”; Miscellany (1685), twelve of her poems mixed with sixty-five by others followed by her translation of the maxims of Rochefoucauld; and finally Lycidus (1688), a translation of Tallemant’s return voyage “from the Island of Love” with “A Miscellany of Poems,” ten of her poems and sixty-two by others. At about the same time, Behn turned to occasional poems marking major events from the death
of Charles II to the birth of a son to James II and Mary of Modena. She also wrote separately published poems to the second duke of Albemarle and to Sir Roger L’Estrange, among others. Shortly before her death, she wrote her ironic welcome to Queen Mary (ignoring William for the most part) and her bitter poem to Bishop Burnet, no friend of Behn’s, who had probably offered Behn money to welcome the new royals. Several of these occasional poems saw second editions and Dublin editions, but there are no copies of these works in manuscript located to date.

In fact, as already noted, there are few copies of Behn’s poems extant in any manuscript format. The Catalogue of English Literary Manuscripts 1450–1700 (CELM) identifies manuscript copies of only twenty-two poems by Behn in thirty-three manuscript sources. Of the 923 records listed under Behn’s name (many not hers) in the Union First Line Index of English Verse, most are copies printed in miscellanies after already having been published. Only sixteen poems by or closely associated with Behn are represented in thirty-two manuscript copies.

With the exception of her tribute to Waller, which was enclosed in her letter to Waller’s daughter-in-law, none of Behn’s poems have been definitively identified as in her own handwriting. This lack of holograph copies suggests that Behn preferred print. However, just as she sent in her own hand her memorial of Waller to his daughter-in-law, she likely transmitted a hand-written copy of the epitaph, what can be considered the second missing witness, to Edward Browne directly or through an intermediary—Tonson or Flatman or someone yet unidentified.

What could have motivated Behn to accept a request to write an epitaph, a form she had not used, even as she had written elegies for four men with whom she had some connection? The edge in Behn’s words as she writes to Tonson suggests she needed money. However, both Jordan Howell and Claudine van Hensbergen offer evidence from the letter to Tonson and from her appearance in her portraits that Behn was financially stable. In a way, it could be both: a financially secure Behn at this time, even with the dearth of new theatrical productions, might have been facing some strains if she had been planning to publish the second part of Love-Letters from a Nobleman to His Sister on her own. The first part of Love-Letters appeared in 1684, “to be sold by Randal Taylor,” with no other identification. In 1685, the second part was printed in two issues, the first “Printed for the Author, and are to be sold by the Booksellers of London” and the second in a unique copy in the British Library “Printed for A. B. 1685.” Illness, loss of income from the merged theatres, expense of self-publication, loss of patronage, fear of the growing political tensions—any number of possibilities in these four years before her death could have led her to accept a commission for a set of lines for a memorial stone.
Somehow a connection was made between Behn and the family of William Fairfax. If Behn did not already know Edward Browne, Behn’s connections in London’s literary and social world could easily have served as intermediaries. While it is still difficult to connect Aphra Behn and Elizabeth Lyttelton, fewer than the proverbial six degrees did separate them. Lyttelton may have been told or assumed that the poem was written by Edmund Waller, a poet who would have been a choice more palatable to such a pious family, and this could have led to the tradition echoed by Wilkin and Keynes.

We have three material witnesses for this poem, most unusual for any poem—a page in a commonplace book, a wall tablet, and a printed page. We may never know what happened between the time the original fourteen lines left Behn’s hands and the time twelve of those lines were engraved on the memorial tablet in Hurst. What we do know is that Behn published the fourteen-line memorial for an unidentified child less than a year after William Fairfax’s death—and published it with her mark of authorship.

She never identified the child. Nor is it likely she even knew who he was. But she knew the poem was hers.

Notes

1 Little attention has been paid to Miscellany or to the poems by Behn in it. In the only monograph devoted to Behn’s poetry, M. L. Stapleton focuses on Poems upon Several Occasions and says little about Miscellany. In their cutting-edge anthology of women’s writing, Kissing the Rod, Germaine Greer and her co-authors reprint this “Epitaph,” with no other discussion except a gloss on the word “translated” (258).

2 The digitized copy of Lyttelton’s commonplace book is Cambridge University Library MS Add. 8460 (cudl.lib.cam.ac.uk/view/MS-ADD-08640/1).

3 The editors of the forthcoming Cambridge Edition of the Works of Aphra Behn have been conducting stylometric analyses of Behn’s works to determine likelihood of authorship. While this “Epitaph” will be one of those subjected to stylometric testing, Behn’s initials signing this poem must still be dealt with.

4 In 1688, the book was advertised for sale as “Miscellany Poems, Collected by Mrs. Behn” in Edward Ravenscroft’s The London Cuckold. See O’Donnell, Aphra Behn, BA2.

5 Ten poems in Miscellany, including this “Epitaph,” are clearly claimed by Behn. Only two of these poems had been published before, the 1685 dedicatory poem to Thomas Tryon and the “Epilogue to the Jealous Lovers,” greatly revised. Two additional previously unpublished poems by Behn appear in Miscellany without attribution: it is unclear why Behn did not claim “A Letter to Mr. Creech at Oxford” along with its “Postcript” [sic]. Brice Harris has made a reasonable case for the attribution to Behn of “Ovid to Jul‘ia.” See O’Donnell, Aphra Behn, BA2. Other poets who
are named or can be reliably identified are James Wright, Henry Crisp, Edmund Arwaker, Sir Francis Fane, and John Howe.

6 The only named child in any of her plays is the seven-year-old Fanny in *Sir Patient Fancy*. In several other plays, children are referred to as “boy” (*Emperor of the Moon*) or “singing girl” or “boy” or “Jack, a sea boy” (*Widdow Ranter*). In the third part of *Love-Letters between a Nobleman and His Sister*, two children are born—one to Calista, one to Silvia. Neither is named or identified by sex; Calista’s infant is removed as she retreats to convent life while Silvia’s is never again mentioned. See Todd’s edition, vol. 2, p. 248-49, where Silvia reveals she is pregnant and p. 365, concerning her delivery and p. 415, a later reference to her pregnancy; see also pp. 307 and 315 concerning Calista’s pregnancy and the removal of the child. In *Oroonoko*, Imoinda is pregnant, but she and her unborn child die at the hands of Oroonoko. A pregnancy drives the plot of the posthumously published (and questioned) “The Adventure of the Black Lady.”

7 Behn’s poem “On the Death of Mr. Grinhil, The Famous Painter” was first attributed to Rochester because it was originally published without attribution in 1680 in *Poems on Several Occasions, by the Right Honourable, The E. of R---* (101-03 in four of the 1680 EEBO copies; 93-96 in the remaining two). Behn later claimed it as hers in *Poems upon Several Occasions* (24-28). Her elegy on Rochester appeared in print in *Miscellany* (46-49). *A Pindarick on the Death of Our Late Sovereign* was printed shortly after the death of Charles II. “On the Death of E. Waller, Esq.” appeared in the collection *Poems to the Memory of that Incomparable Poet Edmond Waller Esquire* (17-20).

8 The *Union First Line Index of English Verse* allows a search for women authors, but it is often hard to determine works by women unless the verse is clearly signed or carries clear implications. The *Index* provides information on works in print and in manuscript. However, with printed works, the range of dates of composition is generally given, but with poems solely in manuscript, dating is difficult. The date range of the Index is “13th-19th Century (bulk 1500-1800)”; thus, narrowing to 1660-1700 can prove difficult. A search on “epitaph” yielded 8558 records over the broad range, with 125 identified as by women. Searches using various combinations of the words “epitaph,” “elegy,” “dead,” “death,” “child,” “boy,” and “infant” drew as many as ninety-one records (often with multiple locations). However, many of these were unpublished or lacked dates or reference to a woman author. Most of the poems on the deaths of children that can be dated appear after 1750, when there seems to be an uptick in interest in the topic.


10 St. Benet Sherehog, originally named for St. Osith or Osyth, was one of over eighty London churches that burned in the Great Fire of 1666 and not rebuilt, and the graveyard was dug up in the 1990s to make way for an office building (“St. Benet Sherehog”). Hector Philips died in 1655, and Philips presumably wrote his epitaph shortly thereafter. Philips wrote several epitaphs, “at least four of which were actually carved on church monuments” (Hageman). However, according to Hageman, only one of these carved epitaphs remains, and it is not Hector’s. Katherine Philips died in 1664 and was buried, according to John Aubrey, “under a gravestone with her father and grandfather and grandmother,” with no mention of her son (vol. 2, p. 154). Aubrey records from the Church register that she was “buried in the north ayle under the great stone with the brazen
monyment” to which he adds “the brasse is now lost” (vol. 2, p. 153). With the church destroyed in the fire, the whereabouts of Hector’s grave-marker, if it ever existed, is at present unknown.

11 Behn refers to this unheard music of the spheres several times in her poetry: in “To Lysander at the Musick-Meeting”, in the Pindarick Poem on the Happy Coronation; and in her tribute “To Mrs. W[harton] On her Excellent Verses,” this last with the “hears/Spheres” rhyme. One of the posthumously published poems attributed to Behn, “Another Song” (“Morpheus, Morpheus”) from The History of Adolphus, also uses this pairing. This latter, the coronation poem, and “To Lysander” also have Cupid or cherub images coupled with the music of the spheres.

12 The Oxford English Dictionary (hereafter cited as OED) indicates all these connotations (s.v. ‘wanton’). In Behn’s “Our Cabal,” the lines “Her natural Curling Ebon Hair, / Does loosely wanton in the Air” show the seductive playfulness of the verb (Poems upon Several Occasions 33), while Angellica Bianca’s vilification of Willmore, “Devil! dost wanton with my pain,” illustrates the undertone of cruelty noted in the OED (The Rover 74).

13 Angels are mentioned in the Bible and in the Quran. In his Summa, Thomas Aquinas explores angelic hierarchies, placing the Cherubim second only to the Seraphim, with the Cherubim associated with “fullness of knowledge.” (Summa, part 1, question 108, Art. 5, reply to objection 5). In Paradise Lost (1667), Milton mentions Cherubim in various forms of the word six times in the first book, so the ranks of angels were not unknown to readers of the period.

14 Keynes notes “87 leaves, the original number having probably been 88” (Commonplace Book 9). Since Cambridge MS Add. 8460 was written in from both directions, there are several ways of numbering the pages. The simplest when dealing with this manuscript seems to be the numbers Geoffrey Keynes assigned to the manuscript when it was in his possession (“A Daughter” 470). Keynes numbered the manuscript pages in order, front to back, and these numbers appear in the upper outer corners to indicate one direction and upside down in the lower outer corners to indicate the other. However, since the manuscript is easily accessed online, pages of this manuscript will hereafter be referred to by image number. The epitaph for William Fairfax has the page number 48 visible in the lower outer corner (image 50).

15 “A Daughter.” Sometime during the First World War, Keynes purchased and studied this manuscript for his work on Browne, and later donated to it to the Royal College of Physicians, along with his own collection. However, later he requested that the Royal College sell his collection to Cambridge (Lyttelton, Commonplace Book, “Item Metadata: Provenance” <cudl.lib.cam.ac.uk/view/MS-ADD-08640/1>). Lyttelton’s death year, which had been variously assigned, was definitively established by Reid Barbour, who located her will in the Consistory Court of the Archbishop of Canterbury (468).

16 While the provenance of the manuscript is not completely clear, it remained in Lyttelton’s hands until she gave it to her cousin Edward Tenison in early 1714 (back flyleaf, image 176), and based on the name on the front flyleaf (image 3), it likely passed later into the possession of bookseller James Dodsley (1724-1797). Keynes identifies the dealer from whom he purchased it: “Mr. Dobell of Charing Cross Road” (Commonplace Book 5), likely Bertram Dobell.

17 Sir Thomas and his wife were predeceased by two adult children: Thomas (1646-1667?), and Mary (1652-1676). sixth other children died in infancy or early childhood: Dorothy (c.1649-1652), the first Frances (1650-1651), twin sons James, who died two months after his birth in 1656, and Richard, who died a year later; and Charles (1655-1662). Reid Barbour accounts for the family’s
eleven children (286). Note that John Whitefoot, a friend of the Browne family, incorrectly reported that the Brownes had ten children (“Some Minutes,” xxxii).

18 Wilkin’s Pedigree 3 followed other charts that add an unnamed oldest daughter, who allegedly married “Sir Charles Cottrell.” In revisiting Pedigree 3, Charles Williams (3) asserted this was Cottrell’s son Sir Charles Lodowick Cottrell, not Katherine Philips’s Poliarchus. Edmund Gosse compounded the confusions by absurdly claiming that Sir Thomas Browne himself was in error when he drew up what Wilkin published as Pedigree 1. Gosse asserted that “[a] man may forget the Christian name of his grandfather and the birthplace of his mother, but he ought to recollect the birth of his eldest daughter and be correct as to the ages and order of his sons” (2). The error of the unnamed daughter arose from Edward Brown’s reference in his journal for 1664 to an unidentified “sister Cottrell” (Browne, Works [Wilkin] vol. 1, p. 51). Roderick Clayton documents the Cotterell marriages and notes that Sir Charles or his son may have been a distant relative of Sir Thomas. G. C. R. Morris clarifies many of the relationships mentioned in Edward Browne’s letters and in those of his father, showing the intermarriages of the Barkers and the Fairfaxes and identifying Sir Charles Lodowick Cotterell’s mother as a Barker.

19 In a postscript to a letter from Sir Thomas to Edward, dated 14 February 1678/9, Dorothy refers to wishing to hear of her daughter’s “delivery,” a wish seconded by Sir Thomas in his 1 March 1678/9 letter to Edward (Browne, Works [Wilkin] vol. 1, pp. 232, 235). This also appears in Geoffrey Keynes’s edition of Browne’s Works, vol. 6, pp. 109, 113 (this edition hereafter cited as Browne, Works [Keynes]). This statement refers to the birth of Ann Alethea, who died in December of that same year.

20 Henry Fairfax seems to have been a man of generous disposition—enough so that Sir Thomas warned his son Edward about a forthcoming visit from Anne and Henry, on 10 May 1679: “I perceau my daughter and sonne Fairfax are like to bee at London the next weeke, God preserve them in health. Hazard not your owne health by any intemperance with H. F. for men who must haue drinck and company are content with any, and are little obliged by compliance or ioynt intemperance, at least tis soone forgott, and tis the greatest friendship that can bee testified to dehort them from excesse, which destroyes them- selues at last, and their children before.” Browne Works (Wilkin) vol. 1, p. 242; Works; (Keynes), vol. 6, pp. 122-23 varies in spelling.

21 The following provides birth and death information for the eight Fairfax children from Pedigree 3 and The Peerage. As the first Frances is said to have died at age 5, she may have been the twin of the second Barker if the second Barker died the same year in which he was born.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>DoB or Baptism n.s.</th>
<th>DoD or Burial n.s.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barker 1</td>
<td>August 30, 1670</td>
<td>September 5, 1670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barker 2?</td>
<td>1672? 1673?</td>
<td>July 2, 1673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frances 1</td>
<td>1673? Barker 2’s twin?</td>
<td>September 16, 1678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>1675-1677?</td>
<td>September 1680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Alethea</td>
<td>March 29, 1679</td>
<td>December 31, 1679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frances 2</td>
<td>November 29, 1680</td>
<td>July 31, 1719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>June 1682</td>
<td>July 27, 1684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alethea</td>
<td>July 16, 1685</td>
<td>March 30, 1704</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
22 Browne, *Works* (Keynes), vol. 6, p. vii. While criticizing Dorothy Browne’s spelling, Keynes ignores some of the creative spelling of Sir Thomas Browne and the irregular orthography of the period.

23 For studies of such communities of learned women, see especially Carol Pal and Margaret Ezell.

24 The tablet is “on the opposite side of the east window” of the north chapel (“Parishes: Hurst”). I am grateful to Rebecca Bullard for calling this parish survey to my attention and for supplying me with photographs of the north chapel and of the wall tablet itself.

25 Browne, *Works* (Wilkin) vol. 1, p. cv. Keynes repeats the tradition that the poem was written by Waller (*Commonplace Book* 16). However, no evidence to date connects Edmund Waller to the Brownes, the Fairfaxs, or the Barkers, and while Waller had a house in a fashionable section of Westminster, where he died in October 1687, he resided mostly in Beaconsfield, Buckinghamshire, where he is buried (Chernaik).

26 Behn’s *Miscellany* was listed in the *Term Catalogues* for Easter 1685 (2:127), and a dedicatory poem to Behn is dated “Jan. 9, 1684” [i.e. 1684/5] (G6’). This indicates that the volume was in preparation early in 1685 [n.s.].

27 In the rare case in which two versions of a Behn poem exist, comparison shows some substantive reworking by Behn for the second published version. The most contentious of these variants involves Behn’s changes to her dedicatory poem to Thomas Creech between 1683 (“To the Unknown Daphnis”) and the following year, when she reprinted the poem in *Poems upon Several Occasions* (“To Mr. Creech”). See Todd 298-301.

28 In a letter from October 1681, Sir Thomas Browne praised Lyttelton for her “sober ways and good actions, diligent in her service to god.” He was pleased that she took with her to Guernsey “good books and divers sermons” (Browne, *Works* [Wilkin] vol. 1, p. 320 and *Works* [Keynes] vol. 6, p. 231).

29 Behn’s poem on the death of Waller and her letter to Waller’s daughter-in-law are in her own hand (Pierpont Morgan Library MA 4395, formerly MA 3585). See *Catalogue of English Literary Manuscripts* 1450–1700 (hereafter cited as CELM). BeA 52. An examination of the records of Behn’s poems in CELM indicates how few manuscript copies have so far been located. While Bodleian MS Firth c.16 is a miscellany partly in Behn’s hand, there are no identifiable poems by Behn—with two possible exceptions. See O’Donnell, “A Verse Miscellany” and Burrows and Love, “Did Aphra Behn Write ‘Caesar’s Ghost?’”

30 Janet Todd identifies this epitaph as a “curiosity” in that Behn should have written it. Todd astutely and wryly adds: “The Epitaph was, however, probably commissioned and, in transforming the dead child into a cupid-like angel babbling heavenly music, it showed more conceit than feeling” (339).

31 For speculation that Behn was in better financial condition than previously believed, see articles by Jordan M. Howell and Claudine van Hensbergen. On the other hand, if the rumor is true that Behn had lent the dying Thomas Otway £5 or had perhaps helped pay for his burial in April 1685, this could be an additional reason for her need. See Duffy (244), Todd (353). Another possibility, yet to be explored, is that Behn herself was underwriting the anonymous publication of *Love-Letters between a Nobleman and His Sister*, a project for which she could have need extra money.
Howell 553. The original of this letter is long missing. See CELM BeA 54. Versions differing in accidentals may be found in Howell (552-53) and in The Literary Correspondences of the Tonsons, edited by Stephen Bernard, Letter 5, “Aphra Behn to Tonson.” The earliest printing of this letter, along with the IOU to Zachary Baggs, is “Memorials of Literary Characters—No. XIV.” As Todd notes, Behn’s voice here is reminiscent of the voice heard in her appeals for money twenty years earlier after her spying mission (335). See W. J. Cameron’s transcriptions of the letters, reports, and petitions related to that mission.

Literary Correspondence, Letter 5, “Aphra Behn to Tonson.” Howell, pp. 552-53.

Sir Patient Fancy (1678), The Feign’d Curtizans (1679), The Second Part of The Rover (1681), and The False Count (1682) were printed for Jacob Tonson alone or with his brother. Between the printings of these plays and the Tonsons’ printing of Poems upon Several Occasions (1684), The Roundheads and The City-Heiress (both 1682), and The Young King (1683) all were printed for Daniel Brown, Thomas Benskin, and Henry Rhodes. Todd does make a passing remark about the Tonsons not publishing any more of Behn’s works following her request for a higher fee (335).

Behn’s Promissory note to Zachary Baggs, Folger MS C.c.1 (4). CELM BeA 55. Reprinted in Milhous and Hume, vol. 1, p. 254, #1261. It was first published in “Memorials of Literary Characters—No. XIV.”

Royal College of Physicians, Names; Royal Society, List. By 1695, Browne was an Elector as well as a Censor for the Royal College of Physicians and had pledged £50 to promote the “good of the college” (Royal College of Physicians, The Catalogue of the Fellows).


Marshall; Van Strien. Browne, Works (Wilkin) vol. 1, pp. xcvi-xcvi. Wilkin suggests it was “an excursion of pleasure.” However, Wilkin also identifies Williamson as a patient of Browne’s (vol. 1, p. cii).

On the title page of his 1673 Brief Account of Some Travels in Hungaria, Browne identified himself as “Physician in Ordinary” to Charles II. According to Charles Williams, Edward Browne was “[a]ppointed Physician to King Charles II and to St. Bartholomew’s Hospital in 1682” (The Pedigree).

Crawfurd 61-79; “Browne, (Edward). Biographia Britannica, 1002. King Charles allegedly said of Edward: “He was as learned as any of the College, and as well bred as any at Court” (“Browne, [Edward], Biographia Britannica 1003, n. E). Considering the court of Charles, this statement might not be much of a compliment. Browne was also said to have attended the dying Earl of Rochester in 1680 (Browne, Works [Wilkin] vol. 1, pp. cii, 202, and p. 278, n. 8).

According to Edward Browne’s Journal for 1664, this Mr. Flatman was a surgeon who had lived “in the gold country in Guiny” and discussed “that country, the inhabitants, their manners, our plantation at Coromontine, and the trafficke with the natives: as also about Lisbone, Barbadoes, and Jamaica, where hee had likewise been.” (Browne, Works [Wilkin] vol. 1, p. 54).

Browne, Works (Wilkin) vol. 1, p. 229 and Browne, Works (Keynes) vol. 6, p. 104; see also Murdoch.

“On Dr. Brown’s Travels.” The poem did not appear in the first two editions of Flatman’s Poems and Songs, but it was first printed in the third edition. Lyttelton’s transcription is found in
image 35 of the digitized manuscript. Keynes reprinted the poem in *Commonplace Book* (11). While Flatman’s poem is the kind of commendatory piece intended to be published with the dedicatee’s volume, a common practice of the time, it was not so used in the second edition of Browne’s *A Brief Account of Some Travels in Divers Parts of Europe* in 1685 or in its reprint in 1687.

44 About twelve years after young William’s death, Browne joined one hundred and one nobles and wealthy patrons in support of the 1697 publication of Dryden’s *Virgil* for which Dryden repurposed the original 1654 plates engraved by John Ogilby for his own edition of the works of Virgil. Dryden had indicated in a letter to William Walsh his plan to sell the “Brass Cutts, with the Coats of Armes of the subscriber to each Cutt” to reap “five guineys per plate” (Macdonald [p. 57, #33a]). At the beginning of the volume, Dryden listed the subscribers and boldly announced the subscription cost. In Dryden’s *Virgil*, one of the old Ogilby plates was newly inscribed “To Edward Browne” on one side of his coat of arms and “D’ in Physick” on the other. (*Works of Virgil, Æneis*, facing p. 286).

45 *Literary Correspondence*, Letter 5; Howell 552-53.

46 In the same letter from Sir Thomas to Edward (16 June [1682]) that notes the birth of the Fairfax’s unnamed son, the William of the “Epitaph,” there is a reference to Elizabeth Lyttelton’s visit to Norwich from Guernsey (Browne, *Works* [Wilkin] vol. 1, p. 345; Browne *Works* [Keynes] vol. 6, p. 266).

47 Presumably, many of the family letters were deemed to have little relevance and were destroyed. The published letters end just before the death of Sir Thomas; these show him more interested in discussing natural philosophy and anatomy than in reporting family matters.

48 Many of these poems and songs had already been published entirely or in part, and often with variants. A number of these poems date from the 1670s. See O’Donnell, *Annotated Bibliography*, A18.1a.

49 In her letter asking Tonson to pay more for *Poems upon Several Occasions*, Behn tried to entice Tonson with a translation of Tallemant’s return voyage. She refers to her proposed translation as “the 2d Voyage: wch will compose a little Book as big as a Novel by it self.” See *Literary Correspondence*, Letter 5 or Howell 552-53. Behn’s “little book as big as a Novel by it self” would have filled only sixty-four octavo pages.

50 See CELM, BeA 1-BeA 25 (excluding doubtful ascriptions).

51 Evidence of her hand is found in Bodleian MS Firth c.16, a poetical miscellany. However, nothing identifiable Behn’s is in this miscellany although the poem satirizing Dryden’s conversion could be hers as might “Caesar’s Ghost.” Both poems are inscribed in the hand identified as Behn’s (O’Donnell, “A Verse Miscellany,” passim). See n. 29.

52 Behn’s authorship of this three-part publication has been called into question, most recently by Leah Orr. The forthcoming volume of *Love-Letters* in the Cambridge edition, edited by Aleksandrea Hultquist, will discuss authorship through stylometric analyses.
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