

Epochs of embodiment

Harvey, Karen

DOI:
[10.1111/1754-0208.12662](https://doi.org/10.1111/1754-0208.12662)

License:
None: All rights reserved

Document Version
Peer reviewed version

Citation for published version (Harvard):
Harvey, K 2019, 'Epochs of embodiment: men, women and the material body', *Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies*, vol. 42, no. 4, pp. 455-469. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1754-0208.12662>

[Link to publication on Research at Birmingham portal](#)

Publisher Rights Statement:

This is the peer reviewed version of the following article: Harvey, K. (2019) Epochs of Embodiment: Men, Women and the Material Body. *Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies*, 42: 455– 469., which has been published in final form at <https://doi.org/10.1111/1754-0208.12662>. This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with Wiley Terms and Conditions for Use of Self-Archived Versions.

General rights

Unless a licence is specified above, all rights (including copyright and moral rights) in this document are retained by the authors and/or the copyright holders. The express permission of the copyright holder must be obtained for any use of this material other than for purposes permitted by law.

- Users may freely distribute the URL that is used to identify this publication.
- Users may download and/or print one copy of the publication from the University of Birmingham research portal for the purpose of private study or non-commercial research.
- User may use extracts from the document in line with the concept of 'fair dealing' under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (?)
- Users may not further distribute the material nor use it for the purposes of commercial gain.

Where a licence is displayed above, please note the terms and conditions of the licence govern your use of this document.

When citing, please reference the published version.

Take down policy

While the University of Birmingham exercises care and attention in making items available there are rare occasions when an item has been uploaded in error or has been deemed to be commercially or otherwise sensitive.

If you believe that this is the case for this document, please contact UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk providing details and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate.

Epochs of Embodiment: Men, Women and the Material Body

Accepted by *Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies*

KAREN HARVEY

Abstract: Using middling-sort letters dating from 1726 to 1827, the essay explores individuals' physical, affective, mental and spiritual experiences and their understanding of the relationship between mind, body and self. The everyday and metaphorical language used in these letters gives the historian arguably more authentic evidence about the complexity of embodiment – a person's perception or experience of the body – than do works of medicine or philosophy. I found that gender was not key in determining individuals' sense of embodiment but that the correspondents' relationship, religion and life-cycle were key to how they discussed their experience of the body.

Keywords: letters, gender, body, mind, emotion, humoral, embodiment

Author biography: Karen Harvey is a Professor of Cultural History at the University of Birmingham. Her research focuses on gender, the body and material culture in eighteenth-century Britain.

*

History ultimately, so we contend, is a succession (and sometimes an overlay) of distinct somatic epochs. In each of these epochs people are differently embodied.¹

In 2005, Barbara Duden targeted the 'biologization in the humanities', which threatened to reduce the flesh to 'a biological given'. An historian of the body, Duden insisted instead on a different approach. She wanted to situate the body at the heart of changes in historical time by exploring how understandings of the body in the past aligned with broader visions about the world. She described this task as an exploration of 'the body as the source of the *cosmos* of an epoch'.² Indeed, history was, Duden suggested, 'the tale of epochal enfleshments of the macrocosmos and embodiment of the microcosmos'.³ Duden's vision was rooted firmly in her landmark book, *The Woman Beneath the Skin* (1991), which used eight volumes of records of an eighteenth-century doctor's treatments of his female patients in the German town of

Eisenach. The version of embodiment she had found there was distinctive: these women experienced their bodies as a system of humoral flows, and this connected to their view of the wider world. Their microcosmos mapped onto their macrocosmos; both conformed to the same ideals of proportion and harmony. Yet Duden posited a change in the later eighteenth century, in which women's bodies were being objectified and hardened by the intervention of doctors' learned knowledge.⁴ Her influential conclusion was that the eighteenth century was characterized by a shift 'from humoral to solidary pathology': the decline of the humoral body meant the passing of seeing the health of the body as grounded in a harmony, balance and proportionality that paralleled in the macrocosmos.⁵

People's experiences of their bodies – embodiment – are historically specific and change over time. This essay takes up the challenge to explore embodiment in the long eighteenth century as experienced by men and women. Duden's work centred on issues of sex and gender, showing that the microcosmos of the body discovered in the records of the women's treatment was highly gendered. The flowing early modern body Duden found is well recognized amongst historians, yet in contrast to Duden's concentration on the female body most would now see this body as common to both men and women for much of the early modern period. Echoing Duden's arguments about change, though, a shift from this early modern humoral body of fluxes and flows towards 'a new body', one characterized by structures and anatomy, organized, bounded and separate from the environment, is a regular feature of the history of the body from 1500 to 1800. The shift has been described using the terms of Mikhail Bakhtin, as a transition from an open 'baroque' body to a closed and disciplined 'bourgeois' body.⁶ Elsewhere it has been referred to as 'the shift from a humoral to a neurological corporeal model'.⁷ Before these changes, the healthy body was dependent upon appropriate flow. Emotions were part of this physical process of circulation, for example.⁸ But as the body changed, so were emotions increasingly understood as a mental not physical phenomenon.⁹

The impact of these changes on understandings of sex and gender have been subject to much discussion. Duden's findings about a shift from a flowing microcosmos of the body to a more solid one chimed with another principal work of the early 1990s, Thomas Laqueur's *Making Sex*. Using printed medical books, Laqueur claimed that sex became newly material in the late eighteenth century. The body became more foundational to differences between men and women; cultural gender was replaced by biological sex. Grounded in a range of cultural representations, Dror Wahrman's argument, that individual identity – including that of gender – was grounded increasingly in notions of a physical naturalized body around 1780

mapped neatly onto the chronology of Laqueur.¹⁰ A differently material body, one of structures not flows, was fixing gender more firmly than before in biology. The extent that this transformed people's understanding of their own bodies is much debated. Laura Gowing has countered that in the seventeenth century, firmly gendered bodies fixed in their differences were already visible in daily life: 'even without sex, the body (and especially the female body) is understood through something that functions like sex (or biology)'. The social and corporeal fused to create sex before sex.¹¹ Studies of the male body are also sceptical of change.¹² In philosophical thought, a growing focus on the role played by the physiology of the material body did not appear to produce gender differentiation.¹³ In medicine, the treatment of men and women contrasted contemporary medical theories of the sexed body and was determined as much by age or individual temperament as it was gender.¹⁴ What was true for medical treatment of physical ailments was also true for emotions. An idea of the openness of women's bodies could render them more susceptible to the physical impact of some emotions, but the similarities between men's and women's embodied experiences of emotion and the way that they were treated are striking.¹⁵ There is some indication that the changes from an early modern 'baroque' body to a new 'bourgeois' body may have impacted men's and women's ideas about and experiences of the body differently, as the closed and contained body became a marker of manly bourgeois power at the end of the century¹⁶ Nevertheless, the correspondence of the Swiss doctor Samuel August Tissot (1728-97) and his sustained treatment of one male patient maps neatly onto Duden's study of women, showing how the physical was linked to the mental, spiritual or the passions for men too.¹⁷

This body of work tells us a great deal about medical theory and medical practice. Yet a history of embodiment requires a different approach. In exploring men's and women's intimate and highly personal experience of their own bodies we need to use documents that they themselves produced. As such, I will use material generated in non-medical contexts to explore, not whether the basis of the categories of sex and gender changed, but whether the experience of embodiment was different for men and women. My use of the term 'embodiment' reflects a body of recent scholarship in the discipline of History and beyond. As Thomas Csordas has explained, embodiment signals 'the methodological and epistemological problematization of a series of interrelated conceptual dualities', most immediately 'the conventional distinction between mind and body'.¹⁸ Embodiment refers to a person's perception or experience of the body and their understanding of how the body relates to other aspects of their being, consciousness or identity. A central thread of notions of embodiment in modern scholarship is the relationship between mind, body and self. This is

expressed through works on the ‘embodied mind’ or ‘corporeal thinking’, which examine not just the brain as embodied but the ways in which ‘the body beyond the brain’ apprehends the world and plays a role in cognition.¹⁹ I do not here enter a thoroughgoing engagement with this philosophical scholarship. Instead, from the perspective of a historian of the eighteenth-century body, I extend the premise to which many humanist scholars of embodiment hold – that a sense of embodiment is culturally specific – and explore how a sense of embodiment is historically specific. A substantial body of intellectual history has examined the seventeenth- and eighteenth-century philosophical debates about materialism arising from Cartesian dualism, and their implication for ideas about the body, soul and religion.²⁰ Historians of medicine also engage with these issues through a focus on changing understandings of the mind and the brain: as George Rousseau began his 2007 article on the history of brain science in this journal, ‘Few subjects in the humanities today compete with the crushing urgency of cognitive neuroscience’.²¹ In contrast, I seek to contribute to the wider discussion about the experience of the embodied mind by stepping aside philosophical and medical debates and by instead exploring lay or everyday notions of embodiment.

To this end, I examine the languages of embodiment in a corpus of 649 letters by both English men and women from the middling-sort dating from 1726 to 1827, focusing on three sets in particular (dating from 1726, 1743-1795, and 1775-1815). Correspondence between patients and doctors has been used extensively in the history of the body; the family letters I use here allow access to a different set of conversations around the body and as such significantly enhance our understanding of contemporaries’ experiences of embodiment. The essay explores how individuals described their own and other people’s bodies, whether the experience of embodiment (of having or of being a body) changed, and whether men and women described that experience differently. I focus on language pertaining to the relationship between body, mind and self. These middling-sort letters were crafted in familial contexts, rather than as part of medical consultation or debates in medicine and philosophy. There is no reason why the wife of farmer or chapman, or a weaver or bookkeeper, might not describe bodily experiences in detail, though it is reasonable to expect that the specialized language of more formal bodies of language might be less prominent or even missing from their writing. Yet the everyday and metaphorical lay or non-specialist language for the body arguably better lends itself to expressing the complex and multifaceted states of embodiment than do the specialist and precise languages of medicine or philosophy. For example, whilst not wanting to downplay the challenges they pose as sources to the historian of the body, challenges characteristic of all written sources, such sources contain sections that show traces

of the ‘feelings and sensations purely interior and intimate’ and only sensible to the person in question, even if they have been distorted for a specific audience.²² Additionally, the distinctive elements of the sources, as well as the more generic, can provide an index to the individual experiences of the writer rather than more widely circulating ideas and motifs.²³ Medical anthropologists are practiced at interpreting the language used to describe physical experiences as an index of their culturally specific sense of embodiment, tracing in them the embodiment of personal and political factors.²⁴ For historians, too, language is one valuable key to people’s past experiences of the body. The language used by these letter writers suggests that gender was not an important factor in determining individuals’ sense of embodiment, but the relationship of the correspondents, religion and life-cycle did affect the way correspondents discussed their experience of the body.

Well, unwell and ‘out of order’

In studying eighteenth-century letters, I have focused on how letter-writers conceived of themselves as mind, body and self, and specifically the language writers used to refer to what we might provisionally describe as their physical, affective, mental and spiritual experiences. I have isolated references to events such as ill-health, good health, feelings, thoughts and faith, and considered not just the content of these (the symptoms of the fever or the degree of loneliness, for example) but the manner in which they have described this (such as their ability to assign cause or their comprehension of what was happening). I have paid particular attention to the ways in which these writers separate out – or not – their physical, affective, mental and spiritual experiences. Yet this is challenging, because letter-writers often described generalized states of wellness or unwellness that resist drawing distinctions between these sorts of experiences.

This is certainly the case for the first set of letters used here: the thirty-six letters exchanged between the non-conformists John and Rebecca Smith in the spring of 1726. These letters were the product of John’s being away from their home in Sheffield for nearly three months, as he pushed forward a bill for the navigation of the River Don. Aged 26 and 30 respectively, Rebecca and John had only recently married on 22 December 1725, John’s first wife presumably having died.²⁵ Amongst the effusive declarations of devotion of this newly married couple, are increasingly common descriptions of being both corporeally and emotionally not well. For example, communicating her state of being around three weeks after

John has left, Rebecca simply declared, 'I am not very well'.²⁶ On reading her declaration, John was considerate in his response and presented her condition using a similarly generalized phrase: 'I am sorry you are out of order but hope by y^e next to hear you are better'.²⁷ The phrase obviously chimed with Rebecca's understanding of her condition, because in her next letter Rebecca repeated the same phrase 'out of order': 'I am very often much out of order but I hope it will go of [*sic*] in time'.²⁸ Rebecca and John evidently shared an experience of absence and longing; they also developed a shared language to describe this. Describing this state as ill-health or unhappiness imposes a lexical distinction not found in the letters themselves, threatening to shape an anachronistic conceptual framework that neither John nor Rebecca would recognize. They understood their experience of embodied discomfort to blend emotion and body into one.

Men often commented freely on their wives' physical conditions and mental states, but the letters of John and Rebecca Smith are remarkable for her forthright comments on her husband's behaviour and health. Like John, Rebecca also developed her own lexicon for describing John's embodied experiences. She captured his experiences of spending long days in the Houses of Parliament with the phrase 'hurry of Body', coupling this with 'y^e Vexations you Meet with in ye operations of persons in power'.²⁹ As the weeks went by, Rebecca's letters highlighted tiredness and wear as the dominant feature of John's London experience, referring to 'all your feteges [*fatigues*]'.³⁰ John then subsequently deployed this language himself, noting that one of her letters 'put fresh Life & Spirits into a weary body wth the fateugues of the Day'.³¹ Here, mind and body were distinguished and mood could overcome the trials placed upon the physical body. John and Rebecca's letters echo each other in other ways. They exhort, empathize and emote in turn, mirroring each other's words and sentiments. On receiving what appears to have been an announcement that Rebecca is pregnant, John admits he received the letter 'wth a passion of Joy', experiencing 'floods of tears of Joy Issued from me in secret as I Cant account for'.³² Rebecca mirrored John's response, though her tears sprang from a different emotion, a sad response to her husband being away for so long: 'I Cant Reflect upon your Last Letter in private but it Costs me Some tears'.³³ As with all these runs of personal letters, and letters more broadly, the shape and expression of their contents were forged collaboratively between the correspondents in the broader context of their relationship. One consequence of this was shared registers relating to health and wellbeing, languages which both expressed and shaped how the body was experienced. As Rublack has made clear, ideas about bodies 'influenced to some extent the ways in which bodies behaved'.³⁴

'such dull stuff'

The language used by eighteenth-century letter writers can elude the neat categories we wish to impose on the past not only because those categories seem to have less purchase for contemporaries but also because those writers offer apparently so few details about the body. The second set of letters used in this essay are the thirty-nine letters exchanged between the Wrights, an Anglican family from Sheffield. Dorothy Jarvis/Jarvis (1696-1753) married Thomas Wright, described as a farmer and carrier, in February 1717 and had several children, including the daughters Catherine (b.1722, married George Elliott, a chapman, in 1742) and Rebecca (b.1723, married David Cooper in 1743).³⁵ Dorothy's letters to Catherine survive, as do letters between the sisters and Catherine's letters to her own daughter, Ann (b.1746). These provide a rare set of letters between women from the eighteenth-century middling-sort and demonstrate the different ways in which these women regarded their bodies. One striking feature of the letters, when compared with the work of historians who study women's bodies through medical material, is just how little these women described the interior of their bodies. Dorothy Wright's thirteen surviving letters to her daughter Catherine are exemplary in this regard. They feature rather clipped references that give very little away in terms of the workings of her body. She reports her recovery from ill-health as often as she describes the ill-health itself. For example, in June 1744 she writes, 'I am much Better I thank god. But Have not got my strength as y^t'.³⁶ A letter from 1746 signs off in a similar way: 'I have not Been Well my self But am better thank God'.³⁷ Only on one occasion does she talk about her bodily health in any more detail, singling herself out in an otherwise healthy household:

I hope this Will Meet you in health as all all is hear Excpting my selfe Whether i for some could or no i don't Know But have Been after as i never was Before i Carce had Breath to get of my seat when sett I went with your sister to Church yesterday and i could scarece get thair & Bac again in the afternoon We Went to the Magdalen Hosptel she Tooke a Cocah and Cepte it i was vastly pleasd With it jumling in the Coach i belive and some Pilles I Took Last night Did me good ... Pleas to Excuse for am very much Tierd shud Be glad have a Line or Too³⁸

Wright's only given symptom is breathlessness; she finds her poorliness incomprehensible and does not know the cause. She compares it unfavourably to bouts of ill-health she has had before, admits to struggles with mobility and resorts to medication. She apologizes,

presumably for a short letter but perhaps also its topic, though she does not explicitly seek out sympathy. She impresses upon her daughter the extent of her poor health not by describing the illness but instead by describing what she is unable to do. Overall, her letter bespeaks the mystery of her own body. This microcosmos of the female body is very different from the one described by Duden. It suggests a body distanced, incomprehensible and apart from the person. This certainly reflects the fact that Dorothy was an older woman of fifty by the time she wrote this letter; her old age made her newly attentive to the unwelcome changes to her physical body.

Dorothy's younger daughter, Rebecca, displayed a similar apparent reticence about discussing her own body. The fourteen surviving letters to her sister Catherine are detailed on matters of clothing, social occasions and family members, as well as effusive on the closeness of their bond, yet she rarely mentioned her health or feelings. When she did describe physical difficulties in detail in a letter of February 1778, she asked Catherine to excuse her for writing 'such dull stuff', suggesting that it was the form of the letter addressed to her older sister that rendered the subject matter inappropriate, rather than her lack of interest or cognizance. Indeed, this longer account explained how Rebecca had been prevented from using her hands properly for a whole month: 'I was at that time unable to hold a pen it hath been a grate trouble to me as I was above a Month useless with my hands (which is ill spair,^d) besides the pain I suffer,^d'. Rebecca gives no explanation for her predicament and no account of what might lie beneath the skin, but instead describes the lack of mobility and the pain. The experience brings on anxiety and dread because no sooner has one episode ended but she fears another. As such, she lamented, 'that Cruel distemper rob.^s me of the Comforts of life'. The term 'distemper' suggests that her physical ailment has affected her mood. Yet Rebecca presents herself as without knowledge and agency about her own body, a body that determines her experiences but over which she has no volition. The letters of the Anglican Wright family are much less effusive about the body and particularly about emotion than those of the nonconformists John and Rebecca Smith. Yet the women in this family would sometimes permit themselves more open expression. Whilst Rebecca Cooper apologized for speaking at length about her body, she believed that the recipient of the letter gave her permission to describe these experiences. Her sister Catherine, she noted, 'is not Exempt,^d from y^e rod of Affliction, tho in a very diffirant [*sic*] manner from mine'.³⁹ Ultimately, if reluctantly, the descriptions of the bodily trials were permissible in this intimate relationship of sisterly support. They are perhaps also driven by Rebecca's sense of her impending death, which was to take place the following year. Rebecca's statements about her body in her

letters, and thus the knowledge we have about her body, were inevitably shaped by the relationship through which those letters were forged.

Mind, Body, Self

Despite the apparent reticence or vagueness of letter writers, later letters tend to be more explicit about whether a state of health or wellness pertained to what they perceived to be either their mind or body, or both. Certainly, letters from the mid eighteenth century onwards suggest individuals increasingly saw the cognitive and corporeal as divided, even as they were viewed as connected. The impact of Rebecca Cooper's (née Wright) distress during her only daughter's illness and death in 1763 contrasts with the descriptions of grief in earlier sources, for example.⁴⁰ Her distress was described in terms of the spirits. Her husband only just back at work as an ironmonger having suffered a condition that affected his ability to walk, the couple heard from a doctor that their daughter was about to have the second of two operations. Rebecca admitted to her sister that she 'realy have not spirits to write as I have so Melancholy a subject to Write upon'; 'I have almost given up,' she explains. Her spirits were subject to another unnamed force apparently out of her control: 'my spirits is so oprest [*sic*] I don't now [*sic*] what I say'.⁴¹ A year later, and following the death of her daughter, this sense of a lack of agency endures as she writes of her, 'weak spirits which I believe I shall never Conquer'.⁴² Such references to spirits also reflect the growing medical interest in nerves and spirits from the late seventeenth century. Notably following the work of Thomas Willis, greater interest was given to the spirits as the substance that travelled between the brain and the body, through nerves, connecting the metaphysical and the physical.⁴³ They remind us that one impact of the science of nerves was to continue a longstanding merging of corporeal and emotional. These letters also suggest the rise of sensibility.⁴⁴ Rebecca Cooper was writing just as 'nervous science' or neurology was about to be transformed by Robert Whytt. His 1765 book described the nervous system not simply 'distributed very nearly throughout the entire body' but effectively *as* the body, 'in that it comprised all the motions or pathological affections therein.'⁴⁵ Two decades later, Catherine Elliott (née Wright) discussed her granddaughter Kitty's health of spirits in letters to her daughter Ann, finally reporting that she was 'much pleased to hear her Spirits so good & now hope she may enjoy a good state of Health'.⁴⁶ The comment seems to allude to a continuation of an early modern 'somatization of emotion' amongst late-eighteenth-century lay letter writers.⁴⁷ Rebecca's understandings about

nerves were echoed in Catherine Elliott's later references to 'spirits'. Neither indicate direct influence of the new neuroanatomy, which produced '[t]he belief in the brain as a cause of mind', but instead suggest that the person and their health was a product of flows that connected the corporeal and the emotional.⁴⁸

The 574 letters of the male members of the Stutterd family provide a useful comparison with those of the women in the Wright family. The brothers John, Thomas and Jacob Stutterd were from a family of Baptists in the north of England. John preached, though both he and Jacob also worked as weavers, and Thomas was a bookkeeper for a wool merchant. Their letters reveal a closely knit network centred around the family and the shared faith of a fledgling religious community.⁴⁹ Baptists prioritized preparation of the heart or the inward reflection on faith as a principal devotional practice; regular, daily self-examination and reflection was an important aspect of this.⁵⁰ There is also an especially embodied nature of the Baptist faith: the community of Baptists were one body, the church was the body of Christ, and 'bodily performance was equated with spiritual belief and inner feeling'.⁵¹ This is surely one reason why of the letters used in this essay, those of the Stutterds are the most effusive on the detail of many bodily experiences and the close connection of mind, soul and body. As John wrote to his younger brother Thomas following the loss of his newborn child in 1780, 'Endeavour to calm the troubled surges of your tempestuous Mind. The painful sensations of the Soul deeply affect the Welfare of the Body'.⁵² The mind was thus a device to treat the body. Thomas, signed off a letter to his wife Mary, in May 1789, advising her on the importance of her mood to her physical wellbeing: 'Before I conclude, let me desire one thing of you – Endeavour to make yourself as content & cheerful as possible – The Exercise of the Mind has often a wonderful effect upon the body. A low, flat, sullen & stupid frame is always [*sic*], hurtful & sometimes ruinous to the Constitution.'⁵³ Lightly adopting a mechanical metaphor, Thomas' advice explicitly disaggregated mind from body and implied a division between cognition and corporeality. Yet both functioned as moving parts together in a mechanistic vision that was already becoming outdated in late-eighteenth-century philosophy and medicine, but which was comfortably aligned with the Baptist faith.⁵⁴

Given the scholarship on mind, body and emotion in this period, we would expect these letters to evidence the idea of a strong relationship between physical health and emotional state. The modern psychological category of emotion may have been a product of the nineteenth century, though a lexical change saw the meaning of emotion shift from a corporeal to an internalized psychological phenomenon from the late seventeenth century.⁵⁵ Yet even in the late eighteenth century, emotions were thought to work through material

structures and directly on organs such as the heart in ways that ‘incorporated but did not overthrown traditional humoral interpretations’.⁵⁶ Mind may have been separated out from body, but the new science of the organ of the brain as the seat of the mind ensured that the mind, its thoughts and feelings were still understood as corporeally situated.⁵⁷ The continuation in the idea of both the cognitive and corporeal nature of emotions, and thus an indistinct mind-body distinction, can be seen in the letters of the Anglican Wright women from the 1760s and 1780s and (even more clearly) in the Baptist Stutterd men’s letters from the 1780s and 1790s.

Yet at times in these letters, mind and body might be unhelpfully uncoupled and out of step with one another. When he was away and homesick, Thomas Stutterd wrote to Mary, ‘I have been moderate in health, but am far from being happy in my mind’.⁵⁸ The difficulties of being separated from Mary, his second and beloved wife, had been an enduring theme of his letters to her. Eighteen months earlier he had described vividly the impact on his mental state: ‘I long to be at home, my mind is all on float, unsettled, not time to read & think on spiritual matters. I cannot yet reconcile my self to a Travelling life.’⁵⁹ Again, Thomas isolated his mind from his body. Yet that mind also took on the very actions of his physical body, floating and unsettled just as his body was moving from place to place. This experience of Thomas’ itinerant body producing an itinerant mind powerfully conveys both the separateness and the embodiment of his mind. Thomas’ older brother John could also separate out mind from body, and did so particularly clearly as he aged. In 1802, aged 52, he complained: ‘Old Age steals on me by rapid Strides. Several Friends who had not seen me of a considerable Time lately accosted me with, “Ah! how old you look”!’⁶⁰ Though he would live for another sixteen years, John personified age as a thief who would take his body from him.

Across the Stutterd brothers’ letters more broadly, the mind was itself imagined kinesthetically, as an object in three-dimensional space. It was a ‘frame’ that moved on a vertical scale; it was up or (mostly) down. Money worries put John ‘in a more low Frame of Mind’.⁶¹ Again advising his wife Mary, Thomas cautioned, ‘By no means let your Spirits sink’ and for her not to ‘give way to a low spirited frame’.⁶² In contrast, the body was commonly measured in terms of strength: ‘weak’ (most often), ‘feeble’ or ‘infirm’. These men’s shared metaphor of the ‘frame’ brings to mind their occupations in the textiles industry; it envisaged the mind as a kind of machine and the spirits as a substance moving within this. This lay understanding of the body combined the mechanist and nervous models of the second half of the eighteenth century. Yet situating the emotions within the mechanical model was increasingly uncommon as vitalist models of an organic force animating the human body

combined with the rise of sensibility.⁶³ These eighteenth-century letter-writers blend models that were distinct in more specialist sources. They echo not only earlier discussion of emotions as fluxes, but also the late-modern ‘central discourse of fluidity’ with its emphasis on ‘embodied feelings’.⁶⁴ For these men, mind and body were separate *kinds* of entities, linked but distinct, and both material. Though the letters of men did not always echo the incomprehension about their own bodies that we saw in the letters of Dorothy Wright and Catherine Elliott, the volition that men felt they had over the fortunes of both was severely limited. Overall, the way these women and men described the mind and body may sometimes appear non-specific, vague, or even contradictory, compared to the medical and philosophical literature used in other studies. Yet these letter-writers’ metaphorical language richly conveyed the experience of being a thinking and feeling body.

A state of ease or ‘uneasyness’

The clear sense of the domain of the spirits, mood, emotions or mind as acquiring its own state of condition can be found in letters from men and women across the eighteenth century. Tracing the use of the terms ‘easy’ and ‘uneasy’ across the whole corpus of letters illustrates this well. In March 1726, John Smith tried to reassure his wife that he would return from London to be with her in Sheffield soon, hoping she would be ‘Easy awhile without my Company’.⁶⁵ But in a letter of 30 March, Rebecca Smith replied angrily of precisely the ‘great Deal of uneasiness’ she felt with him being away, before describing her emotional turmoil in more detail, including a reference to that vertical scale of the spirits: ‘I can assure you when my Spirits is low it makes me uneasy & I Cant Reflect upon your Last Letter in private but it Costs me Some tears’.⁶⁶ Ever attentive, in his letters at least, John replied that her letter in turn ‘gave me no less uneasyness’, reassuring her that he had ‘nothing more at heart than to make your Life Easy & Comfortable’.⁶⁷ Such language echoed the Wright letters of the 1740s. Dorothy Wright declared to her daughter Catherine Elliot on more than one occasion how ‘verey Uneasy’ she was on hearing of Catherine’s disagreements with her sister.⁶⁸ That sister, Rebecca, later wrote to Catherine of the ‘grattist Uneasyness’ that would arise should the correspondence of the two, who had been so dear to one another, ever cease.⁶⁹ The upset and unbalancing concomitant with the state of uneasiness in these cases may affect both mind and body, yet the lack of references to felt physical discomfort suggests that the state of being easy or uneasy related to emotion and affect rather than to the physical self.

Such uses of ‘easy’ to refer to mind and body continued at the end of the century and beyond. In 1782, John Stutterd described himself as ‘low and poorly’ on a Saturday but ‘Cheerful and easy’ by the Sunday. The note accompanying this report, that ‘close Thinking and Bodily Fatigue are equally detrimental’, suggests that he was referring to both his physical and mental state.⁷⁰ In the later letters, for men as well as women, ‘easy’ tended to describe a state of being – which might encompass the physical – that was without mental or emotional challenge. Easy was a very common term in descriptions of childbirth, for example, which would hopefully be ‘moderate easy’, an ‘easy time’ or ‘a very easy time’.⁷¹ The other common instance of ‘easy’ in the Stutterd brothers’ letters was to refer to the absence of anxiety or emotional upset. When Thomas Stutterd had not heard from his wife for some time, he was ‘rather uneasy in my mind fearing bad News or something’.⁷² Catherine Elliott was glad that her daughter Ann had gone to stay with her father when her mother was away, as it ‘makes me more easey when from home’ knowing he had company.⁷³ Some time later, the army officer John William Stanley wrote to his sister from Brompton Barracks in 1827 that he hoped she was well and ‘more easy in your mind’.⁷⁴ This usage of ‘easy’ and ‘uneasy’ to refer explicitly to a state of mind became clearer by the early nineteenth century, though the use of these terms to refer to what the letter writers experienced and described as a cognitive state was common in the letters from across the century.

The Inside Eye

Throughout the examples from the letters, we can see individuals facing and scrutinizing their own (as well as other people’s) bodies. This is a noteworthy act for an historian of the body. We might interpret the palpable awareness of the physical body as evidence of embodiment. By the same logic, we could assume that a lack of discussion about the body in eighteenth-century letters connotes a self-understanding of a person as somehow not embodied. In fact the very opposite might very well be true. Drew Leder argues that it is precisely the materiality of mind that makes the body disappear to the self. Calling attention to one’s own body in writing transforms embodiment from an experience to an object.⁷⁵ There is a caution for historians, here: the strongest evidence for the embodied mind might be an absence of explicit discussion of embodiment in the historical record. Yet this is also an opportunity to historicize self-objectification. Duden speculates that the coherent, bounded modern body is made possible only because ‘an outside eye has grasped the body’, by which she means

medical authority.⁷⁶ The implication might be that the presence of what we might call ‘an inside eye’ militates against a loss of individual autonomy (or a sense of this). Yet a seeing inside eye was not necessarily comprehending. In the letters consulted for this essay, there are relatively few discussions of self-treatment and the care of the body, but instead a feeling of resignation to external forces – very often little understood or unidentifiable. This was a *leitmotif* of the letters. Sometimes these discussions take place in a secular context, but Providence continued to play a direct role in health, illness and death for some. Thomas Parsons explained his ongoing stomach complaint as a result of direct intervention from God: ‘I know I am a Sinner and that God justly afflicts’.⁷⁷ Yet even in these cases of an apparent direct cause, the workings of the body were left opaque. These individuals’ ability to observe their bodies was present alongside an incomprehension of their bodies.

If the individual body belonged to any person or institution, it belonged to the family group. Eighteenth-century letter writers traded using information about health and illness as a common currency. This bound relationships of family, kinship and friendship. The interruption in the flow of health information troubled family members. Rebecca Cooper confided in her sister that she was cross that their brother John had not kept them informed about his wife’s health following a delivery in 1768: ‘I am Realy [*sic*] Angry at Bro.^r John,s Silence’.⁷⁸ Letters and the networks they represented coproduced social bodies. Letters themselves were public, shared and often collaboratively written documents including portions written by different people. If we contrast these with diaries kept by two of the Stutterd brothers, for example, we find a striking difference. In the diaries of both Thomas and Jabez, there are noticeably far fewer comments on the body, compared to the mind or emotions, than there are in these men’s letters. Reflections on the spiritual, and perhaps relating to an individual self, were entered into a diary, but intimate discussion of the body and to a lesser extent the mind become social categories forged as a family or public self.⁷⁹ It was not just the individual person, medical professionals or institutions who could see, grasp and exert power over the body, but groups and networks, notably family.

As this essay has shown, people developed shared lexicons for the body through their correspondence. Just as letters and other interactions between doctors and patients informed ‘a collaborative interpretation of health’, so families and correspondents developed collective and sometimes highly particular ways of talking about the body and health.⁸⁰ These lay ideas about the body give little sense of the Galenic ‘mutable early modern body in constant flux’ that we find in studies of the seventeenth century or in Duden’s account of women’s bodies in the eighteenth century.⁸¹ This is what we might expect to find given the chronology of a move

from a humoral body to a ‘new body’ of structures: these eighteenth-century men and women did not conceive of their bodies in a predominantly humoral framework. Yet nor do they suggest a bounded and essentially neurological corporeality. The letters suggest the influence of the new science of nerves, spirits and brain but in ways that underlined the merging of the corporeal and emotional. In other words, the lay ideas of these men and women do not map neatly onto the detailed chronologies outlined by historians of medicine. Instead, they open up a world of conversations in which personal, metaphorical and confessional lexicons are deployed to describe the experience of being a thinking and feeling body. These letters reflect ‘the ineffaceable fact that minds are embodied’, but they do so in historically specific ways and using language that conveys the personal, heightened and multi-faceted nature of embodiment.⁸² Significantly, they do not reflect any distinguishable gendered patterns. The eighteenth-century letters consulted here show that men and women could share a lexicon for the body. Sometimes they developed this lexicon together through the practice of letter writing; it also appears that their language was shaped by their denomination, as suggested by the more effusive nonconformist letters by the Smiths and Stutterds. This confirms the work of historians who suggest that the distinctions of sex and gender so pronounced in some formal bodies of knowledge, notably medicine, had little purchase in the realm of quotidian practice.

The body was a product and a tool of social practice and, as such, experiences of it should be subject to historical scrutiny. This essay began with Duden’s wish for a modern understanding of embodiment grounded in a historical perspective: we need, she says, ‘a deep historical grasp of our ethical, ascetical and medical traditions – to learn what we have lost’.⁸³ I have questioned the suggestion that by the end of the eighteenth-century individuals were somehow newly disembodied by a modern body. Records generated in the context of medical practice may well suggest that new specialist medical knowledge (and a growing divergence of familial and medical knowledge) and increasing medical authority over the body led to a declining personal autonomy over the body, but the family letters examined here – exchanged between individuals with no specialist medical knowledge – suggest that an incomprehension of the workings of the body and certainly an ability to describe and explain those workings was common to men and women across the century. Indeed, there are suggestions that the experience of embodiment was likely to have been affected as much by age as by historical change, reflecting the fact that embodiment itself is a lived process that, as we would surely expect, is profoundly affected by the physical state of our corporeal bodies. This is not to argue for stasis; more work using longer runs of comparable sources is needed to trace

changes in lay understandings of embodiment. Nor, emphatically, do I wish to suggest that embodiment is somehow pre-cultural. Historians need to engage with this facet of the human past to explore precisely how the corporeal interacts with the cultural, without reifying the distinction between nature and culture. Metaphors of the body out of order, of the mind as a frame of moving parts, and of spirits that sink show us clearly that experiences of embodiment certainly do change.

¹ Barbara Duden, 'Remarks of a Historian of Women's Bodies (à propos the History of the Greek Orders of Columns by Joseph Rykwert)', *RES: Anthropology and Aesthetics* 47 (2005), p.247.

² Duden, 'Remarks of a historian', p.247.

³ Duden, 'Remarks of a historian', p.248.

⁴ Barbara Duden, *The Woman Beneath the Skin* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1991), p.178 and passim.

⁵ Duden, 'Remarks of a Historian', p.250.

⁶ Séverine Pilloud and Micheline Louis-Courvoisier, 'The Intimate Experience of the Body in the Eighteenth Century: Between Interiority and Exteriority' *Medical History* 47 (2003), p. 467.

⁷ Albrecht Koschorke, 'Physiological Self-Regulation: The Eighteenth-Century Modernization of the Human Body', *Modern Language Notes* 123:3 (2008), p.483.

⁸ Ulinka Rublack, 'Fluxes: The Early Modern Body and the Emotions', *History Workshop Journal* 53 (2002), pp.1-16.

⁹ David Thorley, 'Towards a History of Emotion, 1562-1660', *The Seventeenth Century* 28 (2013), p.3-19.

¹⁰ Dror Wahrman, *The Making of the Modern Self: Identity and Culture in Eighteenth-century England* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 2007).

¹¹ Laura Gowing, 'Women's Bodies and the Making of Sex in Seventeenth-Century England', *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 37:4 (2012), p.813-822. Quote at p.821.

¹² Alison Montgomery, 'The man, his body, and his society: masculinity and the male experience in English and Scottish medicine c.1640-c.1780, unpublished PhD thesis (Durham University, 2011), p.326. Available at Durham E-Theses Online: <http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/3452/>

¹³ Ann Thomson, *Bodies of Thought: Science, Religion, and the Soul in the Early Enlightenment* (Oxford University Press, 2008), p.244-5.

¹⁴ Wendy Churchill, *Female Patients in Early Modern Britain: Gender, Diagnosis, and Treatment* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2002), p.177 and passim.

¹⁵ Olivia Weisser, *Ill Composed: Sickness, Gender, and Belief in Early Modern England* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 2015), p.81-103; Olivia Weisser, 'Grieved and Disordered: Gender and Emotion in Early Modern Patient Narratives', *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 43:2 (2013), pp.247-273; Churchill, *Female Patients*, p.179-223.

¹⁶ Lisa Wynne Smith, 'The Body Embarrassed? Rethinking the Leaky Male Body in Eighteenth-Century England and France', *Gender & History* 23:1 (2010), p.26-46.

¹⁷ Pilloud and Louis-Courvoisier, 'Intimate Experience of the Body', p.471.

¹⁸ Thomas J. Csordas, 'Introduction: the Body as Representation and Being-in-the-World', in Thomas J. Csordas (ed.), *Embodiment and Experience: The Existential Ground of Culture and Self* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), p.7.

¹⁹ See, for example, Peter Garratt, *The Cognitive Humanities: Embodied Mind in Literature and Culture* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016), (quote from p. 2 of his intro); Nigel Thrift, 'Intensities of Feeling: Towards a Spatial Politics of Affect', *Geografiska Annaler: Series B, Human Geography* 86:1 (2004), p.57-78, quote from p.67.

²⁰ John Yolton, *Thinking Matter: Materialism in Eighteenth-Century Britain* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1984); Thomson, *Bodies of Thought*.

²¹ George Rousseau, "'Brainomania": Brain, Mind and Soul in the long Eighteenth Century', *British Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies* 30:2 (2007), p.162.

²² Pilloud and Louis-Courvoisier, 'Intimate Experience of the Body', p.45.

²³ Pilloud and Louis-Courvoisier, 'Intimate Experience of the Body', p.455.

²⁴ A good example, and relevant for some of the issues in this essay, is Setha M. Low, 'Embodied metaphors: Nerves as Lived Experience', in Thomas J. Csordas (ed.), *Embodiment and Experience: The Existential Ground of Culture and Self* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), pp.139-62.

- ²⁵ Thomas Stuart Willan, *The Early History of the Don Navigation* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1965), pp.20-21. Biographical information based on the record of their marriage in Archbishop of York marriage licenses index, 1613-1839, sequence 21, page 347: Borthwick Institute, accessed on *Find My Past*, 16 April 2018. Rebecca Fletcher was baptized in the nonconformist Upper Chapel in Sheffield on 18 December 1699: TNA/RG/4/2197, accessed on *Find My Past*, 16 April 2018.
- ²⁶ R Smith in Sheffield to John Smith at the Golden Ball in Fetters [*sic*] Lane, 9th March 1725/6: Sheffield Archives (hereafter 'SA'), LC/70 1-36 Letters between John Smith of Sheffield and his wife Rebecca, 70/4.
- ²⁷ John Smith to Mrs Smith London 12th March 1725/6: SA 70/6.
- ²⁸ Mrs Smith to John Smith 16 March 1726: SA 70/8.
- ²⁹ R Smith in Sheffield to John Smith at the Golden Ball in Fetters [*sic*] Lane, 9th March 1726: SA 70/4.
- ³⁰ Mrs Smith to John Smith 16 March 1726.
- ³¹ J Smith to R Smith April 1725/6 [letter not dated]: SA 70/15.
- ³² J Smith to R Smith 29 March 1725/6: SA 70/12.
- ³³ R Smith to J Smith 30 March: SA 70/13.
- ³⁴ Rublack, 'Fluxes' p.14.
- ³⁵ Biographical details based on Parish Registers of the Cathedral of St. Peter & St. Paul, Sheffield, in SA. Accessed on Find My Past, 16 April 2018.
- ³⁶ D Wright, in Sheffield Park, to daughter, Mrs Elliott in London, Sheffield, 23 June 1744: SA, in LD1576/1 Folder of letters Mrs [Dorothy] Wright to Mrs [Catherine] Eliot, 1743-46. I give the folder number for all references in this collection, as the items are not numbered individually. I have retained all original spelling in sources, including my editorial notes, but this will be removed during copy-editing.
- ³⁷ D Wright, London, to Mrs Elliott, 16 June [1746?]: SA, in LD1576/1 Folder of letters Mrs [Dorothy] Wright to Mrs [Catherine] Eliot, 1743-46.
- ³⁸ 'I hope this will meet you in health as all all is here excepting my self. Whether I for some cold or no I don't know but have been after as I never was before. I scarce had breath to get off my seat when sat. I went with your sister to Church yesterday and I could scarce get there & back again. In the afternoon we went to the Magdalen Hospital. She took a coach and kept it; I was vastly pleased with it jumbling [?] in the coach I believe and some pills I took last night did me good ... Please to excuse for am very much tired should be glad [to] have a line or two'. D Wright, London, to Mrs Elliott, 23 May [1746?]: SA, in LD1576/1 Folder of letters Mrs [Dorothy] Wright to Mrs [Catherine] Eliot, 1743-46.
- ³⁹ R Cooper to Mrs Elliott 13 Feb 1777: SA in LD1576/2 Mrs David Cooper (nee Rebecca Wright) etc to her sister Mrs Elliot [*sic*] 1747-1778.
- ⁴⁰ Compare Weisser, 'Grieved and Disordered', *passim*.
- ⁴¹ R Cooper, London, to Mrs George Elliot at Norfolk St 19 Feb 1763: SA, in LD1576/2 Mrs David Cooper (nee Rebecca Wright) etc to her sister Mrs Elliot [*sic*] 1747-1778.
- ⁴² R Cooper in London to Mrs Elliott in Norfolk St, 13 October 1764: SA, in LD1576/2 Mrs David Cooper (nee Rebecca Wright) etc to her sister Mrs Elliot [*sic*] 1747-1778.
- ⁴³ Darren Wagner, 'Body, Mind, and Spirits: The Physiology of Sexuality in the Culture of Sensibility', *Journal of Eighteenth Century Studies* 39:3 (2016), p. 336.
- ⁴⁴ G. S. Rousseau, 'Nerves, Spirits and Fibres: Toward the Origins of Sensibility', in R. F. Brissenden (ed.), *Studies in the Eighteenth Century*, (Canberra 1975). rev. and repr. in *Nervous Acts: Essays on Literature, Culture and Sensibility* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2004), p.157-84.
- ⁴⁵ Nima Bassiri, 'The Brain and the Unconscious Soul in Eighteenth-Century Nervous Physiology: Robert Whytt's Sensorium Commune', *Journal of the History of Ideas* 74:3 (2013), p.427.
- ⁴⁶ Mrs Catherine Elliot to Mrs Ann Hare, 'Sheffield May 14' [no year given]: in SA, LD1576/3 Folder 3 Letters from Mrs Elliot to Mrs Hare 1785-95.
- ⁴⁷ Rublack, 'Fluxes', p.4.
- ⁴⁸ Rousseau, "'Brainomania'", p.163.
- ⁴⁹ On spiritual diaries in this context, see Cynthia Aalders, "'Your Journal, My Love": Constructing Personal and Religious Bonds in Eighteenth-Century Women's Diaries', *Journal of Religious History* 39:3 (2015), p.386-98.
- ⁵⁰ Karen E. Smith, 'Preparation as a Discipline of Devotion in Eighteenth-Century England: A Lost Facet of Baptist Identity?', in Ian M. Randall, Toivo Pilli and Anthony R. Cross (eds.), *Baptist Identities: International studies from the Seventeenth to the Twentieth Century*, Studies in Baptist History and Thought, vol. 19 (Paternoster, Milton Keynes, Colorado Springs and Hyderabad, 2006), p.22-44. See also the chapters in John H. Y. Briggs (ed.), *Pulpit and People: Studies in Eighteenth-Century Baptist Life and Thought*, Studies in Baptist History and Thought, vol. 28 (Paternoster, Milton Keynes, Colorado Springs and Hyderabad, 2009), esp. chapter 1, John H. Y. Briggs, 'The changing pattern of Baptist life in the Eighteenth Century', p.1-24.

- ⁵¹ Janet Moore Lindman, 'The Body Baptist: Embodied Spirituality, Ritualization, and Church Discipline in Eighteenth-Century America', in Janet Moore Lindman and Michelle Lise Tarter (eds.), *A Centre of Wonders: The Body in Early America* (Cornell University Press, Ithaca, 2001), p.177-190. Quote at p.187.
- ⁵² Letter from John Stutterd to Thomas Stutterd, 15 July 1780, f2: Henry E. Huntington Library [hereafter HEH], Stutterd Family Papers, SFP23, f2. The 574 letters used for this essay are drawn from boxes 1-10 and 16.
- ⁵³ Thomas Stutterd to Mary Stutterd 21 May 1789, f3: HEH, SFP280. Larger font in original.
- ⁵⁴ Minsoo Kang, 'From the Man-Machine to the Automation-Man: The Enlightenment Origins of the Mechanistic Imagery of Humanity', in Helen Deutsch and Mary Terrall (eds.), *Vital Matters: Eighteenth-Century Views of Conception, Life and Death* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2012), p.148-173.
- ⁵⁵ Thomas Dixon, *From Passions to Emotions: The Creation of a Secular Psychological Category* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007); David Thorley, 'Towards a History of emotion, 1562-1660', *The Seventeenth Century*, 28 (2013), p.3-19.
- ⁵⁶ Fay Bound Alberti, 'Bodies, Hearts and Minds: Why Emotions Matter to Historians of Science and Medicine', *Isis* 100:4 (2009), p.798-810. Quote at p.807.
- ⁵⁷ Rousseau, "'Brainomania'", p.161-91; Kate Tunstall, 'The Early Modern Embodied Mind and the Entomological Imaginary', in Mary Helen McMurrin and Alison Conway (eds.), *Mind, Body, Motion, Matter: Eighteenth-Century British and French literary perspectives* (Toronto; Buffalo; University of Toronto Press., 2016), p.202-29.
- ⁵⁸ Thomas Stutterd to Mary Stutterd 25 Sep 1788: HEH SFP221.
- ⁵⁹ Thomas to Mary 14 May 1786: HEH SFP110.
- ⁶⁰ John to Jabez 20 Mar 1802, f2: HEH SFP820.
- ⁶¹ John to Thomas 15 May 1790, f1: HEH SFP345.
- ⁶² Thomas to Mary 10 May 1787, f1: HEH SFP153.
- ⁶³ Kang, 'From the Man-Machine to the Automation-Man', p.158; Catherine Packham, 'The physiology of political economy: Vitalism and Adam Smith's Wealth of Nations', *Journal of the History of Ideas* 63:3 (2002), p.465-81.
- ⁶⁴ Deborah Lupton, 'Going with the flow: Some central discourses in conceptualising and articulating the embodiment of emotional states', in Sarah Nettleton and Jonathan Watson (eds.), *The Body in Everyday Life* (London & New York: Routledge, 1998), p.90.
- ⁶⁵ John Smith to R Smith 22 March 1725/6: SA 70/10.
- ⁶⁶ R Smith to J Smith 30 March [1726]: SA 70/13.
- ⁶⁷ J Smith to R Smith 2 April 1726: SA 70/16.
- ⁶⁸ D Wright, Sheffield Park, to her daughter, undated; D Wright, Sheffield Park, to her daughter, 6 July 1743, f1: SA, LD1576/1 Folder of letters Mrs [Dorothy] Wright to Mrs [Catherine] Eliot, 1743-46.
- ⁶⁹ R Cooper, London, to Mrs Elliott in Sheffield, 7 July 1747, f1: SA, LD1576/2 Mrs David Cooper (nee Rebecca Wright) etc to her sister Mrs Elliot [sic] 1747-1778.
- ⁷⁰ John to Thomas 14 May 1782: HEH SFP54.
- ⁷¹ Jabez to John 22 Sep 1792, f3; SFP48 John to Thomas 25 Dec 1781, f4: HEH SFP502; John to Thomas 16 Jan 1784: HEH SFP77.
- ⁷² Thomas to Mary 2 Apr 1793, f3: HEH SFP529.
- ⁷³ Catherine Elliott to Ann Hare, London, June 4 1785: in SA, LD1576/3 Folder 3 Letters from Mrs Elliot to Mrs Hare 1785-95.
- ⁷⁴ John William Stanley, Brompton Barracks, to Mrs Wm Nicolson, 7 Dec 1827, f2: Sheffield Archives, MD3881 'Letters of J. W. Stanley', MD3881/6.
- ⁷⁵ Drew Leder, *The Absent Body* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990).
- ⁷⁶ Duden, *Woman Beneath the Skin*, p.47.
- ⁷⁷ Diary of Thomas Parsons, January-August 1769, 4th February 1769, f22: HEH, mssHM 62593.
- ⁷⁸ R Cooper to Mrs Elliott 23 Jan 1768: in SA, LD1576/2 Mrs David Cooper (nee Rebecca Wright) etc to her sister Mrs [Catherine] Elliot [sic] 1747-1778.
- ⁷⁹ For example, see, Diary of Jabez Stutterd 1792: HEH SFP837; Diary of Jabez Stutterd 1794-5, HEH SFP838; and Diary of Thomas Stutterd July-D'ec 1792: HEH SFP853. Note this contrasts with the spiritual diaries of women explored in Cynthia Alders, "'Your Journal, My Love": Constructing Personal and Religious Bonds in Eighteenth-Century Women's Diaries', *Journal of Religious History* 39:3 (2015), p.386-398.
- ⁸⁰ Olivia Weisser, 'Boils, Pushes and Wheals: Reading Bumps on the Body in Early Modern England', *Social History of Medicine* 22:2 (2009), p.323.
- ⁸¹ Weisser, 'Boils, Pushes and Wheals', p. 336.
- ⁸² Peter Garratt, 'Introduction: The Cognitive Humanities: Whence and Whither?', in Peter Garratt, *The Cognitive Humanities: Embodied Mind in Literature and Culture* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016), p.1.

⁸³ Barbara Duden, 'Disembodied Health', *New Perspectives Quarterly* (Winter 2000), p.59.