



**Introduction:
“Tolerably Numerous”:
Recovering the London Irish of
the Eighteenth Century**

David O’Shaughnessy
Trinity College Dublin

“London!” exclaimed Miss Counihan. “The Mecca of every young aspirant to fiscal distinction.”

—Samuel Beckett, *Murphy* (1939)

In 1708 Charles McLaughlin set out for London accompanied by two friends, William Mulligan and “Patrick D—d.” After a short time in the capital, they ran out of funds, had “fallen into a state of utter despondency,” and were at a loss as to what the future might hold for them. Mulligan became a soldier and eventually a merchant, amassing a “very considerable fortune”; D—d resorted to robbery until his career was abruptly halted by a jerk of the executioner’s rope at Tyburn. McLaughlin’s biographer tells us this apocryphal anecdote partly in order to inject some tension into his subject’s “train of vicissitudes and fluctuations of fortune” that McLaughlin was to outline over the remaining pages of his two volumes.¹ The tension was artificial, of course, as it was well known to his readers that Charles Macklin—McLaughlin anglicized his name on arrival in London like

Eighteenth-Century Life

Volume 39, Number 1, January 2015 DOI 10.1215/00982601-2834070

Copyright 2015 by Duke University Press

many Irish before and after him—went on to become one of the most celebrated actors of the eighteenth-century London stage. Yet the opposing fates of Mulligan and D—d exemplify the spectrum of possibilities that awaited Irish arrivals in London in the eighteenth century.

We might begin by considering why an essay collection on the activities of the eighteenth-century London Irish might be appropriate at this time. Up until quite recently, if one was looking for information on this ethnic grouping, one might be directed toward John Denvir's *The Irish in Britain* (1892), John Archer Jackson's *The Irish In Britain* (1963), and, more recently, Donald M. MacRaild's *The Irish Diaspora in Britain, 1750–1939* (1999, 2011).² However, there are notable shortcomings with each of these books, at least insofar as the eighteenth century is concerned. Denvir's book identifies this period as the time when the Irish in London first became "tolerably numerous" and provides rich anecdotes, but the historiography and referencing is, naturally enough, inadequate for the purposes of modern scholarship. Jackson's survey is largely concerned with the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, but gives only the most cursory attention to the pre-1800 era. This is a problem that is shared with MacRaild's book, which, despite the very fine scholarship it boasts, simply does not cover the period it claims to cover: the most substantive discussion MacRaild gives of the eighteenth century is a brief overview of the relationship between the United Irishmen and English radicals.

In terms of scholarship of the Irish diaspora, the relative lack of attention to the eighteenth century is perhaps understandable. The nineteenth century has proved a siren call to historians and sociologists. This, after all, was the century that saw the end of the Napoleonic Wars and the spread of the various famines that ravaged Ireland, events that prompted mass Irish immigration to Britain and elsewhere. The influx of Irish immigrants in the wake of 1815, and the concomitant anxieties it fueled, led to the formation of a Select Committee on Disturbances in Ireland in 1825, the Select Committee on Emigration in 1827, and, eventually, the commissioning of George Cornwall Lewis's *Report on the State of the Irish Poor in Great Britain* (1836). Moreover, if we also remember that the first census in Britain to record the country of birth of residents took place in 1841, we must acknowledge that there is vastly more hard data available on the Irish in Britain during this century. Donald Akenson's paradox is particularly true of the eighteenth century: "Given that Great Britain numerically has been the second most important reception area for Irish migrants, nevertheless

it is the place for which we have the least and lowest quality of information on the migrants, particularly systematic data.”³ In addition, there is the issue of language: the evidence suggests that a small proportion of Irish migrants to London could speak English. Peter King, for instance, has shown how the London courts in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries had to cope with Irish prosecutors and defendants who had poor levels of English language fluency.⁴ Father Thomas Mahon, writing to a friend in 1748, was struck by the demands on his confessional bilingualism:

I declare that on certain times of the year I hear 10 (thereabouts) Irish for one English Confession; and which is more that I have met with numbers who had not been for years together for want of an Irish confessor. There are quarters of the town where you hear nothing else but Irish in the neighbour-hood of where I served near 4 years.⁵

Irish, then, appears to have been the dominant language of the lower-class Irish migrant. While these Irish are documented in various records, personal accounts in sources such as letters or journals are rare: as we might expect, the issue of illiteracy among the lower orders, both English-speaking and Irish-speaking, exacerbates the scarcity of these kinds of primary material. Although, as Éamonn Ó Ciardha and Vincent Morley have illustrated, Irish language song and poetry are important and underused source materials for the eighteenth century, there are limits to what a historian can do with them.⁶ In sum, one could say, “Muna bhfuil scríobh nó fiú labhairt an Bhéarla agat, tá sé deacair do rian a fhágáil ar an stair” (If you can’t write or even speak English, it’s difficult to leave your mark on history). The patchy availability of quantitative primary source material and the issue of the Irish language pose substantial barriers to historians and constitute considerable reasons (but not excuses) for the relative sidelining of the eighteenth-century London Irish experience to date.

One problem with the historiographical focus on the nineteenth-century Irish diaspora is that it is usually identified as a “classic” victim diaspora, to use Robin Cohen’s typology, that is, a diaspora motivated by traumatic events in the homeland, in Ireland’s case, the great famines of the mid nineteenth century and the subsequent mass migration that followed in their wake.⁷ Such conceptions of the Irish diaspora appear to have colored the views of historians of eighteenth-century London. Dorothy George’s discussion of the Irish in her chapter, “London Immigrants and Emigrants,” in *London Life in the Eighteenth Century* (1925), although dated,

is typical of the survey historian's position. That chapter lists the following topics: "Irish colonies in London. Riots against Irish labour. Faction fights between English and Irish. Anti-Irish feeling and the Gordon riots. The Irish as a police problem; as a sanitary problem; as an industrial problem and a poor law problem."⁸ While George writes that there were "many different types of Irish in London," it becomes clear that she means there are many different categories of the very poor or destitute, with the primary distinction being between those who are law-abiding and those who are not (114). More recently, Jerry White's *London in the 18th Century* (2012) strikes a better balance. White calls attention to the considerable contributions the Irish made to eighteenth-century metropolitan culture, particularly in the field of the theater. Yet his observation that "even the most brilliant, though, shared something of a common inheritance—impecuniousness" reveals that his discussion of the London Irish is, like George's, overly concerned with poor migrant workers. Like George, White also seems preoccupied with the Irish community's participation in violence.⁹

There is no denying that the history of many of the Irish in London during the century is a gritty tale. For the indigenous inhabitant of the capital and elsewhere in Britain, the shadows of 1641, the year of a bloody insurrection (and equally savage counter-insurrection) in Ulster, were slow to lift. The lurid tales of Catholic Irish violence were discursive threads that would entangle Irish arrivals to Britain in suspicion for many decades. Of course, the British had considered the Irish barbaric long before 1641, in a tradition dating back at least to Gerald Cambrensis in the twelfth century, but the events of 1641 solidified these attitudes.¹⁰ Some parliamentary troops, for instance, were so affected by assumptions of Irish bestiality, that after the Cromwellian destruction of a garrison in Cashel in 1647, they claimed that some of the corpses had "tails near a quarter of a yard long."¹¹ Stories such as these were not slow to filter back to England. Hostility toward Irish papists dating from 1641 was probably revived and reinforced by the Popish Plot (1678–81) and by the later influx of Irish Protestant refugees in London in the late 1680s. They brought tales of oppression and dispossession by James II's Catholic followers in Ireland. From 1688 to 1691 (as in 1641 and its aftermath), London's printers published numerous accounts of Protestant suffering at the hands of papists. The refugees were conspicuous in London as objects of charity, as evidence of the cruelty of Irish Catholics, and as lobbyists urging King William to reconquer Ireland.

Anti-Irish sentiment in eighteenth-century London was also fueled by the perception that cheap Irish labor was putting domestic workers out of employment. Anti-Irish riots, for example, took place in Spitalfields in July 1736, described in a letter from Robert Walpole to his younger brother Horatio (not to be confused with Walpole's more famous son, Horace):

On Monday night last, there was an appearance of numbers of people being assembled in a very disorderly manner at Shoreditch near Spittlefields. Their cry and complaint was of being under-worked and starved by the Irish: *Down with the Irish, &c.* But that night the numbers were not very great, and they dispersed of themselves without doing any mischief. It is necessary here to explain what is meant by this complaint against the Irish, which is founded upon greater numbers than ordinary, as is said, of Irish being here, and not only working at hay and corn harvest, which has been usual, but letting themselves out to all sort of labour considerably cheaper than the English labourers have.¹²

Occasional clashes like this were to occur throughout the century: Denvir records a "terrible affray" between coal heavers, mostly Irish, and sailors in May 1768 (78). These insurrectionists were harshly dealt with; most of them were sentenced to death. Denvir also writes on the Gordon Riots in 1780, which targeted Catholics, many of whom were Irish (86–87), although we might note that the most recent examination of the Gordon Riots surprisingly makes no mention of anti-Irish sentiment.¹³ The century ends with the 1798 rebellion and further tales of Irish barbarity, so it is easy to see how seventeenth-century ideas of Irish barbarity, nineteenth-century facts and figures on the Irish poor, and the notion of a victim diaspora have bled into the accounts of the eighteenth century. The opening anecdote about Macklin's friends serves to illuminate the rigidly dichotomized narratives, both old and new, that historians such as Denvir and White offer; in both of their important books, the Irish either brilliantly enhance the city (Burke, Goldsmith, Sheridan), or live in the margins, eking out a subsistence-level existence.

But between these two possibilities, Irish genius, on the one hand, indigence, on the other, there was a substantial middling Irish who migrated to Britain—and, particularly, to London—an event that that has only recently been the subject of fresh inquiry. John Bergin has shown us the operations of the Irish legal community in London over the century.¹⁴ Toby Barnard's study of Irish visits to London adds color to an often drab picture.¹⁵ Thomas M. Truxes's examination of Irish merchants in London

has complemented the work of Louis M. Cullen.¹⁶ And Craig Bailey's previous work on Irish merchants, lawyers, and charitable societies in London has recently been crowned by the publication of his *Irish London: Middle-Class Migration in the Global Eighteenth Century* (2013), a monograph that promises to be the most authoritative work on the eighteenth-century London Irish to date.¹⁷ All this exciting work has opened up a new field of Irish history to be documented and narrated and allows us to move away from a victim diaspora and the negative, occasionally self-pitying, connotations that this conceptual framework evokes. Rather we might use these scholarly contributions, including this collection of essays, to move to a more enabling idea: like Robin Cohen, refining the work of William Safran, we could postulate a more positive conception of diaspora, one that emphasizes the distinctive and enriching life produced from the interaction of the Irish with natives of their host countries.

Following the work of Bailey, Barnard, Bergin, and others, this collection continues to redress a significant gap in Irish historiography by documenting some experiences of the middling Irish who made the journey to London during the long eighteenth century. These essays collectively demonstrate that Irish migrants, people of disparate backgrounds, formed networks that could variously sustain their identity, advance their professional aspirations, and allow them to orient themselves in the premier city of Europe. The hope is that this collection will move us toward a cohesive and robust account of what it might have meant to be Irish in eighteenth-century London when perceptions of the Irish were subject to the vicissitudes of popular prejudice and engrained stereotypes, to be sure, but when the Irish could, nonetheless, benefit from their networks and from the many achievements of their individual members. The Irish gained acceptance and even plaudits in many fields, particularly from the 1750s to the tumultuous 1790s, when Anglo-Irish relations regressed once more. Throughout the eighteenth century, in the fields of politics, literature, and commerce, we can observe how the Irish deftly encoded "practices of accommodation with, as well as resistance to," their host country, all the while proving Cohen's thesis that the tension between "an ethnic, a national and a transnational identity is often a creative, enriching one (7)."¹⁸ Finally, it is hoped that identifying and examining formal and informal Irish networks operating across the decades of the eighteenth century will lead to recognition that the Irish diaspora, in its various manifestations, is

an integral part of the story of London itself, and not to be read as a side-show provider of eclectic anecdotes somehow outside of the “real” history of the city.



Toby Barnard opens with a skeptical take on the notion of the “London-Irish.” In his wide-ranging survey essay, he finds little evidence that the plentiful Irish visitors to the capital saw themselves as hyphenated in this way. His essay takes account of the whole gamut of Irish visitors, short or long term, rich or poor, across the whole of the century. Summing up substantive bodies of evidence, he argues that a consistent, recognizable, metropolitan Irish identity had yet to stabilize within the capital’s environs at this point in London’s history, such was the multiplicity of forums and motives.

Nonetheless, as Helen Burke’s essay demonstrates, the capital and its inhabitants were conscious of Irish economic and cultural incursions into England. For Burke, early joke books targeting *Teague* and *Patrick* are evidence of a populace developing and circulating cultural capital that expresses anxiety in response to early Irish successes in the theater, but also, more broadly, that may be read as tacit metropolitan recognition that the Irish were set to remain part of the political and economic landscape of the city. Burke’s focus, following Gregory Bateson and Reuven Tsur, on the “ground” (insignificant background detail) of these jokes rather than on the “material” (surface material of the jokes) offers a rich perspective on the opening years of the century and an important context for the work of early Irish playwrights such as George Farquhar.

John Bergin begins his essay by pointing out that while there has been substantial scholarship on Irish Catholics in continental Europe, those that went to London have been much less well documented and researched. Bergin, using little-known, officially compiled lists of papists, draws attention to the political lobbying carried out by prominent Irish Catholics over the century, despite the penal laws then in operation. These lobbyists were also connected to lawyers, merchants, physicians, and booksellers in the capital, and, collectively, they helped fund the various spaces, such as chapels, where Catholics, including the poor, might associate. Bergin’s essay, then, is a significant step forward in establishing that a vibrant and pros-

perous Irish Catholic community was in place in London during the eighteenth century. His concluding observation that London was a stepping stone for many Irish on their way to and from the Continent is important, since, from London, the diaspora spread across Europe.

Networks of a different sort are the subject of Ric Berman's piece, which documents the creation and rise of the Antients Grand Lodge, an outpost of Irish Freemasonry in the capital. Dating from 1751, the lodge was a crucial site of Irish expatriate interaction between the lower and middling classes. By scrupulously examining the registers of the lodge, Berman shows that we can learn much about the domiciles, professions, and habits of these London inhabitants. Coupled with the papist lists Bergin uses, these registers and associated documents are exciting new sources of information on the London Irish. Indeed, Berman's elucidation of the connections between Masonic lodges in London and the Americas strongly corroborates Bergin's argument for London being an important conduit for Irish migration beyond Britain.

Just as the London Irish could move abroad, events abroad could travel back to affect the Irish at home. Part of the social and economic fabric of the capital, the Irish were consequently subject to its vicissitudes. Patrick Walsh's contribution delineates how the Irish were among the thousands that invested in the South Sea Company during 1720, subsequently suffering catastrophic losses when the bubble burst. Walsh shows that this investment was more significant than previously allowed; moreover, he demonstrates that the losses had a detrimental effect on the real economy, contrary to what others have argued. Finally, Walsh's analysis of the South Sea Company fiasco reveals how funds between Ireland and England flowed, and demonstrates how networks were necessary to manage that flow.

The next two articles both tell connected stories of Irish migratory aspiration, albeit from very different social positions, and illustrate the social mobility London offered to the Irish of all backgrounds. Moreover, both articles concern, in different ways, one of the most important Anglo-Irish families of the century, the Shelburnes. Nigel Aston's essay deals with the vexed issue of identity—were the Anglo-Irish more Irish than English or vice versa? He recounts how John Fitzmaurice moved from Kerry to London and offers his story as a case study for a future systematic exploration of Anglo-Irish integration and socialization into London society. Aston describes how John Fitzmaurice, nephew to Henry Petty, first Earl

of Shelburne, adroitly succeeded to his uncle's title in 1751. But the job was only half done, and Aston's narrative of how Shelburne, with the important assistance of his wife, achieved the desired prize of a British peerage (held in higher regard than a mere Irish title) in 1760 tells much about the negotiation of Anglo-Irish identity in London.

There is no little irony that John Petty-Fitzmaurice owed his promotion to the British peerage to the attention and patronage of Henry Fox, first Baron of Foxley. Three years later, Petty-Fitzmaurice was dead, and an acrimonious quarrel between his heir and Henry Fox left Fox so angry that he severed his connection with the new earl. Fox's enmity filtered down to his son, Charles James Fox, who wrestled with the second Earl of Shelburne for dominance of the Whig party in the early 1780s. Shelburne's difficulty, however, was another Irishman's opportunity. My essay tells the story of how a bankrupt Irish apothecary, Dennis O'Bryen, rose swiftly from a position of misfortune to become one of the most important political advisers to Fox. I argue that O'Bryen's Haymarket comedy *A Friend in Need is a Friend Indeed* (1783) was a masterstroke in proving himself worthy, both socially and politically, of mixing in the highest Whig circles. As well as reclaiming the play, which contains a fascinating conflation of ethnic identities in the Hiberno-Jewish character of Ragan, I hope to recuperate O'Bryen, an Irishman who was beside Fox all his adult life, and instrumental to his political career, but who has been neglected by eighteenth-century historians, both of the theater and of British political life.

Although Dennis O'Bryen never made it as an apothecary or surgeon, there were others who traveled to London and did rise through the ranks of the medical profession. The final essay, Craig Bailey's study of James Johnson, illuminates this neglected group. Bailey explores the degree to which the Irish could escape—and, indeed, whether they wished to escape—their Irish heritage in order to embrace the cosmopolitan opportunities of London to the full. Moreover, Bailey carefully demonstrates how later nineteenth-century sources can be used to tease out questions relating to eighteenth-century experiences, a notable methodological point.



This collection and other recent interventions are only the beginning of a much-needed exploration of the Irish experience of eighteenth-century Britain. There are obvious omissions in this collection that need to

be addressed, not least the stories of women and subalterns. Encouragingly, there has been some work done on the experiences of Irish women in London, but more needs to be done, particularly on the middle and lower classes.¹⁹ The question of the very poor will always be hampered by the paucity of sources, but London has rich records (in churches, and local governments) that have not been adequately exploited, such as those held in the London Metropolitan Archives. Developments in digital humanities resources are also exciting; the availability of excellent Internet resources such as the *Old Bailey Online* now allow scholars to drill down to a level not previously feasible.²⁰ For instance, if we were to look at John Denvir's "terrible affray" of May 1768, mentioned above, we can now read the transcript of the trial of James Murphy, James Dogan, Thomas Carnan, otherwise Carne, John Castillo, Thomas Davis, James Hammond, Hugh Henley, Michael Doyle, and Thomas Farmer, otherwise Terrible, for the murder of John Beattie, which took place on 6 July 1768. Not only does this facilitate judgments about the degree to which nationality played a part in the meting out of justice in this case (or in a statistically significant set of cases), but carefully reading these sources can provide more information about the movements of the London Irish. The brief testimony of John Welch, character witness for Doyle, informs us that he lived in Nicholas Lane, Lombard Street, and had been a clerk to an attorney in Dublin before coming to London "to be preferred by the interest of my friends." Unfortunately, he had been in London for twelve months and had failed to secure employment. Collectively, such snippets of Irish experience combine into a rich historical tapestry. To offer another example, the publication of William Godwin's diary in a digitized and fully searchable format allows us to map the activities of the London Irish in more detail than previously possible. We already knew that Dubliners John and Benjamin Binns were involved in radical political circles in London in the 1790s, but we can now see that they were members of an elite conversation club, the Philomaths, which boasted noted thinkers and activists William Godwin, Thomas Holcroft, and John Thelwall as members, along with other Irish radicals like James Agar and John Fenwick. Also, using Godwin's diary, we can plot their topics of debate against the various events of this period.²¹ Finally, we should also acknowledge the importance of the Burney Collection. If we were interested, for instance, in filling out the career of James Agar, barrister and Philomath, the newspapers are a crucial source. The period in the mid 1790s when Agar was discussing political philosophy with Godwin and

Holcroft was sandwiched between his election as deputy grandmaster to the Antients Lodge of England in December 1790, and his arrest for treason, alongside a son of John Philpott Curran's, in May 1798.²² The combination of these sources then allows for clear narrative trajectories to emerge.

Recent scholarship of the Irish in London over the course of the eighteenth century provides an encouraging impetus for further work in this area. Undoubtedly, there were many Irish who had a bleak and dismal existence over the time—Adam Smith, in a brief paean to the potato in his *Wealth of Nations*, observed that the majority of chairmen, porters, coal-heavers, and prostitutes were made up of the “lowest rank” of the Irish.²³ Yet the experiences of this rank must be synthesized with those of a successful migrant middle order, and those of an increasingly confident, influential elite, who achieved fiscal, as well as social, cultural, and political distinction, to elicit a composite and vigorous picture of the London Irish across the eighteenth century.

Notes

The essays in this collection evolved from papers first presented at a conference held at the University of Warwick, 13–14 April 2012. I am grateful to all who attended and contributed to this event. I owe a large debt to Liam Chambers and John Bergin, with whom I discussed and developed the idea of the conference: from its inception right through to this publication, they have provided invaluable guidance, not least with their judicious comments on an earlier version of this introduction. I am also very grateful to the various readers for their careful reports on the essays contained here. Particular thanks are also due to those bodies that supported the conference financially: the Department of English and Comparative Literary Studies and the Humanities Research Centre at Warwick; the British Association for Irish Studies; and, the Embassy of Ireland, Great Britain. Finally, I would also like to express my gratitude to Cedric Reverand, who warmly welcomed the idea for this special issue of *Eighteenth-Century Life* when I first proposed it. I should also note that his meticulous attention to detail, and that of his editorial team, has benefited this collection enormously.

1. James Thomas Kirkman, *Memoirs of the Life of Charles Macklin, Esq.*, 2 vols. (London: Lackington, Allen, 1799), 1:32–33.

2. John Denvir, *The Irish in Britain from the Earliest Times to the Fall and Death of Parnell* (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trüber, 1892); John Archer Jackson, *The Irish in Britain* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1963); and Donald M. MacRaild, *The Irish Diaspora in Britain, 1750–1939*, 2nd ed. (1999; Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011).

3. Donald Harmon Akenson, *The Irish Diaspora: A Primer* (Belfast: Institute of Irish Studies, 1993), 190.

4. Peter King, "Ethnicity, Prejudice, and Justice: The Treatment of the Irish at the Old Bailey, 1750–1825," *Journal of British Studies* 52 (2013): 390–414, especially 398.

5. Thomas Mahon to Peter McCormack, 7 June 1748, cited in Cathaldus Giblin, "Ten Documents Relating to Irish Diocesan Affairs, 1740–84, from Franciscan Library, Killiney," *Collectanea Hibernica* 20 (1978): 58–90; the quotation is from 74. I am grateful to John Bergin for this reference.

6. Éamonn Ó Ciardha, *Ireland and the Jacobite Cause, 1685–1766: A Fatal Attachment* (Dublin: Four Courts, 2002), and Vincent Morley, *Irish Opinion and the American Revolution, 1760–1783* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ., 2002).

7. Robin Cohen, *Global Diasporas: An Introduction*, 2nd ed. (1997; London: Routledge, 2008), 3. Fintan Cullen and Roy Foster, in *Conquering England: Ireland in Victorian England* (London: National Portrait Gallery, 2005), have shown that the Victorian period had its share of Irish successes in London.

8. M. D. George, *London Life in the Eighteenth Century* (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner, 1925), 113–25.

9. Jerry White, *London in the Eighteenth Century: A Great and Monstrous Thing* (London: Vintage, 2013), 152–62, passim.

10. Joep Leerssen has documented British "historical" and literary representations of the Irish in his *Mere Irish and Fíor Ghael* (Cork: Cork Univ., 1996), 32–150.

11. Cited in D. W. Hayton, "From Barbarian to Burlesque: The Changing Stereotype of the Irish," *Irish Economic and Social History* 15 (1988): 5–31; the quotation is from 8.

12. William Coxe, *Memoirs of the Life and Administration of Robert Walpole, Earl of Orford*, 3 vols. (London: T. Cadell and W. Davies, 1798), 3:349.

13. *The Gordon Riots: Politics, Culture, and Insurrection in Late Eighteenth-Century Britain*, ed. Ian Haywood and John Seed (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ., 2012).

14. John Bergin, "The Irish Catholic Interest at the London Inns of Court, 1674–1800," *Eighteenth-Century Ireland* 24 (2009): 36–61; Bergin, "The World of Richard Lahy, an Irish Law Agent in Eighteenth-Century London," in *Irish Provincial Cultures in the Long Eighteenth Century: Essays for Toby Barnard*, ed. Raymond Gillespie and R. F. Foster (Dublin: Four Courts, 2012), 75–92.

15. Toby Barnard, *Making the Grand Figure: Lives and Possessions in Ireland, 1641–1770* (New Haven: Yale Univ., 2004), passim.

16. Thomas M. Truxes, "London's Irish Merchant Community and North Atlantic Commerce in the Mid Eighteenth Century," *Irish and Scottish Mercantile Networks in Europe and Overseas in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries*, ed. David Dickson, Jan Parmentier, and Jane Ohlmeyer (Ghent: Academia, 2007), 271–309, and Louis Cullen, *Anglo-Irish Trade, 1660–1800* (Manchester: Manchester Univ., 1968).

17. Craig Bailey, "The Nesbitts of London and Their Networks, 1747–1817," in *Irish and Scottish Mercantile Networks*, ed. Dickson, et al., 231–50; Bailey, "From

Innovation to Emulation: London's Benevolent Society of St Patrick, 1783–1800," *Eighteenth-Century Ireland* 27 (2012): 162–84; and Bailey, *Irish London: Middle-Class Migration in the Global Eighteenth Century* (Liverpool: Liverpool Univ., 2013).

18. James Clifford, "Further Inflections: Toward Ethnographies of the Future," *Cultural Anthropology* 9 (1994): 302–38; the quotation is from 307.

19. See, for example, Deborah Heller, "Subjectivity Unbound: Elizabeth Vesey as the Sylph in Bluestocking Correspondence," *Huntington Library Quarterly* 65 (2002): 215–34; Sonja Lawrenson, "Frances Sheridan's *The History of Nourjahad* and the Sultan of Smock-Alley," *Eighteenth-Century Ireland* 26 (2011): 24–50; and Amy Prendergast, "The Literary Salon in the Eighteenth Century: The Changing Nature of Elite Sociability in France, Britain, and Ireland" (unpublished PhD dissertation, Trinity College Dublin, 2012).

20. For a cogent assessment of electronic resources pertinent to the eighteenth century, see Paddy Bullard, "Digital Humanities and Electronic Resources in the Long Eighteenth Century," *Literature Compass* (2013): 748–60. doi: 10.1111/lic3.12085.

21. *The Diary of William Godwin*, ed. Victoria Myers, David O'Shaughnessy, and Mark Philp (Oxford: Oxford Digital Library, 2010), <<http://godwindiary.bodleian.ox.ac.uk>>. On the Philomaths, see O'Shaughnessy, "Caleb Williams and the Philomaths: Recalibrating Political Justice for the Nineteenth Century," *Nineteenth-Century Literature* 66 (2012): 423–48.

22. *Morning Chronicle* (30 December 1790), and *Mirror of the Times* (26 May 1798).

23. Adam Smith, *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*, 3 vols. (Dublin: Whitestone, 1776), 1:241.

