"Djuna Barnes, so charming, so Irish, and so gifted, came to Paris in the twenties. . . . Certainly she was one of the most talented and, I think, one of the most fascinating literary figures in the Paris of the twenties" (Beach 112). This is how Sylvia Beach, founder of the bookstore "Shakespeare and Company" (and the first publisher of James Joyce’s *Ulysses*), remembers Djuna Barnes. She was part of Robert McAlmon’s “crowd,” as Beach referred to this group of expatriates, known to all those who had been members of the Greenwich Village group in New York. Dressed in a long, black opera cape originally owned by Peggy Guggenheim, Barnes was a striking figure who was soon considered the most important woman writer of the Paris community.

Barnes’s status as a legendary figure of the American expatriate culture in Paris was probably enhanced by her reclusive life-style, and the anecdotes and portraits that surrounded Barnes through her ninety years have created a picture of a controversial and complex figure. Barnes “is mentioned in nearly every memoir of the period, her beauty and caustic wit the best remembered of her characteristics” (Benstock, *Women* 230). Apart from her many female friends—among them Mina Loy, Natalie Barney, Janet Flanner, Peggy Guggenheim, and Thelma Wood (with whom she had a long, destructive affair)—she also had important male friends. T.S. Eliot was a loyal supporter of her work and James Joyce discussed his work with her. Her contemporaries praised her style and eloquence but feared her sharp tongue. McAlmon considered her a “very haughty lady quick on the uptake, with a wise-cracking tongue” (Knoll 167) and Ezra Pound, who helped Barnes in her first years in Paris but later distanced himself from her, described her as a woman who “weren’t too cuddly” (Field 107).1

Largely because Barnes only published sporadically in later life and began to withdraw almost completely into a bitter seclusion after her return to New York, her literary reputation has cast her into the role of an obscure and melancholic writer. Mostly remembered for her novel *Nightwood* (1936), which has a laudatory introduction by Eliot and was
likened to the work of Joyce, Barnes was often excluded from the modernist canon and has until recently received only little critical attention. Barnes experimented with a variety of genres—including poetry, short stories, plays, short essays and journalism, and theater reviews—and was both a portrait painter and an illustrator of her own work. Her novel *Ryder* (1928) and her play *The Antiphon* (1958) center on family life. In her poetry, *The Book of Repulsive Women* (1915), short stories (*A Book*, 1923; *A Night Among the Horses*, 1929), and in *Ladies Almanack* (1928) Barnes explores the nature of female sexuality, examining the difference within sexual difference and within gender. All her works can be read as a critique of woman's place in Western society, focusing on the relation between women's physical and psychological states. As some critics have suggested, Barnes's texts address the question of woman's relationship to her body, revealing a profound uncertainty and ambiguity towards the female body. Shari Benstock, for instance, has noted that Barnes's works provide contrasting views of women's body: the first its repulsive form, seen through the eyes of women who see themselves as a man would see them; the second the eroticized form woman sees when she has recaptured her sexuality from the patriarchal culture that appropriated it (*Women of the Left Bank*, 252-253).

In the following, I will examine Barnes's *The Book of Repulsive Women* and *Ladies Almanack*, showing how the conflicting discourses of the female body are enacted in Barnes's texts in order to explore sexual difference. I will not only analyze the frequently contradictory views of the female body in Barnes's literary texts, but also look at her texts in connection with the sexually explicit drawings that accompany these two books. Furthermore, I will also focus on the persona of Djuna Barnes, "the lady of fashion," who penned the *Ladies Almanack* and assumed the reputation of a bohemian cult figure. Photographs from this time capture her elegance and style, and of the Left Bank community she was considered the most beautiful. By taking extreme care with her appearance—she was always dressed stylishly and extravagantly despite her financial problems—Barnes sought to escape the claims her body made on her, attempting to gain control of it and freeing it from patriarchal constraints. Barnes's sartorial performances, visible both in the way she dressed and in the way in which she dressed her poems and books, are part of the cultural practice of masquerade through which
Barnes exaggerates the cultural staging of the female sex, revealing the constructed nature of sexual difference.

**Masquerading the Body**

The body for Barnes is not the locus of stable gender identity, but rather the battlefield upon which various conflicting constructions of gender and sexual identities are enacted. As recent feminist critics have pointed out, gender is itself "a corporeal style, a way of acting the body, a way of wearing one's own flesh as a cultural sign" (Butler 256). Drawing on Joan Riviere's notion of masquerade in her essay "Womanliness as a Masquerade" and Lacan's revision of that essay, theorists have sought to define "woman" as a construct that depends, for reasons social and political as well as erotic, upon masks and masquerade. Riviere argued that it was impossible to separate masquerade from womanliness. Femininity thus is already masquerade, that is, mimicry. Far from being written into nature, Butler further argues that sex and gender should be viewed as the discursive products of cultural production. As she suggests:

> Consider that a sedimentation of gender norms produces the peculiar phenomenon of a "natural sex" or a "real woman" or any number of prevalent and compelling social functions, and that this is a sedimentation that over time has produced a set of corporeal styles which, in reified form, appear as the natural configuration of bodies into sexes existing in a binary relation to one another. If theses styles are enacted, and if they produce the coherent gendered subjects who pose as their originators, what kind of performance might reveal this ostensible "cause" to be an "effect"? (Butler 140).

Masquerade and cross-dressing cut gender off from its presumed origins in biological difference and thus turn it into performance. As Butler says: "If gender attributes . . . are not expressive but performative, then these attributes effectively constitute the identity they are said to express or reveal" (141). The attributes that are ascribed to men and women thus constitute our conception of man and woman. Herein lies the attraction of camouflage and cross-dressing for women, who use these techniques in order to gain self-authorization. At the beginning of the twentieth century this strategy of self-fashioning was especially attractive for women. Female modernists, as Gubar argues, "escaped the strictures of
societally-defined femininity by appropriating the costumes they identified with freedom. By the turn of the century, moreover, many identified male clothing with such a costume of freedom” (478).

While many of Barnes’s contemporaries on the Left Bank, like Gertrude Stein, Sylvia Beach or Janet Flanner, cross-dressed in order to gain authority and freedom, Barnes staged herself as rather feminine—although she, of course, uses characters who crossdress in her works, like Dr. Matthews O’Connor in Nightwood. She took great care with her appearance and was dressed extravagantly and wore dark red lipstick and blood red nail polish (cf. Benstock, Women 253). Barnes’s glamorous beauty was depicted by numerous photographers of the period, including Man Ray and his disciple Berenice Abbott. Barnes’s ambivalence about her body is, however, “obvious in photographs of her, which are nearly always taken in profile, emphasizing the ways in which she was divided against herself” (Benstock, Women 254). Immensely vain, Barnes affected a pose that drew attention to her beauty, and it was her beauty, as Benstock says, that made her vulnerable. Natalie Barney, for instance, wrote the following portrait sketch of Barnes:

Djuna Barnes, upright, unsullied, unpolished, grew pale at the insolence of honor being accorded her. [...] I had never introduced an author more awkward and less capable of serving her own cause. [...] Djuna Barnes possesses a candor and a sense of humor which passes through Cervantes and goes right back to Rabelais. She is a curious combination of characteristics for a woman only in her thirties. Her appearance is most singular: She has a nose as sharply angled as an Eversharp pencil; her mouth has an irresistible laugh, and she squeezes her auburn hair tightly under her hat in the manner of Manet, resembling one of his most attractive sketches. One can see in the bone structure of her large hands that she rides horses, and no one has portrayed them as well as she and Degas. She is tall and slender, and her clothes fall at sharp angles against her powerful legs... (123)

Peggy Bacon described her in a similar way:

Djuna Barnes: An elegant head lifted on a slender neck and long aristocratic body. Peach-blonde hair with ripples in it. Sharply tilted, scornful nose. Light eyes in shadowy hollows with a firm, bare gaze like a Siamese cat. Mouth forms an immobile ellipse. A trifle Hapsburg: Gives the effect of a solitary wading-bird, indifferent,
Robert McAlmon considered her “far too good-looking and witty not to command fondness and admiration for [him], even when she is rather overdoing the grande dame manner and talking soul and ideals” (Knoll 167-168). Barnes, as her contemporaries agree, was reclusive, but she was a performer (cf. Broe 5) and McAlmon’s statement concerning her “overdoing her grande dame manner” captures Barnes’s theatricality of appearance.

Barnes’s strategies of self-fashioning and her creation of masks, as I argue, enabled her to enact in her writings the otherwise impossible, namely to give voice and visibility to what has been silenced and erased. Engaging the contradictory and complex multiplicity of the female subject, she uses the representation of the body as a site of struggle to represent female desire. Masquerade doubles representation and, as Mary Ann Doane suggests, “is constituted by a hyperbolization of the accoutrements of femininity” (185). As an excess of femininity, masquerade destabilizes the image of woman and holds it at a distance. Barnes’s ambivalent relationship to her body and her reluctance to position herself should, I think, not be read as a weakness that also manifests itself in her literary texts. Her creation of masks has rather served as an enabling device through which she was able to resist the cultural confinements of the female body. Through the practices of masquerade Barnes uses stereotypical definitions of femininity in order to question them, deconstructing the cultural assumption of femaleness and the female body. This emphasis on the deconstructive nature of Barnes sartorial performance, always undoing itself as part of its process of self-enactment, is, I think, what makes her performance theoretically as well as politically and erotically interesting.

Repulsive and Eroticized Bodies: Barnes’s The Book of Repulsive Women

Beginning as a young and enthusiastic newspaper reporter in 1913, Barnes soon gained entrance to the Greenwich Village community of artists and bohemians, many of whom later joined the Paris expatriate community in the 1920s. In 1915, in New York, she published The Book of Repulsive Women: 8 Rhythms and 5 Drawings in Guido Bruno's
Chapbook Series. This collection of poems and explicit drawings on the subject of female sexuality—written ten years before Radclyffe Hall’s *The Well of Loneliness*—addresses what is called the “bitter secret” (*Book 14*), namely lesbianism. Seen as technically derivative of the *fin de siècle* decadent and symbolist movement, the poems in this book make use of rhyming, regularly metered stanzas and emblematic style that most critics have interpreted as a disguise of the “perversity” of her depicted subjects. As Kannenstine argues, the “alternating attitudes of fascination toward and repulsion from the spectacle of human wreckage show up in conspicuous stylistic excesses” (19). Style was meant to help obscure “the lure of the perverse” from an unsuspecting reading public and thus managed to get the book past the censors (cf. Galvin 86). It may be true that style acts as a protective covering, a mask which works as camouflage, for what might otherwise be censored. But unlike other modernist poems, such as the poems of Marianne Moore, in which the emphasis of the materiality of language eclipses the bodily materiality, the sexual specificity, which already becomes apparent in the title of the book, can easily be detected in these poems. Style, as Benstock argues, rather becomes “code: available to those who ‘know,’ unavailable to those who do not” (245). The sixth stanza of the poem entitled “From Fifth Avenue Up,” for example, reads:

```
See you sagging down with bulging
Hair to sip,
The dappled damp from some vague
Under lip.
Your soft saliva, loosed
With orgy, drip (*Book 14*)
```

If these lines are read as a fairly direct reference to lesbian sexuality, it soon becomes clear that the poems deal with the unrepresentable desire of the lesbian subject. Struggling with the internalization of oppressive attitudes and representational codes in the area of sexuality, the lesbian subject cannot inhabit a clear-cut place of opposition from which she can dismantle the representations of female desire and the female body. Instead, lesbian desire and the lesbian body themselves become the locus of negotiation and de(con)struction. The poems thus enact the undoing of oppositions of sex and gender by exploring the other, and inhabiting the spaces of the between where seeming opposites come together. This project is necessarily located in the future and, in fact,
Barnes’s *Book of Repulsive Women* projects itself into the future, the “someday”:

Someday beneath some hard  
Capricious star-  
Spreading its light a little  
Over far,  
We’ll know you for the woman  
That you are. (*Book 13*)

The use of the future and the subjunctive tense in the following lines, as in “We’d see your body in the grass” (*Book 14*), point to the impossibility of ever being able to represent female desire.  

*The Book of Repulsive Women* thus engages the contradictory and complex multiplicity of the lesbian subject. While the word “repulsive” catches the reader’s eye in the title of this collection, it is only explicitly mentioned once in the poems, that is in the fourth poem “Seen from the ‘L’.” The word “repulsive” stands, however, in direct relation to the word “vivid,” so that the judgmental value of this word is undermined:

Though her lips are vague as fancy  
In her youth—  
They bloom vivid and repulsive  
As the truth  
Even vases in the making  
Are uncouth. (*Book 24*)

The highly stylized black-and-white illustrations, which are reminiscent of the drawings of Aubrey Beardsley, further add to the depiction of “repulsive, diseased” lesbianism. The drawings show woman as fragmented, grotesque, and abstract. But the illustrations, which feature a “familiar repertoire of mesmerized or vampirish females in commerce with a variety of unclean spirits” (Burke 71), take the Beardsleyan technique to an extreme, deconstructing the binary of “respectable” and “disreputable” woman. Revealing an awareness of the difficulty of representing sexual difference from a woman’s perspective, the illustrations distort and dismantle the female body in order to recuperate it. Carolyne Burke argues that the woman or the women represented in this book are described as repulsive because they correspond to “the old images of women” which Barnes “needed to kill off” so that “a different vision might become possible” (70). The term “repulsive,” however,
could also refer to the dominant cultural attitudes toward women, and by parodying mimicry of the morality of a heterosexist society, and camouflaging the female body as repulsive, Barnes reminds the reader “of the multiple levels of repulsion/attraction at work within the outsider observer’s role” (Galvin 92). Through the satirical use of rhyme and verse patterns whose repetitions mock the very subject matter that they are in the process of unfolding, Barnes’s use of the decadent, melancholic vision becomes obvious. Barnes self-reflexively refers to her “crooked” rhyme in the line “Dropping crooked into rhyme.” This satiric game is stressed when she then rhymes the words “vice” and “virtue”:

Ravelling grandly into vice
Dropping crooked into rhyme.
Slipping through the stitch of virtue,
Into crime. (Book 24)

Barnes’s chapbook reveals the speaker’s response to the “short, sharp modern Babylonic cries” of the new women. In poems with titles like “From Third Avenue On” and “Seen from the ‘L’,” the anonymity of the urban wasteland provides her nameless female subjects with the freedom of movement which culminates in disillusionment and spiritual death. The book ends with two short suicide poems in which two dead bodies are on display. “Corpse A,” as the speaker implies, had a potential: dead, she is “a small shattered/Cocoon/. . . / all the subtle symphonies of her/A twilight rune.” The second corpse receives no kindness in its description: it is “shock-abbreviated/As a city cat,” and is lying “out flat listlessly like some small mug/Of beer gone flat” (Book 35-36). The decadence and degenerations of women’s bodies in The Book of Repulsive Women, it seems, is an effect of patriarchal culture. As Benstock puts it, the modern woman “is estranged from a society that sacrifices her body on a patriarchal altar” (Women 241). The recuperation of the female body and the attempt to make visible what has been invisible thus involves a textual destruction of the lesbian body.
Writing the Lesbian Body: Barnes’s Ladies Almanack

*Ladies Almanack* is also concerned with women who love women. Published privately in Paris in 1928, in an edition of 1,050 copies, the book contains twenty-two pen and ink drawings. *Ladies Almanack* is a satire on Natalie Barney’s group of women, the Académie des Femmes, which met every Friday to read women’s writings. Barney figures as Evangeline Musset in the book. Barnes does not appear in the text, but masquerades as a “Lady of Fashion,” mocking, as Lanser puts it, “the classic denotation of female chastity in a virtual conflation of ‘lady’ and ‘lesbian’” (157).

Described by its author as a “slight satiric wigging” (qtd. in Benstock, *Women* 249), the book has evoked conflicted readings. While Kannenstine considers it a “virtually plotless exercise in technique” (33), in which style “gradually turns upon itself in parody” (49), he also sees moments of “Sapphic manifesto” (56) in the text. Andrew Field calls it a “lusty little book” (125), whose “finest portions . . . are about melancholy” (127). Recently, feminist critics have viewed the book both as “wicked satire” (Jay 185) and a celebration of lesbianism (Lanser).6 Such divergent readings reflect the conflicting discourse of lesbianism in the texts. As Benstock puts it, “*Ladies Almanack* reveals Barnes’s enormous ambivalence about the sexual and social privilege it satirizes” (“Sapphic Modernism” 186). The text plays a double role, vacillating between positions, as the text is addressed to the women who are themselves the butt of satire. It thus crosses the “double cross” of the hetero-/homosexual boundary, relinquishing “the power of cultural control over the text, letting the text ‘speak itself’ as the writer retracts the psychic fissures” (Benstock, “Sapphic Modernism” 188).

Again this text is illustrated, but unlike the stylized silhouettes of *The Book of Repulsive Women, Ladies Almanack* is full of details delineated with the apparently naïve perspective and technique of the “ancient chapbooks and broadsheets and *images populaires,*” which Barnes acknowledges as her sources in the foreword to the 1972 Harper edition. The cover is based on *L’imagerie populaire* by “making ladies out of the soldiers following their leader and by putting a skirt on the leader’s coat” (Doughty 146). The rest of the book is illustrated with baroque and medieval grotesques, parodying iconography, sexual caricature, feminized zodiacs, and other archaic emblems.
Like the drawings the sexual language is also in disguise and the book is in a sense about “getting it.” According to Field, “the language is a tossed salad of ingredients” (126), exhibiting many neologisms combined with Elizabethan diction, strangely peppered with punctuation. The text speaks cryptically and evasively. Apparently written for women—the text advertises itself as “the book all ladies should carry” (LA 5)—Ladies Almanack writes the lesbian body, with the lone voice of Patience Scalpel (who is modeled on Mina Loy) interjecting the heterosexual point of view. It tells the mock-heroic story of its patron saint Dame Musset within the twelve calendar months of the almanac. The calendar is a celebration of woman’s accomplishments, it lists her “tides and moons,” her “spring fevers, love philters and winter feasts,” but it is also a depiction of her “distempers”—the signs of her “fallen” condition. Since the fall of Eve, the pain of the world has been rooted in sexual difference, and the “Earth sucked down her generations, Body for Body.” The Ladies Almanack provides an alternative to this tale of heterosexual aggression, offering a lesbian creation myth in the birth of the first Woman born with a difference:

Evangeline Musset was not one of these, for she had been developed in the Womb of her most gentle Mother to be a Boy, when therefore, she came forth an Inch or so less than this . . . (LA 7)

From the original story of Dame Musset to the debates on lesbian marriage staged by “Lady Buck-and-Balk” (Lady Una Troubridge) and Lady Tilly-Tweed-in-Blood (Radclyffe Hall) to the Zodiac in which Barnes spins a lesbian creation myth, as becomes apparent in the section “This is the part of Heaven that has never been told” (LA 24), Barnes presents a wide variety of lesbian existence.

The signs of the zodiac are pictured in relation to a part of woman’s body, each described erotically: “the longing leg,” “the twining thigh,” “the seeking arm,” and “the hungry heart” (LA 52). Woman’s womb becomes “the spinning centre of a spinning world” (LA 51). The book thus involves the textual construction of the lesbian body and lesbian desire as well as the destruction of conventional codes that govern the representation of female desire and the female body, as object of male heterosexual desire. The body, as a consequence, becomes fragmented. As Sielke sums up the dilemma of the modern woman artist: if female subjectivity is problematized, “a deconstructive aesthetics necessarily
reinscribes femininity as fragmentation" (Sielke 62). In the "October" section we find the various parts of the female body almost dancing on the page. But it is the multiplicity of the meaning that attaches to the parts and the whole of the female body that allows for diverse reconnections and connections to be made.

*Ladies Almanack* also attempts to discover the pleasure of woman's speech, and, as Lanser puts it, the text speaks in "tongues" (Lanser 164). In trying to define the feminine, Barnes's text clearly anticipates the French feminist notion of *écriture feminine*. In "The Laugh of the Medusa" Hélène Cixous argues that writing the body becomes a way of giving voice to repressed female sexuality and the female libido which it sustains:

> By writing her self, woman will return to the body which has been more than confiscated from her, which has been turned into the uncanny stranger on display—the ailing or dead figure, which so often turns out to be the nasty companion, the cause and location of inhibitions. Censor the body and you censor breath and speech at the same time. (Cixous 250)

The reclamation of the tongue also entails a recuperation of the female voice. In the "December" section Evangeline Musset dies, and after various funeral services and rituals of mourning she is finally cremated. Her tongue, however, "would not suffer Ash," but "flickers to this day ... on the altar in the temple of love" (*LA* 84). In transforming death to sexual resurrection *Ladies Almanack* reclaims the positivity of the female body. The tongue is celebrated as a sexual instrument, counteracting "emerging Freudian notions of phallic supremacy and clitoral insufficiency" (Lanser 162). For all its symbolic affirmation, the tongue, as Frann Michel has pointed out, remains a troubling image, as it cannot speak (cf. 182). While *Ladies Almanack* speaks pleasure and delight, it does so equivocally, displaying the "otherness of the cultural norm that recognizes its Other only in fear or mockery" (Benstock, "Sapphic Modernism 189).

*Ladies Almanack* can be read as affirmative, "but its affirmation depends upon an unstable irony that also invokes the masculine: the text is always potentially compromised by that which it subverts" (Michel 182). The transformational power of Barnes's writings, with its feminist content, is thus a function of reading, of encoding and decoding the masked ambiguity. Barnes's sartorial performance involves a
questioning of the "naturalness" of gender roles through various bodily discourses. Her texts celebrate the multiplicity of voices, heterodox forms and genres, inscribing gender and sexuality through subversive engagement with language. Her books and poems together with her self-stylized representation of her body as a site of signifying practices and a scene of cultural inscription form one textual "body," which serves as a locus where the cultural construction of various, conflicting identities (female/male, feminine/masculine, hetero-/homosexual) are subverted and transgressed through bodily practices.

Notes
1 For a detailed description of Barnes's relationship to Eliot, Joyce and Pound, see Andrew Field's biography *Djuna*, 104-111. Field also quotes a letter written by Pound to Eliot in 1937, in which Pound pokes fun at Barnes by composing a limerick about her: "There once wuzza lady named Djuna,/Who wrote rather like a baboon. Her/Blubbery prose had no fingers or toes,/And we wish Whale had found this out sooner" (108). The "whale" is a reference to Ford Madox Ford, who had published Barnes's work in the *Transatlantic Review*. For more information on the circle of Barnes's friends in Paris, see also Stromberg 63-89.
2 In 1962 the *Selected Works of Djuna Barnes* became available and since the 1970s scholars have begun to publish book-length studies of her work. In *The Art of Djuna Barnes: Duality and Damnation* (1977), Louis Kannenstine, for instance, acknowledges that "it is indeed time to give Djuna Barnes her due, first by establishing the literary context within which her work belongs and second by recognizing its formal achievement and thematic consistency, qualities not readily apparent upon a piecemeal examination (x). Barnes has become a cult figure for feminists, Mary Lynn Broe's critical anthology *Silence and Power: A Reevaluation of Djuna Barnes* (1991) having initiated a new era in Barnes criticism.
3 Much of the criticism has taken a biographical approach to Barnes's work, taking her ambiguous statement concerning her sexual orientation, "I'm not lesbian. I just loved Thelma" (Field 37 and 101), as evidence for the sexually ambiguous characters of her texts, and arguing that Barnes's codedness and opaque style were the result of her unstable sexual identity and her problems with her body. Conversely, many studies have attempted to read Barnes's texts as autobiographical, trying to determine her sexual identity with the consequence that Barnes and her texts "will once more be reduced to a cult personality, to a counter-myth in feminist couleur" (Bronfen 169). For a good overview of some biographical studies of Barnes, see Bretschneider 17-23. In my analysis of Barnes's sartorial performance, I view the name Barnes as a discursive construct, treating the above mentioned biographical details concerning her style and looks as textual representation that can be read together with her books.
4 In *Ladies of Fashion*, Alexandra Busch argues that apart from *Ladies Almanack*, the female body in Barnes's texts is a negative locus of female identity, a view that stems from Barnes's inability to control her body, which she gradually destroyed through her alcoholism (63-66). See also Benstock, who argues that "there is little evidence from Barnes's writing that her own body ever gave her much pleasure" (*Women* 255).
Sabine Sielke, for instance, argues that Moore in her poems camouflages the female body, using the “dazzling surface of her poems as a kind of ‘martial arts’ in order to construct a female subject and protect the body from the male gaze” (35).

6 Jay analyzes the economic and social factors that structure Barnes’s satire, arguing that because of her financial problems Barnes was an outsider among the wealthy clique of American expatriates. In writing this book, Barnes “bit the very hands that brought Ladies Almanack into existence (185).

7 The full title of the book reads: Ladies Almanack. Showing their Signs and their tides; their Moons and their Changes; the Seasons as it is with them; their Eclipses and Equinoxes; as well as a full Record of diurnal and nocturnal Distempers written and illustrated by a Lady of Fashion.
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