on Bumpers" (perhaps a follow-up by the same author), which satirically described a company of "clever, jovial Fellows" reading the first article aloud in a tavern. Tom Fuddle assumed that "every Body, from the highest to the lowest" drank bumpers, while Will Tipple declared, "I wou'd not give a Farthing for a Man's Company that won't be social!" The company laughed at the essayist's favorable example of Philadelphia, saying that its inhabitants drank bumpers less frequently because of the Quaker City's "Stinginess." As essayists evaluated the benefits of sociable drinking, they walked the line between politeness and bawdy wit, just as the tavern clubs themselves did.66

In a satire on the "Customs of the Province of Drinkallia," a contributor to the New-York Weekly Journal described a town resembling an English tankard, fortified with barrels and roofed with the boards of broken casks. The city arms depicted leeches (alcoholics and hangers-on were often called sponges or leeches), with the motto "When full we are at Rest." Inhabitants drank morning and night. "All claim a Liberty of speech on any Subject," the author wrote, "and from this claim, two or three generally speak at once," on philosophy, love, commerce, and debauchery. "They generally discuss Points of Religion when they have drank most, and settle the State best when they can stand least." According to the laws of Drinkallia, all bargains were sealed with half a bottle; all oaths were void after 3 P.M., no one could drink alone more than two days in a row, and no one could preach temperance. Upon entering any house, the host or tavernkeeper offered strong wine or liquor to the stranger—to refuse labeled the visitor not just ill-bred but traitorous. Such was this satirist's view of New York City—a place that, for all the Hungarian Club's pretensions to regularity, was fundamentally soaked in disorder.67 The tavern's regulations and rituals either represented an empty contradiction or a useful polite fiction, depending on one's perspective. Meanwhile, these satires perpetuated the notion that taverns were open to all men and all viewpoints.

Many critics called for good manners, which would organize men according to their politeness and erudition. Hamilton mocked an "incoherent" tavernkeeper who proclaimed the equality of souls before God, and he scorned a musician whose conversation was fit only for "ignorant blockheads."68 In response to such offenses, many New York taverngoers aspired to even greater heights of orderly sociability. They adopted refined manners, dress, speech, and conversation in a tavern, which would allow them greater access to polite respectability, and perhaps social and economic advancement. Men of wealth and status might face social exclusion if they did not learn and follow the standards of polite sociability.69 Even governors were not immune to lapses in politeness. The lawyer William Smith Jr. heard that Lord Dunmore "fuddled" with drink, had acted like "a silly extravagant Buck" and "a damned Fool" at a feast of the Sons of St. Andrew in 1770. "He grounds all upon his being noisy and clamorous in giving the Toasts . . . at the Table" and had "sunk himself to the vilest

baudy Healths." The company was astonish'd

the witness, and Dunmore had "done for Dunmore sure to be "lampooned and despised / circumspect involving my own [reputation] / disreputable among all sorts of People, & in Confidence."70 Raucous behavior off Smith, who attempted to elevate himself to next table. Yet such hierarchical categorization of insinence on gentility clashed with the level would be an important lesson to those who beholders during the imperial crisis.

In the midst of this discussion of social

Presbyterian lawyers introduced new formal

ability to New York. Smith, William Livingstone, Yale graduates who went on to hold political

These three sought to mobilize city dwellers by launching a number of projects for civic

knowledge as counterweights to state and
criticized the drinking that comprised so much of a young man. Livingston had written, "Mis-
this ignorant generation." Instead, "Bacchus, the greater number." For his own part, Livin-
really think is the last Vice that ever I shall

omination as "the Philosopher" seems to have

Thomas Jones wrote that Livingston was so

similarly resistant to the tavern culture.

"a steady, demure, puritanical countenance;"

Livingston criticized his friend Smith for

"Compunction of Conscience" when it came to

seems to have taken a drink now and then;

evenings he spent "soaking at Tavern with a
general "Damned Hurly burly of the town."

company than the other two; as Jones

hearty, free and engaging disposition, loved com-
pension." When he later ran for office, Scott's
him at "Sot's Hall," criticized a mind "much in

Excess," and said he "dams all but Favourable

Livingston and his companions wrote essays attacking New Yorkers' luxurious drinking, effects of gambling, comparable to the well-

as such as John Adams of Massachusetts,

Philadelphia.71 The three also founded the

Useful Knowledge, which offered its members

as an alternative to the bawdy songs, smoke-

nance, licentiousness, and drunkenness of the