Poetry

In 2021, the global pandemic disrupted research into eighteenth-century poetry, as it disrupted more or less everything else. The most obvious markers of this crisis in this year's publications are the notes acknowledging the collective labour that enabled scholars to work through periods of social isolation. And work they did. Perhaps this is what is most remarkable about this year's review, the sheer number of new studies published (4 books, 15 chapters, and 23 articles). This tally excludes Pat Rogers's hefty new book on Alexander Pope and Edmund Curll, *The Poet and the Publisher*, which unfortunately was received too late to be included in 2021's survey, and which will therefore be reviewed next year. Nevertheless, the above figures are broadly consistent with data from the last five volumes of *YWES*, and they are slightly above the annual average for the last ten-year period (5 books, 12 chapters, 18 articles). In other words, even at the height of the pandemic, publishing output as a whole did not fall. Strains are visible in the corpus, however, and not just in the author notes. Some specialist journals published fewer issues, a shortfall that was made up elsewhere by larger general-interest journals, most notably *RES*, which published significantly more articles on eighteenth-century poetry than usual. This should remind us, as we take stock of the impact of coronavirus, that it is important not only to focus on the headline figures, but also on uneven patterns of distribution.

A similar point can be made about longer-term developments in the field. In this context, the most striking feature of this year's corpus is the centrality of book historical methods. As an organizing paradigm, the influence of book history has been growing for several decades; nevertheless, recently it seems to have achieved a new level of prominence. There are multiple factors which have contributed to this shift, some of which will be touched upon later in this review. Within the last decade, however, the emergence of Digital Humanities has played a particularly important role in accelerating the trend. Alongside and intersecting with these methodological innovations, broader institutional shifts may also have favoured the rapid growth of book history. As readers of this journal will know, the last ten years have not generally been easy for literary departments in the UK and USA. Many have endured further neoliberal restructuring programs, combined with precipitous falls in student enrolments; and there has been a consequent slackening of the entire labour market. Bearing this in mind, we might hypothesise that the way book historical scholarship lends itself to new digital work practices – leading to diversified, technologically innovative, and in some cases public-facing research outputs – has made this area of research more competitive in bids to secure diminishing pools of funding, and thus attractive to scholars in a period of intensifying austerity. To suggest as much is not to disparage the quality of the studies produced, but rather to offer a hypothesis for why book history has now emerged as one of the

most dynamic areas of research in eighteenth-century poetry. (By extension, imagine the kind of multifarious flourishing which might take place if there were more holistic investment in literary research, in and beyond the academy.)

Our survey begins this year with a cluster of works which do not just use book historical methods as one set of tools amongst others, but which actively thematise the sub-discipline, and seek to contribute to its ongoing theorization. This group includes several journal articles, which will be reviewed together in subsequent paragraphs. First, however, we need to start by addressing the most substantial new work in this field, which in 2021 was Carly Watson's debut book, *Miscellanies, Poetry, and Authorship, 1680–1800*. In this ambitious and wide-ranging study, Watson aims to present the most comprehensive history of late seventeenth- and eighteenth-century poetic miscellanies yet published. Her work here builds on a rich seam of shorter studies from the last decade or so, and it has a particularly direct link to the recent special issue of *Eighteenth-Century Life* edited by Jennifer Batt and Abigail Williams: 'Poetry and Popularity in Eighteenth-Century Poetic Miscellanies: New Findings from the Digital Miscellanies Index' (*ECL* 41:i[2017]). (The issue was reviewed in full by my colleague, Robert Scott, in *YWES* 98[2019], 604–6). Indeed, from 2014 to 2017, Watson herself was a project manager working on the Digital Miscellanies Index (DMI), and alongside Batt and Williams, she helped to design the online archive, available at https://dmi.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/. Part of what Watson's book does, it is fair to say, is consolidate this earlier research on miscellanies and the DMI, by filling in gaps, and confirming previously speculative theories. This is all useful scientific work; and Watson goes further, by making a number of new discoveries about the reception and production of miscellanies which will fundamentally reshape how we understand the earlier findings.

The most significant of these discoveries is that miscellanies in the long eighteenth century were not inherently defined as works of mixed authorship, as they usually are today; instead, they were defined by their generically mixed contents. This means that modern literary scholarship has often failed to recognise a major subdivision of the form—namely, 'single-author miscellanies' (p. 3). Watson explores the implications of this finding mostly in her third chapter. Before moving to summarise these implications, though, and the other claims made throughout the book, it is worth briefly pausing to consider the compositional structure that Watson has adopted. The feature which stands out here is the relatively discrete focus of the eight chapters, each of which, perhaps with the exception of the Introduction and Conclusion ('Chapter 1' and 'Chapter 8'), might easily be read as a standalone essay. This impression is heightened by the way that each chapter first reviews the existing critical literature, then elaborates upon new findings, before concluding with its own set of endnotes

and a bibliography. Given the book's subject matter, on one level this pattern is fitting; it certainly emphasises the thematically varied contents of the volume. However, the format inevitably has both its strengths and its limitations. On the one hand, the serial structure facilitates discontinuous reading, and therefore will be convenient for students and researchers who are seeking a quick point of entry into a particular debate. On the other hand, readers who are interested in the book's cumulative as well as its topical arguments will sometimes have to work a little harder to keep these overarching claims in view.

These claims are presented in the form of a classic narrative of rise and decline. In the 1680s, Watson argues, a new type of miscellany emerged, which served as an important venue for the public exchange of coterie and quasi-coterie verse. The next forty years were the golden age for this style of poetic collection; but from approximately 1730, it became increasingly residual. Watson first establishes this chronology in Chapter 1, where she sets up her argument that 'the miscellany played an important and to some extent overlooked role in the self-fashioning of eighteenth-century authors' (p. 9). Chapter 2 makes this point more concretely, by focusing on the sociable model of authorship pioneered in Aphra Behn's *Miscellany* (1685), and by the six Dryden-Tonson miscellanies (1684–1716). Unlike earlier collections of anonymous drolleries and didactic verse, Watson suggests that these books, and their many imitators, provided a generative space in which established and emerging authors could showcase their talent in a spirit of amicable rivalry. In Chapter 3, we return to the crucial and hitherto neglected category of single-author miscellanies. To demonstrate the historical salience of this format, Watson here turns to quantitative methods, exploring trends across a new bibliography of all the single-author miscellanies published between 1680 and 1799 (the bibliography is published with the book, as 'Appendix A', pp. 239–72). The level of analysis contracts to a more human scale in Chapter 4, which examines the literary career of Richardson Pack (1682–1728), a military officer who produced two volumes of Dryden-inspired miscellany verse. Chapter 5 explores the competitive relationship between miscellanies and periodicals. In Watson's telling, this intimate struggle saw the literary magazine first break away from, and then ultimately overtake the miscellany as the preeminent site of sociable verse publication. A further source of competition is identified in Chapter 6, which charts the rise of the 'historical anthology', a mode which displaced the flexible conversation of peer-poets with the rigidity of canonization (p. 160). Using data from the DMI, Watson shows that for every decade after 1710–1719, the ten most widely published miscellany authors were no longer living. (The list of top-ranked authors for each decade are given in 'Appendix B', pp. 273–76.) Chapter 7 qualifies this picture of creeping ossification, focusing on the way readers created their own poetic miscellanies, either by inserting printed material into manuscript volumes (and vice versa), or by binding

pamphlets together into unique composite books, known today as '*Sammelbände*' (p. 192). Finally, Chapter 8 presents Watson's concluding reflections, and briefly extends her arguments to cover miscellanies published in the nineteenth century.

As the foregoing summary aims to foreground, *Miscellanies, Poetry, and Authorship, 1680–1800* is a study that opens up new avenues of research on multiple fronts. The two appendices alone should help to facilitate much interesting comparative work. Furthermore, Watson's study exhibits one of the most appealing traits that has helped to secure book history its current centrality: its ability to retrieve previously marginalised voices from the literary archive. This emphasis is apparent in Watson's attention to the important role of women in the production of miscellany verse—and not just well-known figures like Behn, but also provincial writers like Elizabeth Teft (pp. 80–81) and Mary Jones (pp. 138–45). This same recuperative impulse informs Watson's discussion of the labouring-class writers who sought to emulate the literary and social example set by Stephen Duck (pp. 71–81). Indeed, this latter section contains some of the most suggestive passages of commentary in the entire book. This underscores not only Watson's own considerable methodological versatility, but also the broader resurgence of interest in eighteenth-century studies, noted last year (*YWES* 101[2022]), in questions of class politics. It is a shame then, that despite repeatedly describing her own computational methods as 'distant reading' (p. 16, pp. 177–78), Watson nowhere references Franco Moretti, the scholar who famously coined this term. Moretti's data-driven analysis of literature and social class would certainly have been germane here, as would his Wallersteinian theory of the relationship between literary production in the metropole and periphery. Yet notwithstanding this obvious omission, Watson's book is a valuable new resource for scholars working on the poetry of the period. It answers some research questions, and it marks others for future inquiry. This collegial generosity, in the spirit of 'fruitful doing', still sometimes feels like a rare quality in publications in the Humanities.

Turning now to the articles on book historical subjects, there are four works here which require particular attention. Two of these articles are associated with forthcoming research outputs (more evidence of the sub-field's vitality), and will therefore be reviewed first, since they provide readers with intriguing and potentially useful glimpses into work currently still in progress. The study with the closest thematic link to Watson's book is Betty A. Schellenberg's article, 'Eighteenth-Century Manuscript Verse Miscellanies and the Print-Manuscript Interface' (*HLQ* 84:i[2021] 151–64). This comes from a special issue of the *Huntingdon Library Quarterly* dedicated to 'Women and Book History, 1660–1830', edited by Schellenberg herself, in collaboration with Michelle Levy. The article presents some initial findings from Schellenberg's project,

Manuscript Verse Miscellanies 1700–1820, which involves a team of researchers digitizing materials from North American and British holdings (the evolving archive is available at https://dhil.lib.sfu.ca/mvm). One reason that nobody has previously attempted a complete survey of these works is that they have often been regarded as derivative, since many feature verse that had already been printed in books and/or contemporary periodicals. In addition, Schellenberg suspects, the fact that the large majority of the manuscripts seem to have been compiled by women may have prejudiced researchers against the task. In any case, today, neither of these reasons can serve as a barrier to taking the works seriously. Much like Watson, Schellenberg is interested in the acts of everyday creativity that were involved in selecting, adapting, and copying texts into these unique manuscript books. Her deliberately playful case-study focuses on *A Collection of Poems by Various Hands*, a miscellany compiled by Elizabeth Peart in 1768 (MS Eng. Poet. E. 28, Bodleian Library), which contains a surprisingly large group of poems about squirrels.

By contrast, the second article here is deeply, almost manneredly, studious in its argumentative style. This is N. K. Sugimura's commentary on 'Benjamin Stillingfleet's Notes on *Paradise Lost*, Lost and Found' (*RES* 72[2021] 900–32). Towards the end of the article, Sugimura suggests that Stillingfleet's notes claim John Milton as a champion for the "Ancients" in the period's unfolding *Querelle*. In doing so, whether consciously or not, Stillingfleet's observations uncover 'internal tensions latent in the poetry" challenging "the success of Milton's theodicy' (p. 932). These are obviously far-reaching claims, which may have important consequences for our understanding of the literary history of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. However, for a full statement of the argument, readers will have to wait for the publication of Sugimura's book, *'Perplexity of Contending Passions'* (under contract with Oxford University Press), which will examine Milton's influence on later writers. Meanwhile, throughout the first sections of her article, Sugimura instead focuses on demonstrating that the manuscript BL. C.134.h.1, an interleaved copy of Richard Bentley's 1732 edition of the poem, does not in fact contain Stillingfleet's holograph notes, as generations of scholars have assumed; rather, it contains a selective transcription of Stillingfleet's notes, with additions, by his friend Thomas Dempier. The actual location of Stillingfleet's notes on *Paradise Lost*, Sugimura shows, is in the V&A Museum (National Art Gallery Dyce 6609). She then proceeds to recount in detail how these two sets of notes were produced, and the likely sequence of events that led to the initial confusion, in 1849, when the Dempier volume entered the British Library's collection. Along the way, Sugimura suggests that some modern scholars really ought to have known better.

The two remaining book historical articles are less cutting, but nevertheless also seek to overturn what the authors regard as persistent errors in the scholarship. More specifically, both are concerned with the way that

the career of the influential bookseller Robert Dodsley has been misunderstood, distorting historians' understanding of his contemporary intellectual milieu. Thus, in 'Publishing *The Museum* (1746–1747)' (*RES* 72[2021] 933–54), Leah Orr questions the received narrative that Dodsley was the main driving force behind this magazine. Her argument is a good example of the way that book historical approaches can operate at a medium scale—focusing on corpuses less massive than those sifted by Schellenberg and Watson, but still working with units of analysis larger than individual poems. In response to the claim that Dodsley halted production of the periodical in order to create an opening in the market for his *Collection of Poems by Several Hands* (1748), Orr points out that there was actually fairly little overlap between the two works: by her reckoning, only 12.3% of the poems included in the miscellany had previously featured in the periodical (p. 948). Furthermore, and again contrary to previous assumptions, Dodsley never held sole ownership of *The Museum*. This is clear from a legal instrument drawn up in 1745, which Orr reproduces here as an appendix (pp. 952–54). All of this, Orr is surely right, should invite a reconsideration of the topography of the mid-century literary marketplace.

The aim of Alison Horgan's article, 'Miscellaneous Spaces of Enlightenment: Dodsley, Percy, and the Midcentury Verse Miscellany' (*ECL* 45:iii[2021] 197–212), is in some ways more expansive. Horgan wants to propose a new understanding of the period known as 'the Enlightenment', which in her view has too often been identified with the spread of belligerently critical attitudes. She takes particular issue with Marilyn Butler's claim, in *Mapping Mythologies* (2015), that the "most consistent feature of eighteenth-century literature is its oppositional bias, its search for alternatives to the status quo" (cited p. 201). Instead, what Horgan finds, through a close comparison of Dodsley's *Collection of Poems by Several Hands* and Thomas Percy's *Reliques of Ancient English Poetry* (1765), is evidence of a more tolerant and polyphonic Enlightenment. These miscellanies include a range of different voices, and they do so in emphatically different, but not necessarily antagonistic styles. Horgan's close readings here are deft; nevertheless, the broader theory that these readings are recruited for is only partly convincing. Straight away, the *Reliques of Ancient English Poetry* seems like an odd choice for an argument about non-factional poetry. Horgan does not refer to them here, but there are of course many works—including Marilyn Butler's own, rather impressive essay, 'Antiquarianism (Popular)', in *An Oxford Companion to the Romantic Age* (1999)—which explore Percy's partisan cultural politics, and the oppositional responses his miscellany provoked.

Without stretching the point too far, this curious moment of oversight in Horgan's argument may be taken as emblematic of a more general risk currently facing book historians – a risk not always successfully

navigated, for example, in even as otherwise meticulous a piece of scholarship as Watson's *Miscellanies, Poetry, and Authorship, 1680–1800*. There is, in short, a risk that the recent turn to emphasize the inclusiveness and communality of certain modes of writing and reading will blunt attention to counterexamples, where the rivalry expressed is not amicable and interpersonal, but energised instead by very real political hatreds, and by the corresponding need to deepen bonds of solidarity amongst political allies. This is an argument that was persuasively advanced in 2021 by Joseph Hone's monograph, *Alexander Pope in the Making*. It is therefore a theme that this review will need to return to in its closing paragraphs, which round off the section devoted to studies of single authors. Before that point, however, there are still several thematic clusters to range over.

If book history might in some ways be thought of as bringing literary studies closer to the empirical sciences, then the two following studies complicate things further by moving not only in the opposite direction, but in both directions at once. For Rosalind Powell, in *Perceptions and Analogy: Poetry, Science, and Religion in the Eighteenth Century*, and for Clark Lawlor, in *Literature and Medicine*, the only correct approach to these subjects must be chiasmic. The basic claim here is that in the eighteenth century there was a reciprocal relationship between poetry and natural philosophy. Poems did not merely, in other words, passively rest upon or disseminate knowledge produced elsewhere; on occasion, they too produced new philosophical knowledge. It is a familiar, anti-Platonic, line of argument, but one which is no less interesting for that, and one which Powell and Lawlor are able to push in new directions.

Lawlor's work, in particular, is compelling. The second of the two volumes of essays he edited with Andrew Mangham focuses on the nineteenth century, and will therefore be addressed in a later chapter of this review. Meanwhile, the first volume of *Literature and Medicine* opens with Lawlor's fine essay, '"Mere Flesh and Blood": Poetry, Genre, and Medicine' (pp. 23–50). Here, Lawlor examines some of the diverse ways in which poets responded to shifting medical theories about the dynamic between mind and body. In the first half of the eighteenth century, he suggests, the most important of these shifts involved the slow working through of Cartesian arguments, and the replacement of the traditional humoral theory with a mechanistic, and more specifically, a hydraulic theory of the body. This experience of intellectual adjustment could be fraught, undermining old orthodoxies – a tension which Lawlor detects in the very metre of the century's most famous poet-physician, Dr John Arbuthnot. By the time we reach 1750, a new paradigm shift is underway; from this point on, Lawlor describes how the hydraulic theory of the body is gradually replaced with an emphasis on nerve-fibres and vibrations. For poets, this opened up news ways of understanding sentiment, and their own finely tuned (perhaps too highly strung) artistic sensibilities. Throughout this survey, Lawlor is an expert and

companionable guide, introducing readers to a broad cast of quacks and hypochondriacs, patients, and practitioners, some of whom will be familiar, others of whom are now usually forgotten. In the process, he does much to vindicate his claim that these writers participated in a shared epistemology of specifically *medical* literary experimentation.

Powell's focus is necessarily broader. Rather than the relationship between poetry and any particular branch of eighteenth-century natural philosophy, she is interested in analogy, one of the key devices used across a whole range of philosophical discourses and emerging proto disciplines. As she explains in the introduction to *Perception and Analogy*, Powell wishes to isolate how poets and other writers employed analogy to give their readers a kind of 'cognitive', or 'virtual', experience of phenomena which could not be directly intuited (p. 3). This enables Powell to reassess the divided legacy of Isaac Newton and John Locke. In her account, these figures more than any others contributed to a new sense of anxiety in the eighteenth century, partly because they demanded that knowledge be rooted in empirical experience, and yet at the same time were themselves the architects of theories which many of their readers found dauntingly abstract, and therefore resistant to conceptual assimilation. To make matters worse, the arguments of Newton and Locke subverted some of the traditional props of Christian theology, thereby further contributing to a generalised sense of epistemic and spiritual insecurity. Powell establishes this context in her introduction, before moving in her subsequent five chapters to examine specific examples. Chapter 1 focuses on poets' efforts to find suitable analogies for Newton's theory of gravity, and the complex geometry of outer space. Chapter 2 tackles the many figurative and theological connotations of light during the period. (The argument here is particularly dense, because light so often served both as an analogy for something else, and was also itself described through other analogies.) In Chapter 3, Powell turns to a central theme of the scholarship on poetry and physico-theology: rainbows. She seeks to revitalise the debate here by attending above all to the analogical dimension of the rainbows described in both the Newtonian work of James Thomson, and in the stridently anti-Newtonian poems of Christopher Smart. Chapter 4 compares three long poems—Richard Blackmore's *Creation* (1712), Henry Brooke's *Universal Beauty* (1735), and Richard Jago's *Edge Hill* (1767)—which each feature arguments for intelligent design based on the analogy between the human eye and a mechanical instrument. The focus of Chapter 5 is the nearest Powell comes to overlapping with the work of Lawlor, since here, she too is concerned with the mind-body dynamic. In the first half of the chapter, initially Powell's exemplars are Edward Young and William Blake, who pushed back against the empiricism of Newton by arguing that material perception was an imperfect analogy for spiritual vision; the second half of the chapter then shifts to parse competing versions of the Aeolian

harp analogy in poems from Thomson, Mark Akenside, and Samuel Taylor Coleridge. This section draws Powell's book to a conclusion, once more underlining the high stakes involved in even seemingly subtle variations on a common analogical motif or image.

Stepping back to reflect on *Perception and Analogy* as a whole, the most lasting impression here is of being confronted by an extraordinarily copious erudition. Powell's summaries of the eighteenth-century intellectual contexts, as well as of the modern critical debates, are clear, and in most cases will be accessible to non-specialists and undergraduate students, even when the material under discussion is intricately complex. This is an achievement, and one which extends even further than the synopsis in the above paragraph implies. For reasons of concision, my chapter summaries neglected to mention the wide range of eighteenth-century theological commentaries, natural philosophic tracts, lay scientific pamphlets, and other didactic and advanced theoretical writings which Powell has everywhere placed into dialogue with the poetry. Yet such copiousness does come at a price. Occasionally, it feels as if the poetry is being forced into the background by the sheer welter of other texts. The impression that the book is lacking a stable core is heightened by the difficulty Powell has in specifying the parameters of analogy. When she writes in her introduction that 'analogy is the practical or literary exploitation of likeness, and analogising is a process of making creative comparisons with known phenomena to formulate and explain new concepts' (p. 10), this sounds reassuringly definite; but later chapters show that without further refinement, the concept of analogy remains open enough to include basically any form of comparison, making it hard to discriminate meaningfully between examples. Perhaps the book might have been more successful if the chapters had been organised around specific subgenres of analogy, instead of thematically? In the course of her discussion of the theological connotations of light, Powell cites one of Samuel Johnson's 1755 *Dictionary* definitions for analogy: "*learning* is said to *enlighten* the mind; that is, it is to the mind what light is to the eye, by enabling it to discover that which was hidden before" (p. 81). This usefully defines the form of a particular sub-genre of analogy (*a* is to *b* what *x* is to *y*), and it is easy to imagine a study gathering a range of examples, and using these to start building a historically dynamic taxonomy of eighteenth-century analogies. Powell takes another path, less formalist, less abstract, and for that reason useful in its own way, as an enormously detailed introduction to a broad array of poems which engage with contemporary debates in natural philosophy.

The difficulty of operationalizing 'analogy' as a unit of literary analysis is indicated in a different way by a special feature in Volume 26 of the annual journal and book, *1650–1850*. This feature, 'Metaphor in the Poetry and Criticism of the Long Eighteenth Century' (pp. 133–238), makes no claims to comprehensiveness or

systematicity; rather, the contributions explore the theme from a range of basically unconnected perspectives. In the process, without explicitly aiming to do so, the authors demonstrate the heterogeneity present within just a single branch of analogy. With this in mind, the ambition of Powell's project becomes still more remarkable. Meanwhile, and perhaps wisely, Mark A. Pedreira's editorial introduction to the feature in *1650–1850* limits itself to briefly summarizing the contents of the essays (pp. 133–40). Four of the five essays focus on the eighteenth century, and will be reviewed here; the last, Linda Reesman's contribution, 'Coleridge and Metaphor: Crossing Thresholds' (pp. 220–40), falls under the purview of Chapter XIII below, which focuses on Romantic literature.

Coleridge of course has long been a touchstone for scholars working on metaphor, but the other articles gathered here make a strong case for revisiting earlier writers, whose theory and practice may shed new light on the device. In the first article of the series, 'Organizing Poetry in the Eighteenth Century: Anthologies and Metaphor' (pp. 141–62), Adam Rounce examines the semantic density produced when metaphors overlap. The two types of anthologies he is most interested in are florilegia like *The Beauty of Poetry Display'd* (1757) and poetic manuals, including Edward Bysshe's influential *Art of English Poetry* (1702). These books are usually organised around thematic subheadings—often abstract nouns like 'Love' or 'Eloquence'—where the illustrative excerpts of poetry bear a metaphorical, more precisely a synecdochic, relationship to the heading. Rounce suggests that in some of the texts, the examples subtly qualify, extend, or amplify each other's range of connotations. The effect of this argument is to make Bysshe's work sound more similar to Johnson's famously artful *Dictionary* than historians have previously suspected. Unfortunately, the conclusions reached in the next article are less original. Taking as its starting point William Hogarth's *Analysis of Beauty* (1753), Taylor Corse's study, 'Curvilinear Thinking in The Long Eighteenth Century' (pp. 163–77), claims that sinuous S-curves in the period were associated with a particular mindset visible not only in the plastic and visual arts, but also in poetry, novels, gardening, and political theory. This kind of interdisciplinary work is to be commended; it is just a shame that Corse does not appear to know the closely related arguments made by Ronald Paulson, in *The Beautiful, the Novel, and the Strange* (1996), or by Peter de Bolla, in *The Education of the Eye* (2003). The third article in the feature is more thoroughly in possession of its subject, and is therefore able to open up more interesting routes into the material. This is Michael Edson's study, 'Feeling Allegory: Affect, Metaphor, and Milton's Eighteenth-Century Reception' (pp. 178–203). Here, Edson reviews the generally hostile commentaries on the parts of *Paradise Lost* where Satan meets, talks to, and is aided by Sin and Death. Through close attention to a wide range of eighteenth-century sources, Edson shows that critics tended to think of

allegories as extended metaphors. Hence, the vocabulary of aesthetic disapprobation associated with Miltonic allegory is often one of 'nausea', caused specifically by superfluity. Edson's most innovative suggestion is that this nausea was not just a figure of speech, but was a viscerally embodied experience for eighteenth-century readers. More work in this area would be needed to clinch the argument, which for now remains somewhat speculative. This brings us to the final article in the series, Jacob Sider Jost's study, 'The Worldliness of Edward Young and the Metaphorics of Georgian Patronage' (pp. 204–19). In this article Jost seeks to defend Young from his devotees, who have too often attempted to burnish the poet's literary reputation by downplaying his acquisitiveness. Jost takes an opposite approach: drawing upon the sociological writings of Pierre Bourdieu, he argues that it is Young's deep inhabitation of the elite competition for financial reward and prestige which gives to a work like *Night Thoughts* (1742–1745) its most powerful technical breakthroughs. As a way of bracketing residual pieties about the "grubbiness" of the market, this is tremendous. Whether or not Jost's efforts to redefine the relationship between literary and aesthetic value manages to convincingly hold moral and political judgements in play at the same time is more questionable. Yet it is precisely Jost's achievement to have made the question so urgently visible, and to have done so with infectious wry humour.

But what about politics outside the aristocratic levee? Two studies this year direct attention away from the intimate, at times claustrophobic social world of Young and his patrons, to the fractious border between elite and popular culture. For some gentlemen, of course, this border seemed to require aggressive policing. This is the attitude explored in Jon deTombe's article, 'Both Political and Poetical: Robert Lowth on Enthusiasm' (*ECS* 54[2021] 595–611). Lowth is mostly remembered today for his *Lectures on the Sacred Poetry of the Hebrews*, which he delivered in Latin in Oxford (1741–1750), and in which he did much to recuperate the concept of 'enthusiasm' for polite aesthetics. What is less often recalled is that, in a sermon he preached before the House of Lords on the anniversary of Charles I's execution (30 January 1767), Lowth also associated enthusiasm with the popular unrest of Civil War. deTombe tries to ascertain whether this argument represented a genuine shift in Lowth's thinking, or whether it was consistent with the notion of enthusiasm he had developed in the earlier lectures. In this, he is guided by and makes a useful addition to the already extensive literature on the politics of enthusiasm, from J. G. A. Pocock to Jon Mee. Shifting away from clerical politics, we now turn to the second article in this cluster, Kendra Packham's 'Literature and the Culture of Elections and Electioneering in Eighteenth-Century England' (*RES* 72[2021] 104–28). Packham's aim here is to draw attention to a neglected subgenre of writing: an 'abundant, wide-ranging, ideologically varied literature of elections' (p. 127). Her virtuosic study certainly achieves this goal. There are both Whig and Tory satires here from several intra-party

factions; there are mock-epics, epics, election miscellanies, versified reports from provincial and metropolitan contests, plays, visual satires, poems of praise and blame, election ballads, and songs. More impressively still, Packham shows that it was not just the style and ideology of the works which were diverse, but also the gender and class of those who produced, sold, and read the texts. Thus, she argues, although the franchise was famously narrow in the eighteenth century, the literature of the period sometimes encouraged the non-voting majority to participate in the adversarial culture of parliamentary elections through indirect, sometimes purely symbolic, sometimes more materially consequential actions.

One of Packham's most interesting topics of analysis is the partisan role that women played in eighteenth-century election culture. Here, her article resonates with the aims of *A History of Irish Women's Poetry*, a landmark collection of essays published in 2021 by Cambridge University Press. This volume includes two introductions, both of which touch upon eighteenth-century verse. The first—written by the editors, Ailbhe Darcy and David Wheatley—addresses the tension in feminist historical writing between the desire to restore forgotten traditions while at the same time acknowledging, even embracing, fragmentariness and inherent incompleteness (pp. 1–23). In the second introduction, Anne Fogarty extends this labour of theorization by reviewing the reception history of Irish women's poetry (pp. 24–39). She calls upon scholars to undo 'the obliterating and splintering effects of a literary history amnesiac about women's poetry in all its breadth' (p. 30). This is a call which the two chapters on eighteenth-century poetry take up and amplify. Tríona Ní Shíocháin's chapter on 'The Oral Tradition' takes a Foucauldian approach, arguing that recovering women's oral poetry is particularly difficult because, throughout the eighteenth century, it was systematically devalued in the emerging modern hierarchy of knowledges (pp. 74–88). Sarah Prescott's chapter, 'Archipelagic Ireland: Women's Anglophone Poetry from the Eighteenth Century' (pp. 89–104), returns us to the written word, and to a less thoroughly supressed literary tradition. Building on John Kerrigan's work in *Archipelagic English* (2008), Prescott's method is to map the way different poets conceived of their overlapping national, ethnic, kinship-based, linguistic, and religious identities. To do so, she focuses on one particularly charged genre: poetic addresses to British monarchs and lord lieutenants of Ireland. As might be suspected, the most intransigent criticisms were generally published in the wake of the French Revolution. Nevertheless, although the poems from earlier in the century tended to be patronage-seeking and panegyric, Prescott shows that they still often registered subtle tensions between colonial and metropolitan elites. In a few cases, too, the tensions were not so subtle. Margaret Bingham, Lady Lucas, emphasized her credentials as a Hanoverian loyalist in her *Verses on the Present State of Ireland* (1778), but still excoriated the tariffs on Irish wool as "wanton tyranny" (p. 100).

Prescott does not mention it here, but the impact of the American Revolution resounds throughout Bingham's poem; and this raises the further exciting possibility of developing not only an 'archipelagic feminism' (p. 89), but also articulating it within a broader transatlantic framework.

There were several articles and chapters this year which focused on American poetry, either in isolation, or more commonly in relationship to domestic literary production in the British Isles. From the perspective of undergraduate teaching, the most important of these new publications is Bryce Traister's edition of *The Cambridge Companion to Early American Literature*, which updates and to some extent supersedes the 2003 *Companion* edited by Emory Elliot. For present purposes, the most directly relevant essay in this volume is Amy M. E. Morris's contribution, 'How to Read Early American Poetry' (pp. 49–67). Morris structures her chapter around a series of brief and heuristically suggestive readings of poems in a wide range of genres, from a wide range of authors, and using different methodological techniques. In the background throughout, and sometimes expertly thrown into sharp relief, is the interwoven politics of empire, slavery, and colonialism. Nicholas K. Mohlmann addresses some of the same issues in his richly theorised article, '"Pass the Bounds of Verse": Arthur Blackamore's "Expeditio Ultramontana," the Transmontane Expedition, and Forms of Territory in Alexander Spotswood's Virginia' (*ECS* 54[2021] 427–47). The central poem under discussion here is Blackamore's Latin mini epic, which celebrates the then Governor of Virginia's 1716 expedition through the Blue Ridge Mountains. Mohlmann analyses the two political levels on which the poem operated. Initially, he argues, by marking the occasion of the expedition, the poem had a symbolic and compensatory function, helping to assuage the Virginian settlers' anxieties about the undefended, largely at that point still notional, expansion of their western frontier. Subsequently, when Blackamore's poem was translated (*c.* 1722 – *c.* 1724), and then published in the *Maryland Gazette* (1729), this seems to have been coordinated by Spotswood's factional supporters in his feud with the local plantocracy. The colonial politics of Latin verse are examined in a different context by Ella Lebeau, in her short article 'Francis Williams and the Question of Translation' (*N&Q* 68:iv[2021] 421–5). Williams has been identified as the earliest known Black writer in the British Empire, whose contemporary fame was associated with the odes he presented to successive Governors of Jamaica. His 1759 'Ode to George Haldane' is extant, and Lebeau compares the original Latin with the English translations of Edward Long (1777) and William James Gardner (1873), foregrounding the racism which led them to interpolate some passages, and deliberately misrepresent Williams's intentions in others. As Lebeau highlights, Williams himself was a complex figure. His poetry rankles at, and indeed resists the racist prejudices that are

directed against him; at the same time, Williams was the heir to a plantation, a slave-owner, a wealthy and highly educated free Black man, who insisted throughout his life on his own exceptionality.

In general, in recent years, increasing numbers of scholars have come to feel that engaging with the connections between eighteenth-century poetry, slavery, and Black resistance is an essential and urgent task. But in 2021, things were different. The urgency this year reached a new pitch of intensity; there are more articles, more book chapters, and several of them approach the subject through the lens of revolution. Let it not be forgotten that if 2020 was "year one" of the pandemic, then it was also the year of uprisings—an extraordinary wave of protests against racism and police brutality, triggered by the murder of George Floyd (25 May 2020), but carrying with it the anger and sorrow of far, far too many other killings. These mass gatherings were at once acts of public mourning, acts of political defiance against the police, and defiance against the broader system of racial oppression which the police uphold. By 2021, such was the force of these events, that they had clearly sent shockwaves through literary departments too. In a small way, several publications this year bring together the same focus on memory, history, and politics as the uprisings did. Strikingly, in the works in question, the authors have tended to converge on the same eighteenth-century poet, the Black, at one-time enslaved writer, formerly referred to as 'Phillis Wheatley'. (The inappropriateness of this appellation is discussed below.) The convergence on this poet is in some ways the culmination of a longer process of critical reassessment, driven in part by literary scholars' growing commitment and sensitivity to intersectional historical methods. Another explanation is that, in 2021, this emphasis also reflects the strength of the leadership of women in the Black Lives Matter and #SayHerName social movements.

Certainly, this is the impression one gets reading Zachary Mcleod Hutchins's article, '"Add New Glory to Her Name": Phillis Wheatley Peters' (*EAL* 56[2021] 663–67). It was Hutchins this year who argued that scholars should use the poet's married name, Peters, instead of (or at least hyphenated with), the surname given to her by the family who bought her. Hutchins points out that after marrying the free Black man John Peters in 1778, Phillis chose to use this name in her quotidian and literary affairs. Using this name is therefore a small, but ethically significant way in which scholars can respect the agency of the poet. This agency was examined in more explicitly socio-political terms by another literary historian, Betsy Erkkila, who sets out two important claims in her article, 'Phillis Wheatley on the Streets of Revolutionary Boston and in the Atlantic World' (*EAL* 56[2021] 351–72). Firstly, paying attention to the contexts of civic, legislative, and economic anti-slavery activism in the 1770s, it is clear that Wheatley Peters was far from naïve in believing that the American Revolution might lead to the abolition of slavery, and not just of the trade. Erkkila's second claim is that in the

leadup to the revolution, the poet did not just write about civil unrest; to some extent she probably also participated in crowd actions. Here, the evidence is more circumstantial, and in a couple of minor cases, perhaps Erkkila does read too much between the lines. However, her argument as a whole is convincing. It is extremely plausible that Wheatley Peters was more directly involved in political actions than has hitherto been realised. For example, it is hard to imagine that she did not attend a commemorative service for Crispus Attucks—a sailor of mixed Black and Wampanoag descent—which were held annually between 1770 and 1775 at her church, the Old South Church. Such commemorations were inherently political, responding as they did to the events of the Boston Massacre; and Erkkila is right to draw attention to the resonances with our own times.

The final study in this cluster is 'Silken Fetters: Phillis Wheatley and Ornamental Bondage', which is the concluding chapter in Andrea Brady's new book, *Poetry and Bondage: A History and Theory of Lyric Constraint* (Chapter 12, pp. 381–413). This context may account for the slightly different character of the scholarship. For whereas Hutchinson's and Erkkila's articles both clearly respond to the pressure of events in 2020–2021, presumably Brady's chapter was drafted before the George Floyd protests erupted, and over a considerably longer period of time. Thus, the connections made here between eighteenth- and early twenty-first-century politics tend to be more deeply and comprehensively articulated. Drawing especially on Black Feminist theory, in this chapter Brady presents a detailed review of Wheatley Peters' entire biography, alongside sensitive readings of a good proportion of the poet's published works. Consistent with the broader thesis of the book—and in some ways embodying the phenomenon it describes to its fullest extent—in Brady's account, Wheatley Peters' lyric poetry constitutes a para-philosophical thinking of the concept of freedom, in and through the constraints of verse. This is an outstandingly rigorous piece of scholarship which anyone interested in Wheatley Peters, or in eighteenth-century lyric poetry more generally, should read.

Researchers working on lyric may also find it useful to consult the third chapter of James Harriman-Smith's book, *Criticism, Performance, and the Passions in the Eighteenth Century*. This chapter, titled simply 'Odes' (pp. 83–115), argues that the middle decades of the eighteenth century are an important moment of transition, in which the modern concept of lyric is taking shape, but has not yet been as strictly codified as in later periods. Harriman-Smith's central example is David Garrick's *Ode upon Dedicating a Building, and Erecting a Statue, to Shakespeare*, which was first performed at the 1769 Shakespeare Jubilee at Stratford-upon-Avon. Turning to the poem's early reception history, Harriman-Smith demonstrates that audience members were impressed by Garrick's ability to imitate, indeed evoke, a subtly shifting array of emotional states through his prosodic artistry. To this extent, the poem fits easily within what Gérard Genette has influentially theorised as

the historically emergent "archigenre" of lyric. However, Harriman-Smith also points out that, unlike in the canonical formulation of Goethe, for example, neither Garrick nor his interlocutors seem to have distinguished his lyric poetry sharply from that other crucial archigenre, drama (pp. 83–84). For Harriman-Smith, this interplay of lyric and dramatic verse is a distinctive aspect of the poetics of sensibility.

Now moving away from recent debates about the historicity of lyric, we turn instead to examine two essays published in *The Palgrave Handbook of Animals and Literature*. This volume—edited by Susan McHugh, Robert McKay, and John Miller—represents a major addition to the Palgrave Studies in Animals and Literature series which, at the time of writing, has expanded to include 26 titles. The first study to consider is Anne Milne's chapter, 'Mary Leapor's Creatureliness in "An Essay on Woman" and Other Poems' (pp. 225–37). Milne derives her central concept here, 'creatureliness', from Tobias Meneley's book, *The Animal Claim* (2015), where it refers to moments which problematize the border between human and animal. As well as using it in this way, Milne extends the scope of the concept by using it to think about social boundaries. The brief final section of her chapter is titled 'Is the Labouring-Class Poet Inherently Creaturely?' (p. 233). One advantage of putting the question this bluntly is that it foregrounds the unavoidable conclusion that many of Leapor's contemporary readers, and social betters, did not in fact view her as fully human. Under these conditions, Milne is right, it makes sense that Leapor herself might feel a special kind of empathy for non-human animals. However, caution is needed here. Whilst the concept of creatureliness may have descriptive value for analysing what some eighteenth-century elites saw as a paradox, literary historians should not assume that there is any logical contradiction in the category of 'labouring-class poet'. Some still do, as Milne points out (p. 233). The conclusion to be drawn from this is that scholars of eighteenth-century poetry ought to theorise the concept of 'class' more thoroughly; a turn to the notion of the creaturely does not offer an alternative, but a potential supplement to this work.

A similar argument could be made on the basis of the immediately following chapter. This is Richard Nash's philosophically intriguing essay, 'Poetics of the Hunt: Re-reading Agency and Re-thinking Ecology in William Somerville's *The Chase*' (pp. 239–50). Nash here places Somerville's 1735 poem into dialogue with an anonymous *Essay on Hunting* (1733), both of which describe a hound's acute sense of smell as a kind of olfactory intelligence that rivals, if not exceeds, human powers of ratiocination. Although Somerville's satire on Man's hubris is meant to be entertaining, Nash sees in it an important phenomenological truth. At this point, he turns to the work of one of Martin Heidegger's contemporaries, Jakob von Uexküll, who argued that animals' perceptual apparatuses are so different that they effectively inhabit completely separate worlds, or '*umwelt*' (p.

243). Crucially, for von Uexküll, no *umwelt* can be considered normative. This includes the human world, which is merely one amongst many. Nash is an excellent guide to all this intellectual history, pointing out areas of overlap between von Uexküll's philosophy and Bruno Latour's Actor Network Theory (ANT). Problems emerge, however, when Nash attempts to reintroduce the poetry. His ANT-inspired reading of *The Chase* results in a vapidly aestheticized monism. As Nash himself puts it: '[p]ursuer and pursued are not discrete agents agonistically deployed but parts of an ongoing and unfolding phenomenon whose intra-actions articulate "the chase"' (p. 248). Immediately, one wants to know if things may have looked different from the fox's perspective? In its *umwelt*, did the chase seem quite so devoid of antagonism? And what about the tenant-farmers and peasants, whose fences were thrown down, and whose crops were trampled? On such matters, Nash is curiously silent. ANT in general is not much help here; but for some thoughts in this direction, although focusing on a slightly later period, it is still worth consulting David C. Itzkowitz's study, *Peculiar Privilege: A Social History of English Foxhunting, 1753–1885* (originally from 1977, but republished in 2016 in an affordable paperback edition).

This brings us to the final thematic cluster in this year's review, after which we shall transition to consider a few remaining works grouped around individual authors. The theme which marks this internal threshold is satire, and the genre's various mutations throughout the century. There were three articles in 2021 which sought to cast new light on this subject. The first, and perhaps the most entertaining of all this year's publications, was Shaun Regan's article, 'Exhausting His Whole Stock of Inspiration: Christopher Anstey's *The New Bath Guide* (1766) and the "Thorny Road" of Satire (*PQ* 100[2021] 161–86). Here, Regan succeeds in making *The New Bath Guide* sound like a book worth revisiting. His lovingly detailed paraphrases from Anstey's verse epistles, his many citations, and comments on the adventures of the mock-hero 'Simkin Blunderhead', manage to capture some of the mood of hilarity which surrounded the poem's initial publication. The reason so few literary historians have heard of Anstey today, he suggests, is that this early masterpiece has been overlooked, smeared by association with the later, mediocre, Juvenalian satires. What eighteenth-century readers admired in *The New Bath Guide* was its good-natured Horatian indulgence of follies not only analysed, but known intimately by the author. Similarly, in 'Exeunt the Kit-Cats, Pursued by Pope, Reviewed by Johnson' (*ES* 102[2021] 918–36), Robert DeMaria Jr draws attention to eighteenth-century readers' delight in mock- and anti-heroic forms of poetry, a taste which he thinks became increasingly dominant from about the early 1720s. This shift in taste had a strong link to contemporary politics. Thus, whilst for Joseph Addison and his Whig allies the heroic consecration of statesmen like Marlborough was deeply attractive, for Pope, Johnson, and other

Tories, the aggressive foreign policy described in works like *The Campaign* (1705) was both politically destructive, and aesthetically retrograde. Perhaps DeMaria slightly exaggerates the degree to which traditional epic poetry went out of fashion in later decades. Such, at least, is the implication of the last article in this cluster, Jonathan Taylor's revisionist study, '"Employ'd in Works that Womankind Become": Andromache and the Idealisation of Separate Spheres in Eighteenth-Century Literature and Art' (*JECS* 44:i[2021] 101–21). Contrary to the view that the period saw a gradual flexibilization of gender hierarchies, accomplished partly through the influence of sentimental, post-heroic literature, Taylor foregrounds the persistent efforts of male writers—including Dryden and Pope—to exclude women from the public sphere of neoclassical epic. Indeed, on this matter, Pope and Addison seem to have been in broad agreement (p. 108).

Here we turn to studies of single authors, beginning with none other than Addison himself. His career and literary works were celebrated this year in an important new collection edited by Paul Davis, *Joseph Addison: Tercentenary Essays*. Scholars of eighteenth-century poetry have particular cause for celebration, since the anthology contains two fine essays on Addisonian verse. These include one by Davis himself, 'Was Addison a Poet?' (pp. 61–79), which focuses on the original compositions. The other essay is David Hopkins's contribution, 'Addison as Translator' (pp. 18–39), which examines Addison's translations from the *Aeneid*, from Horace's *Odes*, and especially from the *Metamorphoses*. In terms of both structure and argument, Hopkins's and Davis's chapters are similar. Both begin with a thorough review of the extant sources, before moving to recuperate Addison's poetic work from the frequent charge of bland mediocrity—most memorably expressed by Samuel Johnson. "He did not trust his powers enough to be negligent. There is in most of his compositions a calmness and equability, deliberate and cautious, sometimes with little that delights, but seldom with anything that offends" (*The Lives of the Poets*, cited here p. 36; p. 63). Both Hopkins and Davis attempt to use a similar kind of paradox to persuade us that Addison is, in fact, a delightful poet. For Hopkins, he is a great translator not because his style is more individual than Johnson recognised, but rather because of his chameleonic ability to 'inhabit the minds and art of his originals with a rare completeness and selflessness' (p. 36). In a similar vein, Davis argues that 'Addison was addicted to the complex variant of poetic self-abnegation known to modern classicists as "recusation"—that is, the refusal of demand, whether real or imagined to write a poem' (p. 69). The picture which emerges from these essays is therefore of a radically shifty Addison, for whom poetry, as much as politeness, was a way of appearing and withdrawing at the same time.

From an elusive, perhaps even an evasive poet, we now move to consider two poets who in different ways forcibly insisted on their presence. The first is Addison's powerful critic, Johnson, who, perhaps more than

any other eighteenth-century writer, has often been invoked as a representative of the contemporary *zeitgeist*. The second is James Boswell, Johnson's biographer, and a man who was personally obsessed by the idea of celebrity. Today, it can sometimes feel as if Boswell is still standing in his friend's shadow; and perhaps, therefore, it is fitting to begin with two essays that focused exclusively on him. Both of these works were published as part of a new collection edited by Donald J. Newman, *Boswell and the Press*. This is a slight book, but full of affectionate details. Terry Seymour's chapter, 'Boswell in Broadside' (pp. 68–79), follows its protagonist into the fuddled atmosphere of after-dinner toasts and occasionally ill-advised poetry recitations. In Newman's chapter, '*An Elegy on the Death of an Amiable Young Lady:* Serious Effort or Elaborate Joke?' (pp. 80–93), he contends that this somewhat neglected piece of Boswelliania is more impressive when read as satire. The last publication in this group is more argumentatively sustained, bringing together Boswell and Johnson, and adding a third figure into our matrix of relations. This is Anthony W. Lee's article, '"Con Amore": Hester Thrale Piozzi's Annotations upon Johnson's Early Poetry' (*AgeJ* 24[2021] 63–77). Thrale Piozzi is usually thought of as Boswell's great rival, both for Johnson's affections, and as the author of the most important alternative biography. Yet here, Lee shows that their rivalry did not prevent moments of productive alignment. Lee is particularly interested in Thrale Piozzi's annotations on her copies of the 1807 and 1816 editions of Boswell's *Life of Samuel Johnson*. Though certainly not as complexly layered as N. K. Sugimura's examination of Stillingfleet's notes on *Paradise Lost* (discussed earlier in this review), Lee's attention to the way in which the history of reading can open up new windows onto classic texts resonates with her approach. This may serve as yet another reminder of the fruitfulness of going back to the archive of eighteenth-century manuscript material.

Scholars working on Anne Finch, who is the next poet who received considerable individual attention this year, have rarely needed such prompting. It has long been clear that Finch's manuscripts contain a wealth of materials that twentieth-century editors had not been able to make available. Yet, until recently, this awareness had only provoked local instances of revision and clarification. Things finally changed in 2019, with the publication of Volume 1 of Jennifer Keith and Claudia Thomas Kairoff's superb *Cambridge Edition of the Works of Anne Finch*. This volume established authoritative reading texts for the poems and plays contained in the Northampton Manuscript and the Folger Manuscript, the 'Early Manuscript Books' (compiled *c.* 1685–1701). Now, following the publication of Volume 2, Keith and Kairoff's edition is complete. The much-anticipated second volume focuses on 'Later Collections, Print and Manuscript'. These include *Miscellany Poems, on Several Occasions* (1713), the Wellesley Manuscript (compiled *c.* 1719–1720), and some 'Additional

Poems' by Finch, that do not appear in any authorized collection. The volume also includes transcripts of all Finch's few known surviving letters (1704–1720). To this already impressive work, Keith, Kairoff, and their assistants Rachel Bowman and R. Carter Hailey, have also added a suite of excellent critical and explanatory paratexts. The result is monumental, and will surely set new standards in the scholarly editing of eighteenth-century verse for many years to come. Before moving to consider the other studies of Anne Finch published in 2021, it is therefore worth spending a little longer summarizing the contents and achievements of the edition as a whole, and of Volume 2 in particular.

Both volumes begin with a substantial 'General Introduction' (I: xlvii–cxii; II: xlvii–lxxx), in which the editors describe the main literary, political, and biographical contexts which shaped Finch's poetry. In Volume 1, this historical analysis had been carried as far as the death of William of Orange. Volume 2 then picks up from the same point, starting with an account of the transition 'From William to Anne'. Here, Keith and Kairoff emphasise that despite the new queen's Stuart pedigree, both Anne and Heneage Finch remained firmly loyal to the Jacobite cause. The next section, on '*Miscellany Poems on Several Occasions* (1713)', focuses on Finch's response to the succession crisis. Her eventual disappointment, but steadfast opposition to the Hanoverian Succession is examined in 'From Anne to George'. Turning to 'The Wellesley Manuscript', Keith and Kairoff argue that previous editors have made questionable assumptions about the original purpose of the text. Whilst it may be plausible, as Barbara McGovern and Charles H. Hinnant argued in 1998, that the manuscript was intended as a kind of final resting place for Finch's previously uncollected works, other possibilities should not be ruled out. For Keith and Kairoff, it seems just as plausible, for example, that the Wellesley Manuscript was begun *befor*e the full seriousness of Finch's final illness became apparent, and that it therefore originally represented an intermediary step towards publication. Continuing this focus on editorial interpretation, the last section of the General Introduction, 'Ensuing Years', traces Heneage's careful revisions to Finch's manuscripts after her death. Throughout these five introductory essays, Keith and Kairoff achieve a rare balance between broad narrative summary on the one hand, and on the other, the kinds of detailed and incisive arguments useful to specialists. This same balance is maintained in the subsequent 'Textual Introduction' (II: lxxxi–xciv) and 'Account of the Texts' (II: xcv–cxxix), which provide lucid summaries of the issues for the non-specialist reader, but are also attentive to the interests of book historians and editorial theorists. Indeed, as both Keith and Carter Hailey's contributions to these sections make clear, *The Cambridge Edition of the Works of Anne Finch* is itself, necessarily, a work of editorial theory as well as of practice.

The poems, meanwhile, it is true, are presented with the needs of general readers in mind, more than the needs of textual scholars. The font here is large, the margins are wide, and all the notes have been printed separately at the back of the volume. As my colleague Robert Scott already noted in his review of Volume 1 (*YWES* 100[2019] 646–48), for most literary historians this will make flicking backward and forward through the book a necessary routine. However, many scholars will still find the invitation to immersive reading here welcome; and the remarkable quality of the headnotes, explanatory notes, and textual notes will help to offset the inconvenience of the others. When it comes to the presentation of Finch's 'Correspondence' (II: 507–23), there is even less compromise required. Every letter is immediately followed by the relevant notes. This organization is more practical here given that there are only six surviving letters, and so the section is already straightforward to navigate. Despite the general scarcity of material, the few surviving letters are nevertheless rich in content. Finch here alludes to politics, matters of personal finance, and also touches upon her own poetry and poetics. Once more, Keith and Kairoff have performed a useful act of service in including these documents in their edition.

Finally, Volume 2 closes not only with all the standard apparatuses which one would expect from a work of this nature (a 'List of Source Copies', a 'Selected Bibliography', an 'Index of First Lines', and 'Index of Titles'); the volume also contains an appended 'Reception and Transmission History of Finch's Work' (II: 525–95). This history is divided into three sections. Rachel Bowman first provides an essay on the earlier period, up until the middle of the twentieth century. With the exception of 'The Spleen', which has always been widely considered a masterpiece, Bowman here reflects on the critical tendency to neglect Finch's odes and longer poems, in favour of what increasingly came to be identified as her real forte: "pretty" shorter lyrics (II: 547). Kairoff's section covers the period from the later twentieth century up to the present, which has been characterised by greater attention to Finch's female agency, and, connectedly, her Jacobite political convictions. The last section of the history presents Bowman's 'Selected References to and Reprintings of Finch's Works' (II: 556–95), an annotated bibliography which also does some of the work of a *Critical Heritage*. The references are organized chronologically and include bibliographical data, a short summary of the author's perspective on Finch, and usually some form of illustrative quotation. Literary scholars are indebted to Bowman for creating this resource, which will likely stimulate further publications. In summary, although the two-volume set of *The Cambridge Edition of the Works of Anne Finch* is not cheap, it is still excellent value for money. On nearly every page, the editors' careful labour shines forth.

By comparison, the two remaining studies on Finch are less pivotal due to their relative brevity. First, there is Lara Dodds' contribution to *Making Milton*. This volume, edited by Emma Depledge, John S. Garrison, and Marissa Nicosia, focuses on Milton's acts of authorial self-fashioning, as well as the diverse ways in which his writings were appropriated by other people – booksellers quite literally, writers and common readers less so. In keeping with this theme, Dodds' chapter is titled 'Making Milton's Bogey: or, Anne Finch Reads John Milton' (pp. 157–70). 'Bogey' here is a technical term, originally derived from Virginia Woolf's discussion of Milton's God, in *A Room of One's Own* (1929). As Dodds summarizes, the bogey 'transforms Milton into a polyvalent figure that conjoins two of the challenges faced by woman writers: a literary tradition that has historically excluded women and a powerful religious myth that is used to authorize women's subordination' (p. 160). Dodds goes on to argue that Finch subverted Milton's bogey-status through competitive emulation of his literary technique, and by wresting the Genesis narrative away from him. There are strong parallels here between Dodds' scholarship and the work of another critic, Debapriya Basu, who this year contributed a chapter to Isabelle Hervout and Anne Rouette's new anthology, *Dream and Literary Creation in Women's Writings in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries*. In Basu's chapter, '"[A]s Sometimes Poets Dream": Liminality and the Female Writer in the Poetry of Anne Finch' (pp. 75–89), the argument hinges on a series of allusions to Book Five of *Paradise Lost*. According to Basu, what Milton here described as Eve's dream of Satanic temptation became, for Finch, a kind of master-trope for her own poetic activity. This suggestion is informed by Basu's reading in psychoanalytic theory, especially Julia Kristeva. It is quite unusual to see psychoanalytic arguments incorporated this directly into studies of eighteenth-century poetry, and some critics will probably question the historical basis for adopting the approach. However, Basu's more general point—that for Finch reverie, pastoral retreat, and political exile became a complexly layered topos, in which prevailing gender and dynastic hierarchies were partially suspended—is difficult to question.

Finch shared some of these strategies with the final poet of this year's review, Alexander Pope. The two were of course friends, and political allies. As committed Tories, arguably they were both condemned to a form of internal exile. In Pope's case, his marginalization within early eighteenth-century society was deepened not only by his Catholic upbringing, but also by his physical impairment. However, unlike Finch, Pope's literary works have never really ceased to hold the attention of critics. Patriarchy has played an obvious role in this. There is also, in combination with his gender, the fact that Pope was a brilliant and ruthless self-publicist. Literary scholars have long been fascinated by Pope as a fabricator, both of verses, and of his own mythic persona. The four articles published on Pope in 2021 hold this orientation in common: each of them is

concerned to retrieve a sense of the contingency, labour, uncertainty, and moments of ideological difficulty which Pope experienced even (or especially?) in writing his most accomplished works. On a larger scale, the same is also true of Joseph Hone's book, *Alexander Pope in the Making*—which, as I have already had reason to mention, focuses on Pope's identity as a political partisan. This monograph forcefully reopens the debate on the extent to which the poet directly colluded in Jacobite conspiracy. In doing so, it seeks to defamiliarize Pope, to make his verse once again appear radical, even a little dangerous. It is thus with Hone's efforts to retrieve the non- or anti-canonical Pope that this final section begins.

Pope, Hone argues, made himself into a classic author in the years following Anne's death. This involved obscuring the degree to which he had formerly written for an audience of seditious Jacobites – perhaps as one himself. Hone attempts to reconstruct this entire journey, teasing out evidence of Pope's early progress through the hinterland between loyalty and conspiracy, and showing how these trails were later camouflaged. To do so, he draws on a wide range of archival materials relating to Pope, his networks of friends, and the broader Jacobite diaspora in England and Europe. This research forms the basis of six densely argued but very readable chapters, cast somewhat in the style of a detective narrative. (Hone has published in this genre before, a point to which this review will return in a later paragraph.)

In Chapter 1, 'Pope's Social Contexts' (pp. 11–40), Hone foregrounds the poet's personal and literary ties to two groups of Jacobite sympathisers. Firstly, Pope's correspondence suggests that from an early age he formed part of a circle of Catholic recusants, linked by the central figure of John Caryll; Hone thinks that it was probably here that Pope first met Thomas Southcott, a Benedictine cleric who became an important fundraiser for the 1715 uprising. Slightly later, Pope also befriended the pro-Stuart Duke of Buckingham and Baron Lansdowne. In Hone's telling, the witty Carolean verse-essays of these Tory peers are the most important political and stylistic influences on *An Essay on Criticism* (1711). In Chapter 2, 'Manuscript Circulation' (pp. 41–68), Hone argues that while scribal publication was an ordinary feature of contemporary literary culture, it also enabled Pope to stray beyond what could safely be committed to print. *The Rape of the Lock* may be an example of a work that Pope published in an authorized form (1712), in order to forestall the appearance of a more politically compromising version. In Chapter 3, 'Miscellany Publication' (pp. 69–100), Hone starts to find signs of increasing circumspection and pessimism in Pope's works. Thus, by the time Pope came to edit *Poems on Several Occasions* (1717), although he was still heavily skewing the contents of the volume towards Tory allies, the mood of the collection as a whole was sombre. A similar pattern emerges in Chapter 4, '*Windsor-Forest* and the Politics of Panegyric' (pp. 101–27). Although Pope began work on the poem as early as 1704,

Hone suggests that when it was printed in 1713 it looked back to the recent negotiations at Utrecht with joy - while, at the same time, grimly alluding to the immanent Hanoverian succession. Chapter 5, 'Regime Change' (pp. 128–59), builds on this argument by suggesting that George I's coronation and the subsequent Whig crackdown spurred Pope to try to rebrand his poems as timeless literary classics. Pope's translation of the *Iliad* was part of this project (1715–1720), as was the publication of *The Works of Mr. Alexander Pope* (1717). At this point, it initially seems as if Hone's argument has run its course: we have seen Pope as a young man in a conspiratorial milieu, writing verse with possible Jacobite subtexts; and we have seen Pope make a retreat from active partisanship, into translation, self-canonization, and nostalgia. However, in his final chapter, Hone draws attention to what he sees as Pope's last throw of the dice. Chapter 6, 'Censorship and Political Editing' (pp. 160–88), explores two incidents associated with Pope's edition of Buckingham's *Works* (1723). When this book was first printed, it briefly landed Pope in hot water. The government seized the imprint, and although Pope escaped prosecution, he was obliged to remove two of Buckingham's allegedly subversive poems. More significantly, however, Hone argues that Pope probably was aware that Francis Atterbury had used the edition as a front, enabling him to send a printer to Rome with £50,000 for the exiled Stuart court. If we accept this version of events, then our understanding of Pope's oppositional politics and literary career will have shifted decisively.

This immediately raises two obvious but tricky questions. (1) How far is Hone prepared to push this line of argument? (2) How compelling are his claims? From the start, Hone acknowledges that there is no single irrefutable piece of evidence that Pope was directly involved in plotting the downfall of the House of Hanover. Nor, to be clear, is this quite what Hone is suggesting. What he argues is the more nuanced point that, at times, Pope knew about such plots and offered tacit support, not least by keeping his mouth shut. Occasionally, Hone suggests, Pope also acted on this knowledge. Whether or not he was aware of the role his own literary project ended up playing in the Atterbury Plot, Pope's willingness to expose himself to the risk of legal sanction, by agreeing to edit Buckingham's *Works* in the first place, should be taken as a sign that he knew something was afoot, and was positioning himself to be a beneficiary should there be a successful Jacobite uprising (p. 188). Modern legal terms might distort as much as they clarify the case here, but perhaps an analogy could be drawn at this point to the distinction between being an 'accomplice' and being an 'accessory' to a crime? This is my heuristic, not Hone's. In any case, it bears restating that much of his interpretation here is conjectural. Probably nobody will find all of his interpretations—of the poems and of the facts—equally convincing; and, as Colin Kidd's earlier review of the book shows, some readers will remain sceptical about the whole proposed narrative

(*LRB* 44:8[2022]). There are enough gaps in the record to mean that alternative interpretations are often available. Yet Hone is able to "prove" a few of his subsidiary arguments. He successfully shows that Pope was closer, personally, to several Jacobite agents than has previously been recognised. He also shows that Pope's early literary works were more influenced by Jacobite writers—men like Bolingbroke, Lansdowne, and Buckingham—than scholars have tended to assume. This already changes the way that we read Pope's work. Furthermore, taken together, as circumstantial evidence, these revisionary arguments do make Hone's conjectures elsewhere more persuasive.

Ultimately, all scholars working on Pope will have to reckon with Hone's arguments, and draw their own conclusions. For this community of researchers, this is a book which quite simply cannot be ignored. But even people who do not have a professional interest in the debate would do well to take notice. As an experiment in historical writing, Hone's work is very interesting, and often impressive. It is exciting to watch him using his thorough command of the manuscript evidence not simply to add further detail to the received Pope biography, but also repeatedly to shift local emphases, to adjust accepted chronologies, and thereby cumulatively to lever open areas of uncertainty. This also opens space for the political. It helps show that the British Enlightenment was not characterised by consensus, but rather by more or less explicit antagonisms. For this purpose, Hone's allusions to detective fiction are normally helpful. As with his previous book, *The Paperchase* (2020), which presented a nonfiction narrative about eighteenth-century espionage to academic and non-academic readers, *Alexander Pope in the Making* is meticulously researched; where other scholars might see innocuous coincidences, Hone is always prepared to dig further. Nevertheless, there are moments when this enthusiasm for the genre becomes a limitation. Hone's decision to cast the Whig party in the role of the detective story's traditional villain is one example. The problem here is not so much Hone's committed stance in relationship to the conflict he is describing; much of the best history writing, after all, is similarly partisan. Rather, the problem is that Hone does not really explain the source of his animus against the Whigs. Early on in the book, he does briefly and eloquently describe the injustices faced by Catholics in the wake of 1688 (pp. 13–14); and at one point Hone also refers to popular dissatisfaction with the Hanoverian regime (p. 130). However, these contexts are mostly left in the background. Compare this approach, for a moment, with E. P. Thompson's classic study of Walpolean villainy, *Whigs and Hunters* (1975). In the latter case, Thompson's analysis of Whig elites' systematic disembedding of the economy, and the scale of violence this involved, leave the reader in no doubt why this faction was *particularly* culpable. (The Tories of course were no heroes either.) It is this kind of broader contextualising framework that Hone's descriptions sometimes lack, leaving them feeling cartoonish –

as when he describes Lord Carteret dispatching his 'henchmen' to seize all the copies of Buckingham's *Works* (p. 183). Such moments of dissonance stand out, in a book that in other respects is both stylish and genuinely ground-breaking.

Turning to this year's articles on Pope, two are immediately notable for their quite different approach to Hone's study. These are Julian Ferraro's discussion of 'The Distribution of Wealth in Alexander Pope's *Epistle to Bathurst*' (*RES* 72[2021] 502–19), and Jack L. Hart's article on 'Alexander Pope's Lucretian Vestiges' (*CQ* 50[2021] 348–67). Both of these writers focus on Pope's later works, and place much greater emphasis than Hone on the importance of verse technique. The contrast between Hone's and Hart's mode of argumentation is particularly stark. Whereas for Hone close attention to the rhetorical texture of a poem like *Windsor-Forest* is valuable insofar as it helps to specify the political complexion of Pope's thought, for Hart such historical arguments are unsatisfying, because they too quickly shut down areas of philosophically rich ambiguity in the poems. Such, at least, is the argument he makes about *An Essay on Man* (pp. 353–5). Indeed, according to Hart, Pope's investigation into the uncertain human condition cannot simply be translated into a series of propositions that could stand alone, shorn of their prosodic, syntactic, and rhetorical ornaments: like Lucretius in *De Rerum Natura*, Pope's thinking here is fully imbricated with these devices, it exists in and through the organisation of linguistic matter. In his article, Ferraro, too, is interested in the way that Pope's philosophical thought is performed in the medium of verse; however, he is somewhat closer to Hone, in emphasizing the ethically and politically committed quality of this thought. Tracing changes across several manuscript drafts and editions of the *Epistle to Bathurst*, Ferraro argues that 'as the poem evolves, the problem of riches is increasingly considered in terms of the moral imperative of social responsibility and the charitable mitigation of inequality' (p. 504). For Ferraro, there are even lines of intellectual affiliation that can be drawn between Pope's satire on early financial capitalism and Thomas Piketty's recent criticisms of excessive accumulation (p. 502; p. 518). Where does this leave us? It is not clear whether for Hart, Ferraro's interpretation of Pope would be too narrowly focused on conclusive paths to knowledge, on edification, and moral teleology. Conversely, what would Ferraro say about Hart's arguments? That they tend to abstract Pope's epistemology from his political economy? It would no doubt be worth testing these viewpoints against one another more extensively.

The last two articles on Pope, and the last two articles of the year, both focus on *The Dunciad*. Both aim to retrieve aspects of the satire that scholars have previously overlooked, but the scale of their analysis is radically divergent. In 'Ideologies of Listening and the Rise of the Hypercritic: Rethinking Italian Opera in *The*

Dunciad' (*ECent* 62[2021], 63–81), Jordan Hall offers an ambitious re-reading of the entire fourth book (as printed in Valerie Rumbold's 2009 edition of *The Dunciad in Four Books*). He more specifically contends that the personification 'Italian Opera' is a more important figure than critics have so far recognised; in fact, second only to the goddess Dulness herself, Italian Opera is the most powerful embodiment of everything that Pope despised. Unfortunately, Hall's argument here sometimes feels overstated. For example, he suggests that Pope wanted readers to understand that everything Italian Opera says or does is foolish, and thus, when she banishes Friedrich Georg Handel from Britain, this in fact implies a devastating critique of the composer (pp. 75–76). This would indeed be consistent backwards logic, but is it Pope's logic? There are reasons to believe that his allusions to the composer here are more ambiguous, multifaceted, and involve elements of genuine praise as well as of blame. Meanwhile, in 'Disappearances from *The Dunciad*: Pope's Late Use of the *Grub-Street Journal*' (*RES* 72[2021] 707–31), Pat Rogers presents a detailed account of the contents of a small and very ephemeral paratext. The apparatus in question, 'Appendix VI', was only ever printed in the 1742 version of *The Dunciad in Four Books*. Perhaps unsurprisingly, to date this appendix has received little critical or editorial attention. Nevertheless, in Rogers's hands, it becomes a captivating window onto a now all-but forgotten episode in cultural history. He first traces each of its four elements back to the *Grub-Street Journal*, and takes great delight in revisiting the salvo of nasty squibs fired off by Pope and allies in the early 1730s. When it comes to the question of why Pope briefly resurrected these particular satires, Rogers does have some theories. However, he ends his article by letting these hypotheses stand side by side, his questions enticingly unresolved.