Miscellanies, Poetry, and Authorship, 1680–1800

Carly Watson

Palgrave Studies in the Enlightenment,
Romanticism and Cultures of Print

Series Editors
Anne K. Mellor
Department of English
University of California Los Angeles
Los Angeles, CA, USA

Clifford Siskin
Department of English
New York University
New York, NY, USA

Palgrave Studies in the Enlightenment, Romanticism and Cultures of Print features work that does not fit comfortably within established boundaries – whether between periods or between disciplines. Uniquely, it combines efforts to engage the power and materiality of print with explorations of gender, race, and class. Mobilizing analytical, archival, and digital resources to explore the varied intersections of literature with the visual arts, medicine, law, and science, the series enables a large-scale rethinking of the origins of modernity.

Editorial Board: Ros Ballaster, University of Oxford, UK; John Bender, Stanford University, USA; Alan Bewell, University of Toronto, Canada; Peter de Bolla, University of Cambridge, UK; Aaron Hanlon, Colby College, USA; Devoney Looser, Arizona State University, USA; Saree Makdisi, UCLA, USA; Andrew Piper, McGill University, Canada; Felicity A Nussbaum, UCLA, USA; Janet Todd, University of Cambridge, UK.

More information about this series at
http://www.palgrave.com/gp/series/14588

Carly Watson

Miscellanies, Poetry, and Authorship, 1680–1800

Carly Watson
Department for Continuing Education
University of Oxford
Oxford, UK

Cover illustration: Style of Jean Baptiste Huet. *Book Cover*, made 1775–1800. The Art Institute of Chicago, Belle M. Borland Endowment

For my family

Acknowledgements

I began writing this book as a postdoctoral researcher working on a larger research project, "A New History of Reading and Authorship in the Eighteenth Century", led by Abigail Williams. I owe an enormous debt to Abby, without whose confidence in me I would not have had the opportunity to write this book. Her insightful comments on several chapters have shaped this book for the better, and her advice and encouragement have helped me along the journey to publication. I thank the Leverhulme Trust for funding the project and making the writing of this book possible.

Part of Chap. 7 is based on research undertaken in the Fellows' Library of Winchester College. I am grateful to Richard Foster, the Fellows' Librarian, for welcoming me to the library and giving me access to the collections. I am hugely indebted to my former supervisors, Valerie Rumbold, Kate Rumbold, and Geoffrey Day, who introduced me to the library and its treasures and guided my development as a historian of books and texts. Their generous mentorship and scholarly example have been immensely valuable to me.

I thank the readers who reviewed the manuscript of this book for their helpful and encouraging comments. I am also grateful to Corrina Readioff for her assistance with proofreading. Any errors that remain are my own.

While researching and writing this book I have had many conversations with scholars and friends that have invigorated and challenged me. I am particularly indebted to Jennifer Batt, who has been consistently generous and supportive, and Kelsey Rubin-Detlev, who has been a wonderful collaborator and friend.

Throughout the writing of this book I have benefited from the support of my family in more ways than I can express here. Linda Watson has believed in me unswervingly and kept me on track. Andrew, Ben, and Bethany have encouraged me and been increasingly impatient to see the finished product. This book is dedicated to them.

Contents

LIST OF FIGURES

LIST OF TABLES

Introduction: Redefining the Miscellany

At a time when a quick Internet search can find everything from texts of classic poems to recordings of contemporary performance poetry, readers have not lost their appetite for printed poetry books. In the United Kingdom, sales of poetry books generated record revenue in 2019 for the fifth consecutive year (Tivnan 2020, 6). The growth of sales in recent years has partly been driven by the popularity of collections by individual poets. For two years in a row, in 2017 and 2018, the Canadian poet Rupi Kaur's debut collection *Milk and Honey* (2015) was the top-selling poetry title in the United Kingdom (*Bookseller* 2018; Ferguson 2019). But anthologies of poems by various authors have also been staples of recent bestseller lists. None has emulated the success of *The Nation's Favourite Poems* (1996), a collection enshrining the results of the BBC's search for Britain's best-loved poems, which sold 108,055 copies in 1998 (*Bookseller* 2017). However, more recent collections have sought to help readers improve their mental agility and emotional well-being: *The Poetry Pharmacy* (2017), edited by William Sieghart, aims to help readers harness the "therapeutic power" of poetry (Sieghart 2017, xvi), while Gyles Brandreth's *Dancing by the Light of the Moon* (2019), a collection of poems to memorise, tells readers that "learning poetry by heart can change your life" (Brandreth 2019, 4). Books such as these have a long history, but they have not always been known as anthologies. In the seventeenth century, collections of poems by various authors began to be called

miscellanies, and between 1680 and 1800 *miscellany* or a related word appeared in the titles of hundreds of such compilations. This was the era in which the market for poetry collections in Britain began to resemble the one we know today. In the eighteenth century, new titles were issued almost every year, and publishers produced a wide range of collections to appeal to a growing diversity of consumers. Some miscellanies were aimed at readers with a taste for a particular genre, such as comic or religious poetry. Some had a declared purpose—to edify young readers, or to assist in the teaching of elocution. Others boasted of a connection to a particular place and its community. Many more offered themselves to readers as a pleasing assortment of contemporary poems in a range of genres.

The multiple-author miscellanies of the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries can thus be seen as part of a tradition of poetry anthologies in print, stretching back to Richard Tottel's *Songes and Sonettes* (1557) and other sixteenth-century collections and forward to the present day. But if we want to fully understand how miscellanies shaped the cultures of writing, publishing, and reading poetry between 1680 and 1800, we need to look beyond this tradition. The category of miscellanies was more diverse and more complex in this period than the category of anthologies is today. Modern books with the word *anthology* in their titles vary widely in content, but they have one thing in common: they contain works by a variety of authors.[1] By contrast, late seventeenth- and eighteenth-century books with *miscellany* or a related word in their titles might contain works by one author or many. Paddy Bullard has emphasised that miscellanies have historically had a range of authorial configurations: "Some miscellanies contain the writings of a single author, some are dominated by the work of one or two authors but feature oddments by others, and some present writings by many hands" (2012, 57). In the first half of the eighteenth century, the title *Miscellany Poems* was given to solo collections by authors including Anne Finch, Countess of Winchilsea, Elizabeth Thomas, and Jane Adams (or Jean Adam) of Renfrewshire, Scotland.[2] The same title was given to early eighteenth-century editions of two of the most popular multiple-author collections of the time. In 1716, Jacob Tonson reprinted the series of poetry collections he had begun with John Dryden in 1684 under the title *Miscellany Poems*, and a decade later Bernard Lintot adopted the title for the expanded fifth edition of *Miscellaneous Poems and Translations*, the 1712 collection to which Alexander Pope had been the leading contributor.[3] The character of a miscellany was equally suited to collections with a single author and compilations of pieces by several hands.

Despite the multiplicity of books called miscellanies in the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, the term has become synonymous with collections bringing together works by various authors. Since the late nineteenth century, scholars of English literature have used the term *miscellany* to describe and categorise books that feature works by more than two authors.[4] During the past twenty-five years, these books have begun to receive sustained attention from scholars of literature and the book in the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Defined as collections lacking a dominant authorial presence, miscellanies have provided fruitful matter for scholars interested in how editors and publishers shaped literary trends and how readers experienced literary culture. Yet almost all of this recent scholarship is underpinned by a definition of the miscellany that is at odds with the ways in which the form was understood by authors, publishers, and readers in the period. This book seeks to replace the modern scholarly definition of the miscellany with one that recognises the form's historic openness to different kinds of authorship. In doing so, it aims to establish the importance of printed miscellanies in the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries not only as edited collections that shaped authors' reputations and readers' engagement with literary texts, but also as solo collections in which authors fashioned their own identities and defined their oeuvres. Though there have been important advances in scholarship in recent years, we still have much to learn about how multiple-author miscellanies shaped the cultural presence and canonical status of authors, how they interacted with single-author miscellanies, and how they co-existed with other venues for poetry in print, such as periodicals and songbooks. Single-author miscellanies, meanwhile, have been largely neglected. This book is the first to consider both kinds of miscellanies in tandem, and it argues that the miscellany flourished as a literary form in the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries just as much because it offered a distinctive range of opportunities to authors as because it catered to the needs and appetites of readers.

THE PROMISE OF VARIETY

The study of printed miscellanies has traditionally been the study of collections of works by various authors. In the field of late seventeenth- and eighteenth-century literature, the study of miscellanies emerged as a distinct branch of scholarship in the second quarter of the twentieth century. In 1929, the American scholar Raymond D. Havens advocated the study

of "the popular miscellanies" of the period as mirrors of the tastes of contemporary readers. These collections, he remarked, "contain the work of many men and represent what was thought to be the best poetry of the time, or that most in vogue" (Havens 1929, 501). In the same year, on the other side of the Atlantic, Iolo A. Williams urged librarians to invest in miscellanies "as volumes indispensable to students of English poetry of the early eighteenth century". He argued that as "many of the leading poets of the time first printed their shorter poems—or some of them—in various collections of composite authorship", miscellanies constitute an important part of the documentary record of the writings of eighteenth-century authors (Williams 1929, 233–34). Six years after Williams stressed the importance of fostering bibliographical knowledge of eighteenth-century miscellanies, Arthur E. Case produced a descriptive bibliography of almost 500 "poetical miscellanies" published between 1521 and 1750. Not all of the miscellanies Case recorded are purely "poetical"—many also include prose such as letters, tales, and tracts—but they all feature works by an assortment of authors: "The presence within a book of verse by three or more authors has arbitrarily been made the test of its miscellaneous character" (Case 1935, v). The work of these scholars was instrumental in establishing the importance of multiple-author collections to the history of English poetry in the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. At the same time, their use of the term *miscellany* (sometimes in conjunction with and as a synonym of *anthology*) cemented the modern understanding of miscellanies as a category of books defined by multiple authorship.

Historically, however, the defining characteristic of miscellanies has not been a mixture of authors but a mixture of diverse contents. The word *miscellany* derives from the Latin *miscellanea*, used by Juvenal for a hash of mixed ingredients eaten by gladiators.[5] The word *miscellanea* was first applied to a collection of writing by the Florentine scholar Angelo Poliziano, who produced a book of treatises titled *Miscellanea* in 1489 (Fitzgerald 2016, 156). Poliziano's title implies that the defining feature of his book is its haphazard mixture of materials, like ingredients in a stew.[6] A century after the publication of Poliziano's *Miscellanea*, as Joshua Eckhardt and Daniel Starza Smith (2014, 2) have shown, the word *miscellany* began to be used in England to refer to books and their contents. Sometimes the plural form *miscellanies* (derived from the Latin plural *miscellanea*) was used for a mixture of tracts or other prose works. At other times the singular form was used for a book or part of a book containing an assortment of pieces.[7] However, it was not until the middle of the

seventeenth century that the words *miscellany* and *miscellanies* began to appear in the titles of poetry collections. The first collection of English poems to feature either word in its title or subtitle was Thomas Jordan's *Love's Dialect, or, Poeticall Varieties; Digested into a Miscelanie of Various Fancies* (1646), a collection of love poems and elegies.[8] This was the first of several single-author poetry collections to feature either *miscellany* or *miscellanies* in a subtitle. Later, in the 1680s and 1690s, solo collections began to be more prominently characterised as miscellanies, with titles such as *Miscellaneous Poems* and *Poetick Miscellanies*.[9] During the second half of the century, the word *miscellanea* and its English cognate *miscellanies* were also used to describe the contents of single-author collections mixing poetry and prose. The first miscellany of this kind was Richard Flecknoe's *Miscellania* (1653), containing an assortment of poems followed by essays, letters, and characters in prose.[10]

Collections of poems by various authors were also labelled as miscellanies. According to Eckhardt and Smith (2014, 8), Abraham Wright coined the phrase "poetic miscellany" in his prefatory description of *Parnassus Biceps* (1656), a nostalgic collection of university verse. Sixteen years later, *Westminster Quibbles in Verse* (1672) was published with the subtitle "A Miscellany of Quibling *Catches*, *Joques* and *Merriments*"; the collection reveals nothing about its authorial origins. But it was not until the 1680s that *miscellany* and related words began to appear frequently in the titles of multiple-author poetry collections. In 1684, Jacob Tonson published *Miscellany Poems*, the first of a series of collections of poems by "the most Eminent Hands" presided over by John Dryden until the mid-1690s.[11] As Stuart Gillespie and David Hopkins (2008, 1:xvi–xvii) have argued, *Miscellany Poems* and its successors played a pivotal role in establishing the miscellany as a distinctive kind of multiple-author collection. In the fifteen years after the publication of *Miscellany Poems*, nine collections of poems by various authors appeared with titles describing their contents as "miscellany poems" or "poetical miscellanies", or simply identifying the book as a "miscellany".[12]

In the second half of the seventeenth century, then, literary collections of all kinds began to be called miscellanies. For authors and readers, the defining feature of miscellanies was not a diversity of authorial voices, but rather a diversity of subjects and genres. Writing in the dedication of a miscellany of his own poetry and prose published in 1709, William King stressed that the form should reflect the diversity of the reading public:

> It is generally presum'd, that a Miscellany should consist of what the World
> most delights in, that is, Variety: There the Serious may find Contemplation;
> the Witty, Mirth; the Politicians, State Maxims; the Humoursome, fresh
> Airs; [and] the Amorous, new Sonnets[.] (King 1709, a2ʳ⁻ᵛ)

King's definition invokes two common justifications for the variety that characterises the miscellany form: it gives readers pleasure, and it helps to attract the widest possible audience, from studious readers to passionate lovers. It was not just books that promised variety: periodicals also began to present themselves as miscellanies. The first periodical to feature the word *miscellany* in its title or subtitle was the *Gentleman's Journal: or, The Monthly Miscellany* (1692–94), which purported to be a printed version of a manuscript newsletter incorporating a selection of new writing in verse and prose. In the next two decades, five more periodicals adopted the term *miscellany* or *miscellanies* in their titles.[13] Several of these publications solicited and printed contributions from their readers, creating an innovative and interactive kind of miscellany that was later popularised by magazines such as the *Gentleman's Magazine*, established in 1731. Moreover, as I argue in Chap. 5, the *Gentleman's Journal* provided a model of audience participation that influenced the development of the poetic miscellany tradition.

While the Latinate word *miscellany* and its plural *miscellanies* were widely used in the titles of books and periodicals in the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, the Greek-derived *anthology* did not appear in any English title until the end of the period. In the eighteenth century, the English word *anthology* remained tethered to its classical roots. Derived from the Greek words *anthos* (flower) and *legein* (to gather), it was still used in its etymological sense: the first definition given by Samuel Johnson in 1755 was "A collection of flowers" (1755, s.v. "anthology *n. s.*"). Johnson's third definition, "A collection of poems", suggests that the word had begun to be used in its modern sense, as a generic term for a collection of literary texts. However, this simple definition belies the relatively restricted usage of the word as a literary term in the eighteenth century. The word *anthology* was rarely used to refer to a collection of poems except as the anglicised title of two major collections of classical epigrams, the Greek Anthology (first printed in 1494 under the title *Anthologia Graeca Planudea*) and the Latin Anthology (given definitive shape by Pieter Burman the Younger in the mid-eighteenth century as *Anthologia Veterum Latinorum Epigrammatum et Poëmatum*).[14] When

the compiler of *The Festoon* (1766), a collection of English epigrams, extended the floral metaphor of his title by referring to the compilation as an "Anthology … of borrowed flowers", it was uncommon for the word to be applied to a collection of English poems (*Festoon* 1766, vi). The first collection of writings in English to feature the word in its title was Joseph Ritson's *English Anthology*, published in the mid-1790s. Ritson offered a selection of the best English verse "from the beginning of the sixteenth century (or, including an extract from Chaucer, from the latter part of the fourteenth) to the present time", arranged in three volumes (Ritson 1793–94, 1:i). Ritson's collection was the first since *The Muses Library* (1737) to propose a historical survey of English poetry from the medieval period to the present, and its title signalled its ambition to define an English poetic canon.[15] As Anne Ferry (2001, 22) has observed, Ritson's title was an allusion to the Greek Anthology; it asserted both the canonical status of the collection and the importance of the English poetic tradition as a rival to the canon of classical poetry. However, innovative though Ritson's title was, it was not influential. The idea of an English anthology was a novel one at the end of the eighteenth century, and it would be another hundred years before the word *anthology* became familiar as a title for collections of English poetry.

This is a study of how the idea of the miscellany shaped the forms in which poetry was written, published, and read between Dryden and Tonson's experiments with a new kind of poetic miscellany in the 1680s and the appearance of the first self-styled poetry anthology in the 1790s. Though the modern sense of *anthology* was not current in this period, I make use of the term to describe eighteenth-century poetry collections that differ fundamentally from contemporary miscellanies. For many modern scholars, the miscellany and the anthology form a dichotomy that can be applied to collections created in any era. Scholars of medieval literature have distinguished between manuscript miscellanies and anthologies: the former are typically more haphazard in structure and varied in content than the latter, which tend to be carefully organised.[16] For Laura Mandell (1999, 110) and Michael F. Suarez (2001, 218–19), scholars of eighteenth- and nineteenth-century print culture, the key distinction between the two kinds of collection is not structural but aesthetic: miscellanies cultivate an appetite for novelty and variety, whereas anthologies foster a desire for a canon. As I argue in Chap. 6, miscellanies shaped the consumption of poetry in more ways than this distinction allows, including by promoting the canonical status of past and contemporary authors. But

there is a valuable insight in Mandell's discussion of late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century anthologies. For Mandell, an anthology is not a collection of poems but a collection of poets: "The anthology figures not single poems but an author's oeuvre as a whole, living body" by printing selections from authors' works within a historical framework, often with the addition of biographical material (1999, 115). The present study extends Mandell's theory by making authorship central to the distinction between miscellanies and anthologies. Unlike miscellanies, in which authors' roles are social and flexible, anthologies confer fixed identities on the authors they feature as historical figures with distinct oeuvres. The differing characteristics of miscellanies and anthologies, and the crossover of content between the two forms in the eighteenth century, are explored further in Chaps. 2 and 6.

Miscellanies, Poetry, and Authorship

Collections of English poems by various authors have been published in Britain since the mid-sixteenth century. *The Court of Venus* (1538?), a collection that survives only in fragmentary form, may be the earliest, but it was Richard Tottel's *Songes and Sonettes* (1557), known today as Tottel's Miscellany, that paved the way for a tradition of English poetry collections of multiple authorship.[17] The development of this tradition in the second half of the seventeenth century has been linked to the expansion of the market for printed literature. In the only previous book-length study of the literary collections of the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, Barbara M. Benedict argued that it was during the Restoration era that the "literary anthology" (understood to encompass miscellanies) emerged as a distinct "printed genre" (1996, 14). The rise of the anthology, in Benedict's account, was prompted by the growth of the reading public and the increasing output of the book trade. The emergence of "a new, nontraditional audience of gentry and 'middle classes'" increased demand for printed literature. Meanwhile, the growing quantity and diversity of works in print created a desire among readers for books promising "judicious selections" of the best, most instructive, or most entertaining pieces. This was the role that the anthology took on, becoming a "mediator" between literary culture and its audience (ibid.). Thus, according to Benedict, the history of literary collections in the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries is the story of how the changing appetites of readers fostered the invention of a new literary form.

However, the evolution of literary collections was understood differently in the eighteenth century. In an important essay on the miscellany form, the Earl of Shaftesbury attributed its rise not to the broadening of the reading public but rather to a "Revolution" in the culture of authorship (1711, 3:4). Shaftesbury's *Characteristicks of Men, Manners, Opinions, Times* (1711) consolidated his position as one of the most influential writers of the eighteenth century. A prose miscellany largely made up of previously published philosophical writings, it included an essay on the nature and origins of the miscellany form itself. With self-deprecating humour, Shaftesbury represented the miscellany as a modern invention born out of resistance to an elitist model of authorship. There was a time, he wrote, "when the Name of AUTHOR stood for something considerable in the World", as authors were masters of their craft and "few in Number". But the exacting standards of authorship provoked resentment among "those *Wits* who cou'd not possibly be receiv'd as AUTHORS upon such difficult Terms" (ibid., 3:3–4). There was a need to democratise authorship, and the miscellany played a central role in this: it emerged as a form ideally suited to the undisciplined invention and piecemeal compositional habits of the modern "*Wits*". Shaftesbury was primarily interested in the miscellany as a vehicle for an individual author's writings, but his observations proved equally applicable to collections by several hands. The editor of *The Edinburgh Miscellany* (1720) opened his preface by quoting Shaftesbury's remarks on the democratising influence of the miscellany form: "From every Field, from every Hedge or Hillock, we now gather as delicious Fruits and flagrant [*sic*] Flowers, as of old from the richest and best cultivated Gardens."[18] This miscellany included poems attributed to young women and university students, and its editor claimed that many "had either never been compos'd, or never seen the Light without it" (*Edinburgh* 1720, ii).

This study examines the history of miscellanies in the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries in large part through the lens of authorship. In doing so, it makes two key arguments. The first is that miscellanies proliferated in this period because the form's organising principle of variety could be adopted by a wide range of edited and authorial collections. This flexibility allowed the miscellany to establish itself at the centre of late seventeenth- and eighteenth-century literary culture. The second argument is that the miscellany played an important and to some extent overlooked role in the self-fashioning of eighteenth-century authors. Scholars have long been interested in the miscellanies written and edited

by such major authors as Jonathan Swift, Alexander Pope, and Henry Fielding.[19] In recent years, miscellanies by women and labouring-class poets have also begun to receive attention.[20] Yet these discussions have sometimes lacked an appreciation of how authors harnessed the miscellany's distinctive formal character and adapted earlier models. In the following chapters, case studies of miscellanies by labouring-class poets and an army officer-turned-miscellaneous writer show how eighteenth-century authors used the form to define themselves and their role in the literary marketplace.

The next three chapters of this book establish the contours of a history of miscellanies that is not bounded by the modern author-centric definition of the form. Chap. 2 focuses on the tradition of collections of poems by several hands that has dominated critical and bibliographical studies of miscellanies for the past century. It examines the authorial dynamics of multiple-author poetry collections from the mid-seventeenth century to the later eighteenth century. For much of the seventeenth century, as Adam Smyth has observed, printed miscellanies containing verse "declare[d] little interest in authorship" (2004, 2). Later, in the 1680s, poetic miscellanies gained a new cultural importance as venues for the formation of authorial communities and reputations. The miscellanies produced by Jacob Tonson and John Dryden in this decade have rightly been recognised as pioneering, but Chap. 2 argues that it was Aphra Behn who refined the Dryden-Tonson model and realised the potential of the miscellany to commemorate literary friendships and forge communities of authors with shared interests. The type of miscellany that Behn produced remained popular for half a century, creating opportunities for authors pursuing careers in print to build their reputations. Other kinds of poetic miscellany maintained a place in the market, among them collections advertising their origins in an exclusive coterie or social milieu rather than in the literary world of a named editor. These collections sometimes invited readers to join their communities of authors by sending in contributions to fill future parts or volumes. Readers also played an active role in defining miscellany communities by filling in gaps in attributions, a common feature of late seventeenth- and eighteenth-century miscellanies. In the 1730s, the rise of magazines diminished the importance of miscellanies as outlets for new poetry, and the chapter concludes by exploring the repackaging of miscellany poetry in mid-century anthologies that replaced the fluidity of an authorial community with the hierarchy of a canon.

Chapter 3 examines the parallel but comparatively neglected tradition of single-author miscellanies. It defines a single-author miscellany as a collection appearing to contain works by one author with a title emphasising its miscellaneous character. Hundreds of such collections including verse were published in the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The first half of the chapter examines the authorship of these miscellanies, the roles that they played in authors' careers, and how they were published. It reveals that Shaftesbury's conception of the miscellany as a form suited to a greater diversity of authors was prescient: in the second half of the eighteenth century the number of miscellanies by women and the number published in English provincial towns and cities rose dramatically. The chapter also reveals that in the eighteenth century an increasing proportion of miscellanies were published by authors themselves, who paid for their printing under printing "for the author" arrangements or raised money to cover the costs of production from subscribers. For these authors, making a profit from the sale of their books was important, but it was not the only motive for publishing. In the 1730s, a group of labouring-class authors used these methods of publishing to produce miscellanies that aimed to capitalise on the success of the "*famous* Threshing Poet" Stephen Duck (Tatersal 1734, 23). The miscellanies published by John Bancks, Robert Dodsley, and Robert Tatersal have been discussed in the context of the development of labouring-class writing, but the role that the miscellany form played in these authors' self-fashioning as labouring poets has not been fully explored. The second half of the chapter argues that these authors took advantage of miscellanies' capacity to accommodate multiple identities in their pursuit of literary recognition and social advancement.

Chapter 4 presents a case study of an author whose work forged connections between single-author miscellanies and miscellanies by several hands. Richardson Pack (1682–1728), an army officer who began a career as a published author after his retirement from military service, has been all but forgotten. But there is much that can be learned from Pack's career about the literary and commercial influences on miscellaneous writing in the early eighteenth century. In the course of a publishing career lasting nine years, Pack produced two miscellanies and a scattering of poems and translations. Almost all of his works were published by the London bookseller Edmund Curll, a prolific producer of miscellanies of all kinds. Pack's miscellaneous writing suited Curll's publishing programme: some of Pack's prose pieces augmented Curll's stock of literary material that could

be recycled and recombined in multiple publications. But the literary character of Pack's work is more significant than the manner of its production. As he revealed in one of his published essays, Pack was an admiring reader of the enduringly popular series of miscellanies published by Tonson between 1684 and 1709 and overseen by Dryden until his death in 1700. Chapter 4 shows that not only did Pack borrow from and imitate a number of poems published in the Dryden-Tonson miscellanies, but he also recreated the literary character of these collections in a miscellany that showcased his literary talent and social aspirations. Pack's career as a poet and miscellany author sheds light on the reception of the Dryden-Tonson miscellanies and illustrates how miscellany characteristics could be shared by single- and multiple-author collections.

The second half of the book turns from questions of authorship and influence to consider how miscellanies shaped the consumption of poetry and were in turn shaped by the broader landscape of poetry publishing. Chapter 5 examines the evolving relationship between miscellanies and periodicals and assesses the influence of periodicals on the publication of poetry in miscellanies. Like miscellanies, periodicals played a major role in the transmission of poetry in print and often boasted of their variety. In the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, as books called miscellanies multiplied, the first periodicals to adopt the title of *Miscellany* or *Miscellanies* were launched. Several published new poetry, either as their staple content or alongside prose. Chapter 5 begins by tracing the influence of the *Gentleman's Journal: or, The Monthly Miscellany* (1692–94), the first periodical to be conceived and labelled as a miscellany, on periodical culture and the development of the periodical as a venue for poetry over the next twenty years. Moreover, it argues that the *Gentleman's Journal* had an influence on the publication of poetic miscellanies, inspiring Jacob Tonson to adopt a new publishing model in the 1690s that anticipated the production of annual series of miscellanies in the eighteenth century. The chapter moves on to examine the impact of eighteenth-century developments in periodical literature—namely, Joseph Addison and Richard Steele's reinvention of the essay paper in the second decade of the century and the popularisation of the magazine in the 1730s—on the tradition of miscellanies featuring poetry. Poems originally published in essay papers, often anonymously, were repackaged in miscellanies as works of celebrated authors. Furthermore, some authors whose work was featured in the poetry pages of magazines went on to publish miscellanies of their writings. The chapter concludes by examining the case of one such

author, the Oxford poet Mary Jones (1707–1778), who achieved critical and commercial success with *Miscellanies in Prose and Verse* (1750). With new evidence of the printing of her verse, this case study redraws Jones's trajectory from periodical to miscellany publication and highlights the role that periodicals played in disseminating and inspiring her lyric verse and songs.

Chapter 6 investigates the role of miscellanies in the formation of the English literary canon. There is a consensus among literary historians that the English canon evolved into its modern form in the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. However, the part that miscellanies played in the formation of the canon in this period has not been extensively explored. A preconception that miscellanies tended to promote new and contemporary writing and a lack of tools for analysing the contents of large numbers of collections have stood in the way of scholarly investigation. This chapter examines how miscellanies participated in the formation of the canon both individually and collectively. It begins by demonstrating that the forms and functions of late seventeenth- and eighteenth-century poetry collections were more fluid than modern definitions of the miscellany and anthology allow. The miscellany form was used to promote an English poetic canon: in 1693, the bookseller Francis Saunders revamped an old miscellany as a rival to a pioneering French anthology. Furthermore, one of the most successful poetry collections of the eighteenth century—*The Works of the Earls of Rochester and Roscommon*, first published in 1706 but dated 1707—functioned as both an anthology of Restoration poetry and an ever-changing miscellany of poems by later authors. The chapter also makes innovative use of quantitative methods to examine the relationship between miscellanies and the canon. The Digital Miscellanies Index, launched in 2013, has enabled large-scale analysis of the poetic contents of miscellanies. This chapter uses data from the Index to measure the relative prominence of contemporary and past authors in miscellanies from decade to decade over the course of a century. The analysis shows that although the miscellany has been characterised as a form showcasing mainly contemporary poetry, the dominant trend in miscellanies for much of the eighteenth century was the increasing prominence of authors of the past. The analysis also uses the data collected to make the case that miscellanies participated in establishing the canonical status of older authors such as Shakespeare and Milton in the eighteenth century.

Chapter 7 turns from assessing the cultural influence of poetic miscellanies to exploring their histories as books. It exploits underused bibliographical evidence to tell new stories about how miscellanies were sold,

how they were valued by collectors, and how they were read and created by readers. The first part of the chapter provides a snapshot of the range of English poetic miscellanies available to buyers of second-hand books half a century after the fashion for a new kind of poetic miscellany began in the 1680s. A survey of unpriced booksellers' catalogues from the 1720s reveals that even in a market dominated by books in learned and foreign languages miscellanies of English verse maintained a strong presence. The second part of the chapter throws new light on the revival of interest in Richard Tottel's popular Tudor miscellany *Songes and Sonettes* (1557) in the second half of the eighteenth century. The pricing of editions of Tottel's Miscellany in auction and fixed-price sale catalogues from this period shows that the collection was recognised by book collectors as an important example of older English poetry and printing before it received significant attention in literary scholarship and bibliography. The remainder of the chapter argues that the miscellany was a malleable form in the eighteenth century. Readers in this period, as in previous centuries, sometimes had bundles of books and pamphlets bound together, creating unique composite volumes, or *Sammelbände*. Though many of these volumes were purely practical assemblages of material, others were organised in a way that mirrored the structural patterns of printed miscellanies and encouraged the same kinds of reading. By examining books from an eighteenth-century gentleman's library, this chapter shows how readers could participate in miscellany culture by creating personal miscellanies that reflected the connections and contrasts they perceived between the texts they read.

The Rediscovery of Poetic Miscellanies

Case's foundational bibliography of poetic miscellanies was published in 1935, but it is only in the past twenty-five years that the importance of these collections has begun to be recognised. The upsurge of scholarly interest in printed miscellanies in recent decades is closely related to a number of major developments in literary scholarship. First, the rise of the history of the book as an academic field from the 1970s onwards generated new interest in poetic miscellanies as commercial products. While early twentieth-century scholars regarded poetic miscellanies as barometers of popular taste, book historians have emphasised that they were "money-making endeavours", compiled by editors and publishers from readily available materials and often for specific constituencies of readers.[21]

The work of Michael F. Suarez on Robert Dodsley's bestselling *Collection of Poems* (1748–58) and on the broader landscape of eighteenth-century poetic miscellanies has been particularly influential in showing how "networks of social … and economic relations" shaped the publication of poetry in collections by several hands (Suarez 2001, 218; see also Dodsley 1997). Second, the reorientation of scholarly attention in the 1980s towards eighteenth-century poets and poetry that had been excluded from the traditional canon fostered a new awareness of miscellanies as part of the vast and largely unexplored corpus of poetry published in the period. In the introduction to his groundbreaking *New Oxford Book of Eighteenth-Century Verse*, an anthology that "redefined the canon of eighteenth-century English poetry" (Ribeiro and Basker 1996, vii), Roger Lonsdale asserted that scholars had barely begun to take stock of "the sheer quantity of verse published in the century—the thousands of substantial, separately published poems, the hundreds of volumes of collected poems by individual authors, the innumerable miscellanies by several hands, all the verse which appeared in the poetry sections of hundreds of magazines and newspapers" (Lonsdale 1984, xxxv–xxxvi). Lonsdale's work opened the way for numerous studies of neglected authors and genres that discussed poems published in miscellanies by several hands.[22]

More recently, the expansion of digital scholarship has transformed the study of poetic miscellanies. Until the early years of the twenty-first century, the only tools that existed for tracing the publication of individual poems in seventeenth- and eighteenth-century miscellanies on a large scale were two card indexes: the Boys-Mizener index of poems in miscellanies listed in Case's bibliography, housed at the Kenneth Spencer Research Library in Lawrence, Kansas, and Walter Harding's index of verse in his collection of poetic miscellanies, songbooks, and other printed material, held at the Bodleian Library, Oxford.[23] Within the past two decades, the creation of searchable digital collections of primary material and, even more importantly, online indexes of printed poetry has enabled scholars to track appearances of individual poems and poets in seventeenth- and eighteenth-century miscellanies with unprecedented speed and precision. The central achievement of scholarship on poetic miscellanies in the past decade has been the creation of the Digital Miscellanies Index (DMI), a freely available online index of verse in over 1,700 collections of writing by various authors published between 1557 and 1800.[24] The DMI was first conceived and developed as a comprehensive and accessible "guidebook" to the vast and varied landscape of English verse in

eighteenth-century miscellanies (Williams and Batt 2017, 2). During the first three years of the project, researchers collected data for over 40,000 poems and poetic extracts printed in multiple-author collections between 1700 and 1800. When the DMI was launched in a beta version in 2013, users were able to retrieve information about particular miscellanies, poems, and authors and search for poems and miscellanies by genre or theme.[25] During the second phase of the project, the DMI's dataset was enlarged by integrating data for sixteenth- and seventeenth-century collections from Michelle O'Callaghan's Verse Miscellanies Online and Adam Smyth's Index of Poetry in Printed Miscellanies, 1640–1682.[26] At the same time, a new search interface was developed to enable easier identification of clusters and patterns in the data, particularly in relation to authorship and attribution. By the end of 2017, the DMI had been transformed into an index covering the first 250 years of English poetry collections by several hands.

This is the first book-length study of late seventeenth- and eighteenth-century poetic miscellanies to make use of the DMI's data. The discussion of the relationship between miscellanies and the canon in Chap. 6 extends the "data-driven reception history" that has begun to emerge in scholarship on miscellanies (Williams and Batt 2017, 2). The DMI's enhanced search interface and enlarged dataset have made it possible to track the authors most widely published in miscellanies from decade to decade and map out the collective role of miscellanies in shaping the English literary canon for the first time. The analysis in Chap. 6 demonstrates how the DMI has opened up poetic miscellanies to distant reading, enabling scholars to investigate issues of popularity and canonicity on a large scale. The DMI is not the only online index of eighteenth-century poetry in print to have been created in recent years: Emily Lorraine de Montluzin's index of poems published in the *Gentleman's Magazine* before 1801 was launched in 2012, and in the same year records for poems printed in eighteenth-century books and periodicals began to be added to the Union First Line Index of English Verse hosted by the Folger Shakespeare Library.[27] The emergence of this trio of indexes has made it much easier to trace the movement of texts and authors between some of the most popular forms of eighteenth-century print, from poetic miscellanies and songbooks to magazines. Chapter 5's discussions of a newly uncovered printing of a poem by Mary Jones and the broader interactions between periodicals and miscellanies reap the rewards of these developments. Until recently, scholarship on miscellanies was limited by the lack of accessible tools for

searching the contents of large numbers of collections. This study combines the breadth of analysis of multiple-author miscellanies that digital tools have made possible with the attentiveness to single-author miscellanies that has been missing from twentieth-century scholarship to offer a new account of miscellanies and the publication of poetry from the age of Dryden to that of Wordsworth.

Notes

1. The *OED* defines *anthology* in its modern literary sense as "[a]ny published collection of writings, typically by various authors". *Oxford English Dictionary*, s.v. "anthology, *n*. 2.a.(b)" http://www.oed.com/ (accessed 10 September 2018).
2. For details of these miscellanies, see Appendix 1, under 1713 (Anne Finch), 1722 (Elizabeth Thomas), and 1734 (Jane Adams).
3. *The First [–Sixth] Part of Miscellany Poems. Containing Variety of New Translations of the Ancient Poets: Together with Several Original Poems. By the Most Eminent Hands. Publish'd by Mr. Dryden*, 6 vols (London: Jacob Tonson, 1716; ESTC N6906, N70161, N49205, N64834, T214159, T175048); *Miscellany Poems*, 5th ed., 2 vols (London: Bernard Lintot, 1726–27; ESTC T5781).
4. For an account of the formation of miscellanies as a category of printed books in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, see Eckhardt and Smith (2014, 10–11).
5. *Oxford English Dictionary*, s.v. "miscellany, *n*." http://www.oed.com/ (accessed 8 September 2018). Juvenal refers to "miscellanea ludi" (the hash of the gladiatorial school) in Satire 11 (Braund 2004, 402–3).
6. On Poliziano's invocation of classical models for his miscellany, see Fitzgerald (2016, 157).
7. This overview is indebted to Eckhardt and Smith's detailed account of the propagation of the word *miscellany* in the late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries (2014, 2–10). See also the first two senses of the noun *miscellany* recorded in the *OED. Oxford English Dictionary*, s.v. "miscellany, *n*. 1., 2." http://www.oed.com/ (accessed 15 September 2018).
8. Jordan's collection is not mentioned by Eckhardt and Smith (2014).
9. The following single-author poetry collections published during the seventeenth century feature *miscellany* or a related word in their titles or subtitles (this list includes first editions only, except where the first edition is unknown): Thomas Jordan, *Love's Dialect, or, Poeticall Varieties; Digested into a Miscelanie of Various Fancies* (1646; Wing J1045); Nicholas Murford, *Fragmenta Poetica: or, Miscelanies of Poetical Musings, Moral and*

Divine (1650; Wing M3100); George Tooke, *Annæ-dicata, or, A Miscelaine of Some Different Cansonets, Dedicated to the Memory of my Deceased, Very Dear Wife, Anna Tooke of Beere* (1652?; Wing T1892); Thomas Jordan, *Piety, and Poesy. Contracted, in a Poetick Miscellanie of Sacred Poems* (1665; Wing J1054A); W. S., *The Poems of Ben. Johnson Junior. Being a Miscelanie of Seriousness, Wit, Mirth, and Mysterie* (1672; Wing S203); Matthew Stevenson, *Poems: or, A Miscellany of Sonnets, Satyrs, Drollery, Panegyricks, Elegies, &c.* (1673; Wing S5508); James Carkesse, *Lucida Intervalla: Containing Divers Miscellaneous Poems, Written at Finsbury and Bethlem* (1679; Wing C577); Andrew Marvell, *Miscellaneous Poems* (1681; Wing M872); John Whitehall, *Miscellaneous Poems* (1685; Wing W1867); John Rawlet, *Poetick Miscellanies* (1687; Wing R358); Thomas Steevens, *A Miscellany of Poems upon Several Occasions both Moral and Amorous* (1689; Wing S5399); Thomas Heyrick, *Miscellany Poems* (1691; Wing H1753); Thomas Rogers, *The Loyal and Impartial Satyrist: Containing Eight Miscellany Poems* (1694; Wing R1842C); John Dennis, *Miscellany Poems*, "Second Edition" (1697; Wing D1035); Ambrose Philips, *Miscellany Poems* (1697; Wing M2232A); *Miscellaneous Poems upon Several Occasions. Written by a Young Lady* (1698; Wing M2229).

10. The following single-author collections of poetry and prose published during the seventeenth century have titles emphasising their miscellaneous character (this list includes first editions only): Richard Flecknoe, *Miscellania. Or, Poems of All Sorts, with Divers Other Pieces* (1653; Wing F1231); John Norris, *A Collection of Miscellanies: Consisting of Poems, Essays, Discourses, and Letters, Occasionally Written* (1687; Wing N1248); Benjamin Farrah, *Miscellanea Sacra. Containing Scriptural Meditations, Divine Breathings, Occasional Reflections, and Sacred Poems* (1692; Wing F519); John Dennis, *Miscellanies in Verse and Prose* (1693; Wing D1034); Thomas Brown, *A Collection of Miscellany Poems, Letters, &c.* (1699; Wing B5052).

11. The majority of editions of the Dryden-Tonson miscellanies published between 1684 and 1727 feature the ascription "By the most Eminent Hands" on the title page. See Case (1935 no. 172).

12. After *Westminster Quibbles in Verse* (1672; Wing W1470), the following collections of poems by various authors were given titles characterising them as miscellanies (this list includes first editions only and excludes collections of which only one part is called a miscellany): *Miscellany Poems* (London: Jacob Tonson, 1684; Wing D2314); Aphra Behn, ed., *Miscellany, Being a Collection of Poems by Several Hands* (London: Joseph Hindmarsh, 1685; Wing M2230); *Miscellany Poems and Translations by Oxford Hands* (London: Anthony Stephens, 1685; Wing M2232); *Miscellany Poems. With The Temple of Death* (London: Gilbert Cownly, 1685; ESTC