Biblioteca
di Studi
di Filologia
Moderna

Ilaria Natali

«Remov'd from human eyes»: Madness and Poetry 1676-1774

STUDIORUM UNIVERSITAS
FIRENZE UNIVERSITY PRESS

BIBLIOTECA DI STUDI DI FILOLOGIA MODERNA

– 30 –

BIBLIOTECA DI STUDI DI FILOLOGIA MODERNA

Collana Open Access del Dipartimento di Lingue, Letterature e Studi Interculturali
Università degli Studi di Firenze

Laboratorio editoriale Open Access
Beatrice Töttössy, direttore - Arianna Antonielli, caporedattore
Università degli Studi di Firenze, Dipartimento di Lingue, Letterature e Studi Interculturali
Via Santa Reparata 93, 50129 Firenze
tel. +39.055.5056664-6616; fax. +39.06.97253581
email: <laboa@lilsi.unifi.it>
web: <http://www.fupress.com/comitatoscientifico/biblioteca-di-studi-di-filologia-moderna/23>

Ilaria Natali

«Remov'd from human eyes»: Madness and Poetry 1676-1774

FIRENZE UNIVERSITY PRESS
2016

«Remov'd from human eyes»: Madness and Poetry 1676-1774 / Ilaria Natali. – Firenze : Firenze University Press, 2016
(Biblioteca di Studi di Filologia Moderna ; 30)

http://digital.casalini.it/9788864533193

ISBN (online) 978-88-6453-319-3
ISSN (online) 2420-8361

I prodotti editoriali di Biblioteca di Studi di Filologia Moderna: Collana, Riviste e Laboratorio vengono promossi dal Coordinamento editoriale del Dipartimento di Lingue, Letterature e Studi Interculturali dell'Università degli Studi di Firenze e pubblicati, con il contributo del Dipartimento, ai sensi dell'accordo di collaborazione stipulato con la Firenze University Press l'8 maggio 2006 e successivamente aggiornato (Protocollo d'intesa e Convenzione, 10 febbraio 2009 e 19 febbraio 2015). Il Laboratorio (<http://www.lilsi.unifi.it/vp-82-laboratorio-editoriale-open-access-ricerca-formazione-e-produzione.html>, <laboa@lilsi.unifi.it>) promuove lo sviluppo dell'editoria open access, svolge ricerca interdisciplinare nel campo, adotta le applicazioni alla didattica e all'orientamento professionale degli studenti e dottorandi dell'area umanistica, fornisce servizi alla ricerca, formazione e progettazione. Per conto del Coordinamento, il Laboratorio editoriale Open Access provvede al processo del doppio referaggio anonimo e agli aspetti giuridico-editoriali, cura i workflow redazionali e l'editing, collabora alla diffusione.

Editing e composizione: LabOA con Arianna Antonielli (caporedattore), e i tirocinanti Sofia Balbetti, Costanza Baldini, Giulia Bartoli, Emma Bassani, Sara Brezzi, Angela Fuselli.

Progetto grafico di Alberto Pizarro Fernández, Pagina Maestra snc.

Certificazione scientifica delle Opere
Tutti i volumi pubblicati sono soggetti ad un processo di referaggio esterno di cui sono responsabili il Consiglio editoriale della FUP e i Consigli scientifici delle singole collane. Le opere pubblicate nel catalogo della FUP sono valutate e approvate dal Consiglio editoriale della casa editrice. Per una descrizione più analitica del processo di referaggio si rimanda ai documenti ufficiali pubblicati sul catalogo on-line della casa editrice (www.fupress.com).

Consiglio editoriale Firenze University Press
G. Nigro (Coordinatore), M.T. Bartoli, M. Boddi, R. Casalbuoni, C. Ciappei, R. Del Punta, A. Dolfi, V. Fargion, S. Ferrone, M. Garzaniti, P. Guarnieri, A. Mariani, M. Marini, A. Novelli, M.C. Torricelli, M. Verga, A. Zorzi.

Università degli Studi di Firenze
Firenze University Press
via Cittadella, 7, 50144 Firenze, Italy
www.fupress.com

Gone mad is what they say, and sometimes *Run mad*,
as if mad is a different direction, like west;
as if mad is a different house you could step into, or a separate
country entirely. But when you go mad you don't go any other place,
you stay where you are. And somebody else comes in.
Margaret Atwood, *Alias Grace* (1996)

La folie, c'est un pays où n'entre pas qui veut.
Philippe Claudel, *Les âmes grises* (2003)

CONTENTS

Foreword 3

1. Introduction: «the signes of madness beginning»
   1.1 Madness, imputed madness, and poetry: weaving threads 7
   1.2 Madness and internment between 1676 and 1774 16
   1.3 The madness of interpretation 28

2. The «Doctor's Patient» views in James Carkesse's *Lucida Intervalla*
   2.1 «A Bethlehemite in Bedlam» 41
   2.2 «To Bedlam you aloud, Fop Mad-Quack calls» 49
   2.3 «A Sword in the hands of a madman» 57

3. Perspectives on doctors and doctoring in Anne Finch's production
   3.1 «So here confin'd, and but to female Clay» 67
   3.2 «A sort of men she spied / Call'd doctors» 75
   3.3 «My old inveterate foe» 88

4. Shifting images and «observance» in William Collins' poetry
   4.1 «Poor dear Collins» 101
   4.2 «Dim-discover'd Tracts of Mind» 113
   4.3 «Luckless Collins' Shade» 127

5. Micro- and macro-vision in Christopher Smart's *Jubilate Agno*
   5.1 «For silly fellow! silly fellow! is against me» 137
   5.2 «For Eternity is like a grain of mustard» 146
   5.3 «For I am inquisitive in the Lord» 154

6. A 'moral eye' in William Cowper's early poetry
   6.1 «My continual misery» 165
   6.2 «Et fluctuosum ceu mare volvitur» 171
   6.3 «Thy rebellious worm is still» 181

I. Natali, *«Remov'd from human eyes»: Madness and Poetry 1676-1774*, ISBN (online) 978-88-6453-319-3
ISSN (online) 2420-8361,

7. Conclusions: «a madness greatly different in its appearances»
7.1 Finding a direction 193
7.2 The (poetic) performance for 'sane' eyes 201

Works Cited 211

Index of Names 253

FOREWORD

The present study analyses the representations of madness in English poetry between the years 1676 and 1774, which mark two significant changes in the managing of mental disease. In 1676, London's St. Mary of Bethlehem Hospital for the Insane, also known as Bethlem or Bedlam, moved to a new building in Moorfields which was three times its former size. This event was the first sign of a new tendency nationwide: in the following decades, Britain witnessed the opening of many new mental care institutions and the expansion of existing ones. The first attempt to regulate the burgeoning of these institutions was the *Madhouses Act* of 1774, which provided for licensing and inspection of private madhouses. By focusing on the years 1676-1774, my work considers roughly the period that Michel Foucault defines as the Classical Age in his influential *Folie et déraison. Histoire de la folie à l'age classique*, 1961 (*History of Madness,* 1972 [1965]). Although I do not endorse Foucault's much contested idea of a European «Great Confinement», I explore its possibilities as a means to point out a change in the feeling towards mental trouble in seventeenth- and eighteenth-century Britain.

This book proposes an interdisciplinary approach, with literature as the main field of inquiry. The following chapters examine how various seventeenth- and eighteenth-century poets represent their experience of the changing definitions and treatments of mental disease. Specifically, I analyse the texts of five authors, James Carkesse (ca. 1636-1711), Anne Finch (1661-1720), William Collins (1721-1759), Christopher Smart (1722-1771) and William Cowper (1731-1800), who were all officially considered insane; hence, they were confined in public hospitals and private madhouses, or otherwise estranged from society. These writers occupy different places in the English literary canon and belong to different literary currents, but a common thread runs through their poems: they all respond to contemporary definitions of madness and to the procedures of normalization proposed by the medical world. My analysis widens, thus, to consider medical treatises such as Robert Burton's *Anatomy of Melancholy* (1621), Thomas Willis' *De Anima Brutorum* (1672; *Two Discourses Concerning the Soul of Brutes*, 1683), Richard Blackmore's *A Treatise of the*

I. Natali, *«Remov'd from human eyes»: Madness and Poetry 1676-1774*, ISBN (online) 978-88-6453-319-3
ISSN (online) 2420-8361,

Spleen and Vapours (1725), George Cheyne's *The English Malady* (1733), William Battie's *A Treatise on Madness* (1758), and Robert Whytt's *Observations* (1765).

Poetry seems to be the ideal *locus* for the study of insanity: Western thought has connected this genre with madness (and divine inspiration) at least since Plato's treatment of the subject in his dialogues, especially *Φαῖδρος* (*Phædrus*) and *Ἴων* (*Ion*; Greek *editio princeps*, 1513; first complete English translation by Thomas Taylor, 1804). Over the centuries, the question of the 'mad' poet has brought forth a traditional association between folly and genius, or a view that madness is somehow generally linked to artistic creativity. However, with the so-called Scientific Revolution of the seventeenth century, the prophetical image of insanity was overwhelmed by much more profane preoccupations concerning material or even corporal aspects of this condition. The aesthetic-philosophical discourse on madness has never disappeared, but engaged in a complex, dynamic relationship with the concept of insanity as illness. Even nowadays, it is hardly possible to reconcile the long-standing fracture between a suggestive, aesthetic model of insanity and the factual import of being labelled as mentally unsound, since the first aspect traditionally appertains to the fields of philosophy and literature, the second to those of social sciences and the history of medicine. I hope this book contributes in some small way to show that working at the intersection of these two paradigms can offer a renewed understanding of the 'poetry of insanity' and the various levels of discourse that it may contain.

After Foucault's *History of Madness*, the topic has experienced a surge of critical interest in the philosophical, social, medical and legal fields, among others. As far as the study of insanity in literature is concerned, recent approaches have evaded monologic definitions, describing mental disease as a phenomenon that consists of interrelated cultural processes. Scholars like Allan Ingram, Michelle Faubert, Alan Richardson and Katharine Hodgkin do not 'anachronistically' attempt to identify possible symptoms of the author's disorder in the literary text, but they investigate imagery and language in an intertextual and interdisciplinary way to shed light on new interconnections between expressions of the self and established frameworks of subjectivity. My research method is much indebted to these critical attitudes, as the more detailed introduction in the first chapter will help clarify.

Before beginning my discussion, I would like to acknowledge the considerable support of those that made this work possible. The research underlying this book has been carried out thanks to a fellowship at the Department of *Lingue, Letterature e Studi Interculturali* (University of Florence, Italy), based on the project «Madness: spaces of segregation, marginalization and constraint emerging from literatures in English and the European cultural memory». I am most grateful to my supervisors,

Professor Donatella Pallotti, who has offered me invaluable guidance and steadfast assistance throughout my academic life, and Professor Rita Svandrlik, who has sustained and encouraged me. I am greatly indebted to Professor Paola Pugliatti for generous and substantial help under many circumstances. I sincerely thank the faculty at the Department of *Lingue, Letterature e Studi Interculturali* of the University of Florence for support that goes well beyond funding.

My thanks to Professors Donatella Pallotti and Carla Dente, who gave me the opportunity to present the early results of my research at the *2012 IASEMS* (*Italian Association of Shakespearean and Early Modern Studies*) *Conference* in Pisa. While this book was in its final stages, the IASEMS executive board offered me a further occasion to talk about my research at the *2015 IASEMS Conference* in Bergamo. Many among the founders and members of IASEMS have offered me feedback and suggestions at these conferences, and precious help in other occasions: in particular (in alphabetical order) Maurizio Ascari, Mariacristina Cavecchi, Rocco Coronato, Giuliana Iannaccaro, Alessandra Marzola, Roberta Mullini, Alessandra Petrina, Manfred Pfister, Franca Ruggieri, Laura Tosi and Romana Zacchi, to whom I am very grateful. I had a fruitful exchange of views on the international level at the seminar *Storia, Identità e Canoni letterari* (*History, Identity and Literary Canons*) held at the University of Florence, and I wish to thank the organizers, Professors Ayşe Saraçgil, Angela Tarantino and Ioana Both. I also owe a debt of gratitude to Professor Gigliola Sacerdoti Mariani for her interest in this project; she has been a source of inspiration. I greatly appreciate Dr. Annalisa Volpone's help with various bibliographic references and, even more importantly, I appreciate her enduring friendship. I am indebted to the Director of the University Institute Carlo Bo in Florence, Professor Josiane Tourres, for her encouragement during the preparation of this book. Special thanks go to the *Coordinamento* and *Laboratorio editoriale Open Access* at the University of Florence, in particular to Professor Beatrice Töttössy and Dr. Arianna Antonielli. I dedicate this book to Sara and Nora and to the memory of Piero Mascagni.

1

INTRODUCTION: «THE SIGNES OF MADNESS BEGINNING»

1.1 *Madness, imputed madness, and poetry: weaving threads*

Few concepts can be considered as unsteady and changeable as madness. Its multiple discourses have long concerned, puzzled, and fascinated virtually every field of knowledge, including social studies, medicine, philosophy, history, law, fine arts, and literature. In the twenty-first century, scholars of various disciplines have tried to capture the elusive nature of madness following its declinations in different cultures and times[1], emphasizing the forms it can take, the abilities it can affect[2], or comparing old methods with the latest techniques now available to understand mental disorders[3]. Any efforts to capture the essence of this phenomenon, however, have proven only partially useful: the inherent plural and variable nature of madness can be thought of as its primary meaning.

Before illustrating the scope and perspective in which the present work deals with the vast idea of madness, I would like to draw some generalizations about recent cross-disciplinary understandings of this term. Without aiming to be in any sense comprehensive, the following reflections on the concepts of insanity have emerged in an attempt to structure and organize the object of study, or – allow me the paradox – to find a rational path into insanity. After all, because «the controversy and debate which surround notions of madness are integral to these notions» (Geekie and Read 2009, 143), the idea of madness itself is also pervaded with paradoxes. Among the competing formulations presented in the last few decades, in fact, we can recognize some prevalent patterns. In what might be considered an attempt to transcend or re-articulate traditional binary ways of thinking, some ideas combine to form, in my opinion, three main interrelated aporias concerning

[1] On these topics, see ed. Hubert 2000; eds, Colborne and Mackinnon 2003; Lederer 2006; Keller 2007; Reiss 2008; ed. Turner 2010; Goddard 2011.

[2] See, for instance, Guimón 2001; Hubert 2002; Davis 2008; Bean 2008; eds, Read and Dillon 2013; Greenfeld 2013.

[3] See, for instance, Heinrichs 2001; Bentall 2003; Geekie and Read 2009; Staub 2011.

I. Natali, *«Remov'd from human eyes»: Madness and Poetry 1676-1774*, ISBN (online) 978-88-6453-319-3
ISSN (online) 2420-8361, CC BY-NC-ND 3.0 IT, 2016 Firenze University Press

insanity. As we will see, these notions recur in different forms when looking at madness, so they might also be considered as recurring motifs in this book.

The first aporia is connected with the explanation of madness in terms of spatial metaphors. Insanity is often seen as continuously crossing the threshold between an 'inside' and an 'outside' (of society, thought, self, etc.), or as belonging to both spaces at the same time. For instance, we are accustomed to associating madness with a «remote and unfamiliar phenomenon» that causes the subject's alienation and exclusion (Radden 2009, 59), but it should also be acknowledged that madness «has currently become a *common* discursive *place*» which «occupies a position of *inclusion* and becomes the *inside* of a culture» (Felman 2003, 4, original emphasis).

Sociology has demonstrated that today the mentally challenged may still occupy a liminal position in society, one which consists of inclusion and exclusion simultaneously. Surveys and studies concerning current options for the integration of mental health patients show that acceptance is not always coupled with «psychological integration», «participation» and «opportunities» for participation, so that the subject may be in a state of mere absence of exclusion (Baumgartner and Burns 2013). If madness can be «mis à l'intérieur de l'extérieur, et inversement» (Foucault 1972a, 22; Murphy 2006, 11: «placed on the inside of the outside, or vice versa»), it is also true that some mental conditions are still seen as making the individual «for the most part unaware of the distinction between its self and the world around it» (Lafrance 2009, 13), with «practically no sense of inside and outside or self and other» (Ogden 1989, 33). It is probably in relation to a generic idea of 'lack of the self' that western civilizations have traditionally seen mental disorder as a condition that can be studied and even understood, but not from within that condition itself.

Studies on madness are therefore dominated by external formulations that have historically included recurring psychiatric, psychological, sociological and philosophical ideas of the phenomenon. The second aporia on madness can be seen to concern cyclical continuities and discontinuities regarding notions of insanity over time. Whereas scholars from disparate fields often concur on the protean mutability of madness, it has often been pointed out that such mutability is coupled with permanency. According to Katharine Hodgkin, «there is some concept of madness in every human culture, and […] every human culture identifies some people or some forms of behaviour as mad» (2007, 4). Whereas the forms of deviance may vary according to cultures and times, recognizing certain behaviours as insane can be thought of as an innate and biologically determined procedure, which appears «natural to the human mind» (Hodgkin 2007, 4)[4].

[4] Interestingly, Thomas Szasz defines madness as a 'socially' determined procedure when he points out that «the existence of madness or mental illness as abnormal behaviour is intrinsic to society» (Szasz 2007, 23). It is worth noting that the 'naturalistic' approach is also questioned in Scull 1995, 387-388.

Along with persistence, the repetitiveness of certain aspects of madness in space and time has also attracted scholarly attention; Robert Perrucci says, «the mentally ill have been ignored, dehumanized, rediscovered, and then rehumanized so many times in history as to make any simple theory of progress suspect» (1974, 3). In addition, to some extent, the notions of insanity are also recursive[5]; this is well exemplified by the idea of «excess» and by the different forms and meanings it has acquired over time in connection with madness. Apparently, nowadays «madness is not so much mental malfunction as a state of horrible hyperfunction of certain mental characteristics» (Nettle 2001, 9); in its literary representations, it is commonly depicted «as an immoderate implementation of features that are considered normal in their moderate form» (Bernaerts *et al*. 2009, 284.). The debate on whether madness can be considered some sort of crossing of a limit has dominated the thinking of all times, to the extent that we may outline a brief history of madness through the words «excess» and «exaggeration». Insanity is a state of excess originating in Aristotle's μελαγχολία (melancholy), or Cicero's excess of *atra bilis*, it is vehement desire and love of learning and study in excess (Burton 1638, 687),«an excessive congestion of blood in the brain» (*Encyclopaedia Britannica* 1771, 149), «enthusiasm […] or intense thought upon some particular thing» (Lavington 1754, 16). It is «cerebral functions […] in *excess*» (Burgess 1858, 8, original emphasis), an «exaggerated development of natural passions of human nature» (Maudsley 1895, 314), «a transient, temporary, or lasting exaggeration» (Storey 1935 [1924], 409). It can imply «dopamine reactor excess» (Snyder 2006, 484-485), that is, «an excess or deficiency of certain neurotransmitters» (Scull 2011, 4), or a brain «overwhelmed by excess internal and external information» (Freedman 2010, 184).

The procedures of permanency and constant return are so widespread in the conception of insanity that they also permeate the third aporia. This aporia concerns another Janus-like aspect of madness, which can apparently be thought of as a 'construct' and 'reality' at one time. Tomi Gomory, David Cohen and Stuart Kirk wonder, «is madness medical disease; a person's unfortunate, incompetent handling of greater and lesser problems in living; social labeling of disapproved behavior; social construction tout court?» (2013, 2). Philosophy of science has provided us with instances of this problem: the most radical example is probably the revisionist movement commonly referred to as anti-psychiatry, which sometimes implied that insanity existed only in discourse and institution[6]. More recently, the

[5] Incidentally, the iterative nature of some explanations of madness reminds us of Deleuze's notion of repetition with difference (2001).

[6] Thomas Szasz's position concerning the idea of madness is quite radical: he compares it to the belief in witchery in the past (Szasz 1960, 113-118). Most other expo-

existence of 'madness' has not been put into question in the scientific field; yet, scholars have problematized the general idea of mental disorder as a social construct that groups together unrelated conditions[7].

As far as social history is concerned, Roy Porter has often emphasised that madness cannot be treated as a mere social construct or aesthetic concept, since it is accompanied by concrete facts (1992b, 277)[8]. In other words, the notion of insanity remains ambiguous and subjective, but its effects are concrete and tangible. It is a fact that 'mad' people might feel pain, incapacitation, and possibly pose a danger for themselves or others; it is also a fact that disorders of thought can find their origin in organic disease. The dualism of body and mind in madness, rooted in the Platonic tradition, still finds new expression in science, for recent studies have demonstrated biological bases for mental illness (Dumit 2003, 35-47). Far from being only abstract, Sander Gilman notes, the idea of madness is a reality which is «mirrored in and conceptualised through the pressures of social forces and psychological models» (1988, 9). According to this view, madness has a 'concrete' and factual substratum which is heavily mediated by cultural paradigms and conventions. Models of insanity, therefore, do not exist independently of reality; different interpretations of that reality bring along the theoretical debate.

What has especially attracted my attention while exploring definitions of madness is that, at any age, it has been hardly possible to cope with this subject without crossing disciplinary lines. Nowadays, mental care experts emphasize the need for «a holistic view of mental illness» and recommend «an integrated multidisciplinary approach to addressing the biological, psychological and social factors that contribute to mental health problems» (Department of Health and Children 2006, <http://goo.gl/5Xks1w>). Clear evidence of an interdisciplinary tendency can be found in the fifth edition of the *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders* (*DSM-5*), released in May 2013. In its last two editions, among the mental «Problems Related to Other Psychosocial, Personal, and Environmental Circumstances», the manual includes a much debated additional category, called «Religious or Spiritual Problem» (American

nents of the 'anti-psychiatric' movement do not deny the existence of 'madness', but rather question its status as an illness (see Laing 1960, 38). A point of reference for the work of these psychiatrists was Erwin Goffman's *Asylums* (1961), where diagnostic labels are seen as self-fulfilling prophecies. In the 1980s, David Ingleby's work reopened many of these issues (Ingleby 1981 and 1982).

[7] On this point, see, for instance, Lilienfeld and Marino 1999, 400-411, and ed. Craighead *et al.* 2008.

[8] It is worthy of note that Porter dealt with the interconnections between madness and literature with particular reference to Samuel Johnson's alleged melancholy (Porter 1985b).

Psychiatric Association 2013, 725). It has been noted that such addition marks a turning point in the cultural sensitivity of medicine and «could help to promote a new relationship between psychiatry and the fields of religion and spirituality that will benefit both mental health professionals and those who seek their assistance» (Turner *et al.* 1995, 435-444)[9].

This necessity to shift between different fields of knowledge was evident even many centuries before psychiatry and psychology were to emerge. Democritus and Hippocrates thought that mental disorders concerned not only physicians, but also philosophers. Similarly, Seneca distinguished between 'organic' and 'spiritual' *insania*, proposing medical or other intervention to cure body and mind (*Ep.* 94.17). With regard to ideas about melancholy and madness in the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, Jeremy Schmidt emphasizes that mental disturbance was a condition that required both a «physician of the body» and a «physician of the soul» (2007, 2). Because different branches of thought intersect and interact in the definition and understanding of madness in apparently all epochs, we might suppose that madness is by nature an interdisciplinary phenomenon, although such scholarly approach to the subject has been systematically adopted only recently. Interdisciplinary study embraces complexity and engages multiple perspectives at the same time as its epistemological method: like the concept of madness itself, it is naturally pluralistic. Interdisciplinarity might be thought of as ideal for the study of insanity, as it contends any sense of stability and tries to capture the state of flux of all discursive practices. In addition, it allows for contradiction and difference, avoiding teleological readings of texts and phenomena.

In the light of these observations, the critical approach proposed in this book brings together two different fields of study: it consists of a combination of literary analysis and the history of medicine – or, to be more specific, the history of madness. My discussion is based on literature, focusing on the poetic text in particular, through investigation of writings by James Carkesse (ca.1636-1711), Anne Finch (1661-1720), William Collins (1721-1759), Christopher Smart (1722-1771), and William Cowper (1731-1800). In the following chapters, I establish an interdiscursive and intertextual web of connections which weaves together literary texts, medical treatises of the seventeenth and eighteenth century and, occasionally, other kinds of scientific or philosophic essays and pamphlets. My analysis aims to show that negotiating between different discourses makes it

[9] As far as the intersections between law and madness are concerned, Phil Fennell notes that «[m]uch of the literature on law and psychiatry is premised upon the notions that the two disci-plines co-exist in a relationship of mutual antagonism» (Fennell 1986, 35). One might also emphasize that the field of Medical Humanities, which emerged in the last decades, is now rapidly expanding (see Oyebode 2009).

possible to capture plural and heterogeneous patterns of insanity, which at times coexisted or replaced one another in both literature and society.

Interdisciplinary analysis is particularly precious in examining the simultaneous interplay of different cultural constructs. As Edgar Morin has observed (1973), this method focuses on questioning the automatic simplification of complexities in which singular disciplines can occasionally fall, overlooking interactions and interferences between elements that belong to different frameworks of thought. While the roots of interdisciplinarity are to be found in the thought of Nietzsche and other philosophers writing at the turn of the century, the development of current notions of this approach began in the 1960s, within a general procedure of challenging the disciplinary authority of institutional structures. Difference, contradiction, and plurality lie at the core of theories developed by Julia Kristeva and Roland Barthes. The latter presented his conception of text as «un espace à dimensions multiples, où se marient et se contestent des écritures variées, dont aucune n'est originelle» (Barthes 1984, 67; Howard 1984, 52-53: «a multidimensional space in which are married and contested several writings, none of which is original»). As both Barthes and Kristeva have underlined, intertextuality (together with interdiscursivity) has a vital role in the multi-prospective and comparative nature of working between disciplines. According to Graham Allen,

> [...] intertextuality reminds us that all texts are potentially plural, reversible, open to the reader's own presuppositions, lacking in clear and defined boundaries, and always involved in the expression or repression of the dialogic 'voices' which exist within society. A term which continually refers to the impossibility of singularity, unity, and thus of unquestionable authority, intertextuality [...] remains a tool which cannot be employed by readers wishing to produce stability and order. (Allen 2000, 209)

Intertextuality is central to the study of madness because this phenomenon «speaks with a voice that organizes multiple discourses into an intertextual whole» (Thiher 1999, 208). Kristeva, Barthes, Foucault, Genette, and Derrida, among others, have all «depersonalized intertextual encounters» in different ways, shifting attention from the idea of origin, source, and individual text or author towards a rhizomatic conception of network of voices (De Nooy 1998, 271). Foucault and Derrida, whose thought is examined in greater detail in the following sections, can be seen as the meeting points between interdisciplinarity and intertextuality, for they have not only radically re-negotiated the hierarchical relationship between disciplines, but also investigated the complex relationships between language, identity and culture. Both philosophers, however differently, seem to share the idea of a network «of complex relations between what is traditionally understood as "history, economics", "psychoanalysis", "politics", etc. in the theatre of the mental world, the inside-outside of the mind» (De Nooy 1998, 208).

Due to the breadth and complexity of the subject, no study concerning literary madness can be all-encompassing; thus, it is crucial to set clear margins to the field of inquiry. The present work focuses on poetic insanity, which is part of an ancient literary and philosophical tradition. The 'mad poet' has engaged the cultural patterns of western civilization for centuries, ever since Plato proposed the first theoretical formulations of poetical creativity. The mystery of poetic inspiration has customarily been associated with the influence of a frenzied, divine power that strips the subject of any control over his or her utterances – a myth, Silke-Maria Weineck says, that «perhaps ironically, [...] the poets themselves appear to have cultivated» (2002, 19). The relationships between mental excess and poetry have long been explored by literary scholars, historians and philosophers[10].While partially revisiting this long-standing debate, the present book also proposes a shift in perspective: rather than considering the ways in which madness shapes poetical creation, I will focus on the different ways in which poetical texts create and represent the idea of madness.

Within the context of madness and poetry, my analysis is framed by definite but partially flexible boundaries, which first concern time and place: I examine intersections between poetry and mental medicine in Great Britain between 1676 and 1774. As is illustrated below, these years mark two important turning points in the perception of madness: the upper chronological limit of this book, 1676, corresponds to the rebuilding and expansion of Bethlem Hospital at Moorfields, London[11]; the new Bethlem can be seen as one of the first signs of a need for additional places of confinement. The lower chronological limit coincides with the *Madhouse Act* of 1774, which established regular inspections of private madhouses in the London area. Although this statute did not stem the rise in internment, it officially identified madness as a social problem, the managing of which was to be subject to regulations.

In general, this book avoids anachronistically imposing twenty-first-century concepts regarding mental health upon fictions of earlier periods; for this reason, the terms more widely employed here are «madness», «mental disorder», «insanity», «derangement», and «lunacy». To use

[10] Klibansky, Panofsky and Saxl's investigation of the concept of melancholy and genius (1979 [1964]) is foundational to the discussion of this subject. More recently, novel perspectives on this subject have appeared in a collection of essays devoted to the 'long' eighteenth century edited by Allan Ingram, Stuart Sim, Clark Lawlor, Richard Terry, John Baker and Leigh Wetherall-Dickson (Ingram *et al.* 2011).

[11] «Bethlem» is a common contraction for Bethlehem Hospital, colloquially known as Bedlam. In this book, I use the shortened term «Bethlem» to refer to the historical institution, as it is a recurring form adopted in contemporary scholarship. «Bedlam» is occasionally employed to indicate the symbolic or allegoric representation of the hospital.

J.K. Wing's terms, these words cover a «wide range of experiences or behaviours» and have nowadays «no scientific value» (1978, 141)[12]; they are now archaic terms used to evoke a provocative image and elude current psychological and psychiatric discourse. In addition,

> [The term] madness has much broader salience for the social order and the cultures we form part of, and has resonance in the world of literature and art and of religious belief, as well as in the scientific domain. And it implies stigma, and stigma has been and continues to be a lamentable aspect of what it means to be mad. (Scull 2015, 14)

Similarly, «mad» is a «generic name for the whole range of people thought to be in some way, more or less, abnormal in ideas or behaviour» (Porter 1987b, 6). Since seventeenth- and eighteenth-century texts are read here in the light of contemporary 'mad discourse', the lexical choices of the period are also respected. In the same line of reasoning, the institutions of confinement are referred to with the term «madhouse» instead of the more recent «asylum»[13].

As a final preliminary remark on the scope of this book, the criteria adopted for the selection of poets and works analysed here need stressing. When dealing with authorial madness, we are tempted to use current models of judgement, or to 'diagnose from a distance'. Yet, retrospectively defining a writer as 'mad' bristles with theoretical difficulties; not last, it entails applying today's scientific and social frames of evaluation to a pre-psychiatric past. Such a procedure is inevitable to a certain extent, as emphasized by George Rousseau: «we cannot deprogramme ourselves to stave off» newer categories and medicalized concepts of mental disease (2000, 74). In order to avoid, at least partially, any 'historical violation', I have limited my discussion to those authors who were imputed as insane according to contemporary standards. Carkesse, Finch, Collins, Smart and Cowper were interned in institutions or removed from society, and they all suffered from the social stigma which accompanied their condition. Aware of being seen as deviant, these five poets describe experiences of personal or social impairment and tackle contemporary medical discourse, providing us with precious points of view on the concepts and contexts of marginality in seventeenth- and eighteenth-century England[14]. Ingram brilliantly illus-

[12] Wing refers specifically to «madness», but his remark can be widened to other, similar terms.

[13] The term «asylum» seems to have been first currently employed for the York Hospital, founded in 1777.

[14] Cesare Segre underlines that our understanding of literature can be much improved by learning more about the authors' sources of inspiration and 'what kind of

trates further aspects of dealing with 'imputed madness', which are worth extensive quotation:

> One particularly problematic border, however, is not the line between sanity and madness, but between sanity and imputed madness. For the individual who has been defined as mad, albeit protestingly, and especially for the individual who has been confined as mad, unique stresses exist when trying to secure redefinition in terms of the sane world. The imputedly mad individual seeking re-entry into language and society comes from a margin that is both real and internalised […]. The language of the allegedly mad, therefore, is potentially both sane and not sane, anxiously, or aggressively, adopting the discourse of reason, as if never removed from it, yet speaking too in the knowledge of that elsewhere to which return would confirm the unspeakable. In the discourses of madness, the discourse of imputed madness 'itself' occupies a curious borderland, neither wholly sane nor wholly outlawed, but waiting at the fringes of what is hearable, recollecting what it was like to be sane, or to be thought sane. (Ingram 2002,144)

I have already underlined elsewhere that literary madness presents us with various possible angles of investigation (2013). When focus is on the imputed insanity of the writer, theoretical grounds can become slippery: there is a common tendency to consider 'mad' literature as a testimony of 'factual', or 'real' madness. However, as Ingram reminds us, there is little difference in studying the work of 'insane' artists and that of 'sane' artists depicting insanity, as both can be considered *representations* of madness (Ingram and Faubert 2003, 4). William B. Ober similarly warns that, when reading texts by 'mad' authors, we are often «concerned with the idea that they wrote the kind of poetry they did […] because their mental condition enabled them to perceive reality in a [different way] from the ordinary run of men», underlining that this biased reading «is fraught with danger» (1970, 205).

In addition, Felman demonstrates that 'mad' literature as a whole is essentially linked to the conventions and rhetorical artifices of the various genres, as well as of the age, revealing «stylistically sophisticated ways by which literature communicates with madness» (2003, 4). In this sense, therefore, it is crucial to contextualize each work within the literary traditions and formal tendencies of a certain literary period. In other words, keeping in mind the aporia regarding construct and reality, we can view insanity as a concrete phenomenon that is constantly re-shaped by a variety of forces and influences – including what Carolyn Miller (1984) defines the «social action» of genres and, we might add, of literary expression at large.

obsession speaks' in the text (in the original: «[…] si capirebbe molto meglio un testo se si sapesse […] quale ossessione vi parla», Segre 1994, 24).

1.2 *Madness and internment between 1676 and 1774*

The period from the second half of the seventeenth century to the end of the eighteenth proves to be particularly fruitful for a study on literature and the history of madness. As is well known, new scientific and sociological paradigms were emerging after Galileo Galilei, Johannes Kepler, Francis Bacon, and René Descartes, among others, secularized the idea of culture. The so-called «seventeenth-century revolution» brought about momentous changes in natural philosophy, anatomy, and medicine. Several crucial milestones were passed within a relatively short time frame: soon after William Harvey and Marcello Malpighi first described blood circulation, Robert Hooke's contribution to microscopy led to the discovery of cells, and the recently founded Royal Society started propounding the inductive method of inquiry.

By the mid-seventeenth century, therefore, the study and treatment of insanity was coming to terms with new systems of thought that undermined the basis for traditional therapy. Earlier views of mind and soul were undergoing destabilization and reinterpretation, and the common grounds between medicine and religion needed to be re-negotiated. This moment of transition planted the seeds of a medical revolution; however, most historians today would agree that it did not immediately result in a flowering of scientific creativity. Remarkably, seventeenth-century mental medicine continued to rely upon past models as much as on new theories. Drawing on diverse, even inconsistent ideas simultaneously, 'mad'-doctors elaborated varying aetiologies of madness and proposed an almost confusing range of treatments. As Michael MacDonald remarks, «[p]hysicians tried to maintain their scientific respectability by accepting some modern ideas and marrying them to ancient remedies, a match that was more attractive politically than philosophically» (MacDonald 1981, 197). Clark Lawlor, too, notes that seventeenth-century medical thought was deeply indebted to older principles, for it «replaced black bile with a more modern conception – the nervous system – yet the […] core symptoms of fear, sadness and hallucinations remained as usual» (2011, 29). For this reason, the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries are often thought of as a period in which «medical practice remained – by any definition – unenlightened, and highly traditional» (Porter 1982, 49).

In the seventeenth and even in the eighteenth century, most physicians were still building on modified or revised Hippocratic conceptions. Accordingly, they emphasized the importance of moderation in all practices for human well-being and considered diseases to be the result of imbalances of the four humours (black bile, blood, yellow bile and phlegm). Treatments thus aimed at restoring the humoral balance through expulsion of the substances in excess, a purpose often achieved with bleeding, emetics or purges. The Galenic system was also used, together with the so-called Hippocratic Galenism, which placed a high value on clinical observation

and devoted particular attention to the effects of natural ingredients on specific humours[15]. Furthermore, various aspects of Paracelsianism had already been assimilated by Galenic doctrines in the late sixteenth century, when «chemical remedies were incorporated into Galenic medicine and recognised by official pharmacopoeias» (Wear 2000, 431). The encounter between Galenism and Paracelsianism laid the foundations for iatrochemical theories and therapeutics, such as those proposed by the Dutch physician Jean Baptiste Van Helmont, who influenced Thomas Willis and Thomas Sydenham in England (Thiher 1999, 64-69).

Early medical literature seemed to be the only authoritative discourse in the field of medicine: no wonder that in 1621 Robert Burton still heavily relied on humoral theories and, in 1647, the statutes of the College of Physicians kept to Galenic principles. The influence of ancient notions was still evident in the categorizations of mental disorders, which underwent minor modifications in the seventeenth century, and extended well into the eighteenth. Insanity was commonly subdivided into «phrensy» or frenzy, «mania» (sometimes coinciding with «perfect» or «real» madness), and «melancholy» (or «partial *insania*»). Like the ancients, a number of seventeenth- and eighteenth-century physicians considered melancholy and mania as two forms of the same disease, differing «in degree only» (Mead 1762, 486). According to Robert Burton and his contemporaries, frenzy was an acute «inflammation of the Brain», accompanied by fever; mania was an angry and violent raving, but without a fever, and melancholy was a sense of «anguish, dulnesse, heavinesse and vexation of the spirits» (Burton 1638, 8, 11). This classification was accepted, at times with additional sub-categories or minor variations, by physicians such as Thomas Willis (1672, 332), Archibald Pitcairn (1718, 106), William Smith (1768, 149-150), and Thomas Arnold (1782, 29-61).

Thomas Willis' theories can be thought of as especially representative of the seventeenth century. The therapies he recommended for 'manic' patients are germane to the purposes of the present study, especially to James Carkesse's description of Bethlem. Willis believed that medical remedies were to be accompanied by custody and restraint, and that the physician should apply equal and opposite strength to that demonstrated by the deranged person. So, «to desperate Love ought to be applied or shrewed indignation and hatred: Sadness is to be opposed with the flatteries of Pleasure» (Willis 1683, 193). Moreover, «to correct and allay the furies and exorbitancies of the Animal Spirits», the physician needed «threatnings, bonds, or strokes, as well as *Physick*» (Willis 1683, 206). In order to submit the corporeal soul, «bloodletting, vomits, or very strong purges, and boldly and rashly given, are most often convenient», as this

[15] For more on this topic, see Hankinson, ed., 2008.

treatment would make the corporeal soul «in some measure depressed and restrained, […] compelled to remit its pride and fierceness» (Willis, in Hunter and Macalpine, eds, 1963, 191). In a similar vein, Thomas Sydenham maintained that madness could commonly be «cured by large Evacuations, by Bleeding and Purging» (1729 [1696], 54), and Pitcairn recommended avoiding «Opiates» in favour of «Vomiting and Purging» (1718, 189). Until the mid-eighteenth century, most physicians at least partially complied with the view that «perfect Madness», or mania, needed «Cupping with Scarifications, large Bleedings, Glysters, Blisters, Hypnoticks, frequent Purging and Vomiting» (*A Treatise of Diseases* 1727, 17).

Further classifications of madness derived from Hippocratic texts concerned melancholy and its subdivision into hypochondriac and hysteric disorders. Hysteria (or «vapours») was commonly associated with malfunctioning of the female womb, although «its symptoms are so many, that it cannot be defined by one thing only» (B.A. 1674, 129). Andre du Laurens and Felix Platter wrote influential treatises focused on 'hypochondriac' melancholia, a disease of the mind accompanied by gastrointestinal symptoms. Later, Willis (1664) regrouped hypochondriac disorders with the hysterical, classified them among «convulsive diseases» of the nerves, and identified the first as more common in male and the second in female patients. Thomas Sydenham (1844) further suggested that hypochondriac and hysteric disorders were variants of the same disease, with no gender distinctions. As Stanley W. Jackson notes,

> […] this whole process led to the hypochondriacal symptom-complex being redefined as a separate disorder known as «hypochondriasis» or «the spleen», which was less and less frequently thought of as a form of madness, although still often viewed as kin to melancholia. […] [O]n a continuum of severity [hypochondriasis] could lead to melancholia, a separate disorder, or even develop further into mania. (Jackson 2007, 448)

The term «spleen» was often used in connection with humoral imbalance because Hippocrates understood hypochondriasis as a bodily affection regarding this specific organ. Seventeenth-century medicine refined Hippocrates' concept and considered the spleen as the receptacle of black bile, a function that made it more subject to disorders than other parts of the body.

Robert Whytt substantiated a sense of continuity between «low spirits» (embracing both hypochondriac and hysteric disorders), melancholy and mania, and added a fourth category about further «violent passions of the mind, in people whose nervous system is very delicate», a disease to him «entirely unknown» (1765, 315). Whytt's *Observations* proposed a classification of 'nervous' disorders, redefining the various and varying theories on the nerves that had characterized British medical thought since the seventeenth century. He shifted attention from humours and

spirits to the solid consistency of nerve fibres, which, in his opinion, regulated bodily motion and the workings of the brain. As Heather R. Beatty notes, «whereas animists believed that disease was the soul's attempt to rid the body of noxious agents by prompting physical symptoms, Whytt argued that [...] the brain and nerves monitored disease» (2012, 14).

Medical discourse on the nerves was by no means a novelty: it had been at the core of Thomas Willis and Thomas Sydenham's assumptions, since both, with some differences, identified madness in disorders of animal spirits and convulsions of the nerves[16]. To be more specific, Willis' *Cerebri anatome* (1664, *Anatomy of the Brain*) opened the way to a series of studies that treated the brain as the origin of illness of both mind and body[17]. Yet, it was only in 1749, with David Hartley's *Observations on Man*, that the first model for nerve impulses was propounded. «By 1750», Heather R. Beatty says, «the nerves were of paramount importance to medical theory», contributing to reshape the concept of mental disease and its implications (2012, 14).

As we have already had occasion to notice, different and often competing theories in mental medicine were simultaneously at work between 1676 and 1774. At least two threads seem to intertwine in the definition of madness in those years: the bodily aspect of mental disease and the notion of deviance in perception or imagination. Delusions, Hobbes suggested in 1651, are at the core of madness, as can be seen when «some man in Bedlam [...] should tell you, he were God the father» (2003, 62). Similarly, in 1690 John Locke imputed madness to a wrong association of ideas, because «madmen», in his opinion, did not seem «to have lost the Faculty of Reasoning: but having joined together some Ideas very wrongly, they mistake them for Truths» (1706 [1690], 93). These theories had an impact on the medical thought of the following century, and particularly on the works of William Battie and John Monro, who engaged in a well-known debate on madness in 1758. The two physicians disputed over deluded imagination and sensation being at the root of derangement, and the role that judgement played in the process. Monro, however, did

[16] Hansruedi Isler explains the idea of animal spirits in these terms: «In man, the immortal, immaterial rational soul moved the material sensitive soul, using its capabilities as it wished. [...] Willis adopted Gassendi's model of the human and animal soul, in which humans and animals share two corporeal, material, and hence mortal souls. The lowest one, vegetative and vital, is in charge of the unconscious functions of the inner organs, and consists of the flame-like vital spirits in the blood. The middle one, the *anima brutorum* or animal soul, consists of animal spirits, enabling animals and man to move and sense, and to perform acts of simple reasoning and remembering» (Isler 2009, 97).

[17] Willis' *Cerebri anatome* was followed by studies by Marcello Malpighi (*De Cerebro*, 1665) and Herman Boerhaave (*Sermo academicus de comparando certo in physicis*, 1715).

not challenge Battie's *Treatise on Madness* solely on a theoretical level; he also responded to specific criticism about the treatments he adopted in Bethlem, which Battie considered to be too invasive. The latter proposed a new view on madness as a disease that could be cured, once the correct perception of existing objects was re-established (Battie 1758, 5-6). Battie and Monro's foundational works attained two main purposes: on the one hand, they decisively shifted the terms of the medical debate from humoral theories to questions concerning the nerves, perception, and imagination. On the other, in so doing, they opened the way to a different conception of treatment: Battie suggested, in Richard Mead's words, «to inure the [mad] mind by degrees to a new way of thinking» (Mead 1762, 493).

Today, the first 'mental health revolution' is commonly associated with the changes brought about by the theories of Philippe Pinel, Vincenzo Chiarugi, and William Tuke, founder of the York Asylum (1792)[18]. Most scholars agree on the fact that the therapeutic dimension of madness between 1676 and 1774 was conservative, and saw relatively modest and unspectacular advances. There is no such consensus, however, about the development of new social responses to insanity in the same years, much less on the changes in mental care institutions and policy of internment. Underlying the ongoing scholarly debate is one key issue: the idea of Great Confinement proposed in Michel Foucault's *History of Madness*[19].

Foucault's work, Ann Goldberg writes, «has come under attack for substituting a new kind of grand narrative in the form of the history of hegemonic, scientific discourses of power» (1998, 7). Yet, since the 1970s and 1980s, its influence has been evident on social historians such as Michael MacDonald, Roy Porter and, above all, Andrew Scull, who has revisited the rise of madhouses and other institutions of internment dialectically referring to Foucauldian views and perspectives[20]. Most importantly, despite divergent views, Scull attributes to *History of Madness* the main in-

[18] For more on this topic, see Beard 1989, 22.

[19] Foucault's project has had various editions in the original language and in English. As far as the French versions (Plon) are concerned, the 1961 first edition (*Folie et déraison. Histoire de la folie à l'âge classique*) was followed by an abridged text in 1964 (*Folie et déraison. Histoire de la folie*) and other Gallimard unabridged editions in the 1970s (e.g. *Histoire de la folie à l'âge classique: suivi de mon corps, ce papier, le feu et la folie, l'absence d'oeuvre*, 1972). In Great Britain, an abridged text was published in 1965 by Pantheon Books (*Madness and Civilization: A History of Insanity in the Age Of Reason*, translated by Richard Howard). Here, I quote from the recent edition edited by Jean Khalfa and translated by Jonathan Murphy (2006). The latter text is the first English full version of the unabridged work and includes a translation of the two appendices included in the Gallimard 1972 edition (*La folie, l'absence d'oeuvre* and *Mon corps, ce papier, ce feu*).

[20] See, for instance, Scull 1979, 1989, 14-20 and Scull 1992, 150-163.

spiration for his work. He writes: «MacDonald, Porter, and I all, I think, exhibit a distinctly ambivalent attitude to the work of Michel Foucault», but adds: «in no small measure it was probably his wide-ranging speculations that attracted us to the field in the first place» (Scull 2006, 4-5)[21]. Foucault's work can be or has been questioned on various levels, but it has remained a point of reference for later studies concerning madness, including the present book. Indeed, some of the poets under investigation in these pages (James Carkesse in particular) are little known; I have already noted how this implies an engagement with widening the canon of mad literature (2013), a procedure that finds its roots in Foucault's theories. Even more significantly, the period analysed here is enclosed into the philosopher's definition of the Classical Age. Therefore, *History of Madness* and the idea of the Great Confinement particularly bear on the purposes of the following analysis, and deserve detailed attention.

The conception of madness, Foucault notes, underwent a fundamental change in the mid-seventeenth century (the beginning of *l'âge classique*), bringing about a shift from removal to confinement[22]. The event marking the beginning of this transformation, Foucault says, was the opening of the *Hôpital Général* in Paris (1656); for over a century, according to the philosopher, institutionalization reached a peak in Europe, in the phenomenon that he calls the Great Confinement. The late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries were further characterized by the emergence of normalizing practices meant to shape individual behaviour. According to Foucault, the change underlying the Great Confinement also concerned a new sensitivity about the public sphere of human behaviour. Interned 'mad' people were chiefly failed social individuals, who were experiencing a tendency «à se passer de ce contrôle médical, qui était prévu, au XVIIe siècle, dans le règlement de certains hôpitaux», and, in the meantime, «à 'socialiser' toujours davantage le pouvoir de décision qui doit reconnaître la folie là où elle est» (Foucault 1972a, 143; Murphy 2006b, 126: «to dispense with the medical controls that had been planned by the regulations of certain hospitals in the seventeenth century», and «to turn decisions about where madness began and ended into purely social issues»).

Today, a common point of disagreement with *History of Madness* concerns the documentation upon which Foucault relied. Among others,

[21] Probably, *History of Madness* is also accountable for these scholars' concern with the eighteenth century in a decade when criticism mainly focused on the medical revolutions of the Victorian age. As exemplary of the latter tendency, see, for instance, Skultans 1975, Peterson 1978, Shortt 1986, Showalter 1985, Arieno 1989.

[22] It might be noted that such a shift also points toward a new tendency towards «inclusion par exclusion» (Foucault 2001, 1482; Faubion 2001, 78: «inclusion through exclusion»).

Porter, Scull, MacDonald, and Andrews have «modified Foucault's conclusions in the light of detailed empirical data» (Wear 1992, 9). *History of Madness* is often seen as a «magisterial work» on a theoretical level, with little to do with factual evidence, especially as far as Britain is concerned (Bynum, Porter and Shepherd 1985, 4). To use MacDonald's words,

> [t]he great value of Foucault's work lies in his insight that madness was a speculum in which normal people saw their own image reversed and distorted. Its major weaknesses are that abstractions confront abstractions in his book and his description of how real men and women thought and acted is often vague or fanciful. (1981a, xi)[23]

In the light of revised data and recent research, Roy Porter has defined the Great Confinement as «a concept which I do not find especially applicable to England» (1987a, 8) and suggested that a phenomenon of this kind could be identified there only in the following century[24]. Even more radically, Edward Shorter claims that in this country «it would be nonsense to speak, as [...] Foucault does, of any kind of "grand confinement"» (1997, 5). Although the debate is still open, most scholars tend to agree that a British Great Confinement existed, if understood as the establishment of a new policy towards the managing and caring for the insane at a certain point in history. In particular, there is conformity surrounding Porter's view that the progressive increase in internment of the mad was more gradual in England than in France, and reached its peak in a later time window. It is from the mid-eighteenth century that public hospitals for lunatics started to flourish in all Britain, with the foundation of new institutions such as Guy's Hospital in London (where a separate ward for lunatics was built in 1728), St Luke's at Moorfields (1751), followed by mad-hospitals in Manchester (1766), Newcastle upon Tyne (1767), York (1777), Liverpool (1790) and Leicester (1794).

[23] The idea that thorough empirical research is to inform any historical discourse on madness has led to a widespread tendency towards limiting the field of study. Foucault's work has been paradigmatic of the impossibility of offering a large frame that could account for the countless specificities of the phenomenon. Broad views on the history of madness are presented as necessarily incomplete: see, for instance, eds, Micale and Porter 1994, Shorter 1997, Porter 2002, Scull 2011. Rather than attempting wide-ranging perspectives on insanity in western thought, scholars have dealt with definite social and cultural dimensions, with additional restrictions concerning chronological boundaries, thematic concerns or particular kinds of mental affliction; see Bynum 1974, Skultans 1979, Scull 1993, Micale 1995.

[24] On this topic, see also Porter 1992a, 119-125 (Porter's essay was first published in 1990 in «History of the Human Sciences», 3) and Porter 1983, 12-34.

Gloria Sybil Gross argues that, although Porter disputes the idea of a Great Confinement, his analysis of the late seventeenth century reveals «an encroaching social stigmatization of the mentally ill, which sometimes indeed led to their being put away» (1992, 74). Whereas it is undeniable that «the institutionalized population grew» between the 1650s and 1750s (Porter 1992a, 114), such growth has not been considered significant, especially if compared with the subsequent tendency towards internment. MacDonald, in fact, notes that the confinement of the mad before the 1750s is not impressive when looking at the total number of institutionalized people (MacDonald 1981a and 1981b, 11-25). Arguably, in the years that Foucault defines as the Classical Age, some scholars perceive the 'symptoms' of a change in the treatment of madness in England, but empirical data does not support such perception. The possibility of an English great internment, in my opinion, remains an open question because the available documentation is necessarily incomplete. Private madhouses, a new system of confinement that will be discussed briefly, flourished from the end of the seventeenth to the nineteenth centuries; they were hardly ever registered and, before the 1774 *Madhouses Act*, information available on their number or on the number of their inmates is very scanty[25]. It may be not coincidental that most of the alleged mad writers considered in the present study were interned in this kind of institutes.

The first author analysed in this book, James Carkesse, was allegedly the first to publish a collection composed during confinement; he experienced both a private madhouse at Finsbury and the 'new' Bethlem, shortly after its opening at Moorfields. The hospital, established at Bishop gate in 1247 as the Priory of St. Mary of Bethlehem, had been a small institution for centuries: by 1403, it could accommodate only six inmates. The City of London began administering it in 1547; in the 1630s, its premises had widened to comprise a group of outbuildings (Andrews *et al*. 1997, 15-17). In 1674, the king was petitioned for a new building, which was completed two years later in Moorfields and could accommodate three times the original number of inmates. The 'second' Bethlem was further expanded after 1676, with the addition «of one hundred cells for male and female incurables» between 1725 and 1735 and a «less spectacular» widening in the 1750s (Andrews *et al*. 1997, 295).

In public or charity institutions like Bethlem, «poverty was one of the absolute criteria for admission» (Allderidge 1985, 20), a fact which points to the double condition of most inmates as both mentally unstable and indigent. At least until the first decade of the eighteenth century, lunatics

[25] See Parry-Jones 1972, 282. The difficulty of establishing the number of inmates in private institutions before 1744 is also emphasized in several chapters of King and Gear, eds, 2013.

were associated with vagrants and beggars, probably on the grounds of a general idea of idleness and lack of productivity. The Poor Law Act of 1601 was still the only available legal document for consideration of pauper lunatics, and it made no distinction between the old, sick, poor, and mentally disordered[26]. For this reason, the latter group was often sent to workhouses, «mostly in the provinces» (Arieno 1989, 28). The first Act of Parliament which distinguished pauper lunatics from other marginal categories was passed in 1714, and established that the «furiously mad» who were «dangerous to be abroad» should be «safely locked up in [...] secure places» and «chained»[27].

The 1714 Vagrancy Act officially suggested a new tendency in the perception of madness, underscoring its relevance as an increasingly social problem. It also had important practical consequences, as Bethlem was the only public provision for the insane, and new places of confinement were needed. On this issue, Monica E. Baly observes:

> The cost of dealing with [...] lunatics fell on the parish, and one way of disposing of the parish lunatics was to board them out in private houses. From the evidence given to the Select Committee at the beginning of the nineteenth century it is clear that this practice had been widespread at the beginning of the eighteenth century and was one of the origins of the private madhouse system. The affluent insane were placed in the more genteel custody of medical men or clergy 'experienced in dealing with distempered persons', who found their disordered charges a useful supplement to their income. (Baly 1995 [1973], 84)

Commercial or private madhouses emerged, and quickly burgeoned in all parts of England. These privately owned houses were used for the confinement of the insane, and charged the patients and their families «according to the type of accommodation occupied and the services rendered» (Parry-Jones 1972, 124). In most cases, these madhouses were far from residential areas, and were not supervised by doctors. Their custodial practices were considered questionable even for the time: for example, the criteria for admission were not clear, and there were no regulations concerning the establishment of the institutes in the first place.

In the second half of the eighteenth century, the problems connected to the private management of the insane opened a debate consisting

[26] *The Poor Relief Act*, 1601 (43 Elizabeth c. 2) is commonly known as «Poor Law(s)».

[27] The full title of the Act of Parliament discussed here is *An Act for reducing the Laws relating to Rogues, Vagabonds, Sturdy Beggars and Vagrants, into one Act of Parliament; and for the More Effectual Punishing such Rogues, Vagabonds, Sturdy Beggars and Vagrants, and Sending them Whither they Ought to be Sent* (Statute 12 Anne c. 23).

of two main issues. The first issue concerned the uncontrolled spread of the madhouses. One of the main sponsors of the *Madhouses Act*, Thomas Townshend Junior, is reported to have said in 1773: «within seven miles of London, there are eighteen of these houses; there must be very many poor creatures therefore, and the object of a magnitude highly deserving the attention of the House» (Townshend, in Cobbett 1813, 838)[28]. The second issue was connected to the treatment of the insane in private madhouses, and the reasons for their detention; these subjects are tackled, for instance, in an address which relates «unlawful, arbitrary, cruel and oppressive acts, which for some years past have been committed in places generally called Private Mad-Houses» (*A Case Humbly Offered* 1763, 25). In particular, the document is concerned with people «forcibly taken, or artfully decoyed» into private madhouses «without any authority», then «stripped naked», «deprived of all communication with the world, and being denied the use of pen, ink and paper», and often hidden under «some fictitious name in the house» (1762, 25). The pamphlet primarily reports instances in which it was possible to take advantage of a lack of regulations in the private management of lunacy to remove an estranged husband or wife.

Andrew Scull mentions that a similar discourse on the threats of unlawful incarceration was circulating as early as the 1720-30s, in Daniel Defoe and Alexander Cruden's protest pamphlets (Scull 2011, 41). Defoe also offers his view on the overall system of confinement in London, counting a total of 152 institutions for deviants in 1724, that is, «more public and private prisons, and houses of confinement, than in any city in Europe» (Defoe, in Arnold 2009, 115). Meanwhile, the medical world described madness as a very common and progressively spreading condition. In 1742, George Cheyne noted that excesses due to «Gluttony and Intemperance» caused people «confin'd for Lunacy and Madness» to increase «to a Number I dare not name» (1742, 85); in 1758, William Battie defined insanity as «a terrible and at present a very frequent calamity» (1758, 1). Edwin Fuller Torrey has illustrated numerous later manifestations of this new feeling by doctors such as Thomas Arnold, who believed insanity was increasing, and William Perfect, who wrote that «instances of insanity are at this day more numerous in this kingdom than they were at any other former period» (Perfect, in Torrey 2007,

[28] On April 22, 1773, Parliamentarian Thomas Townshend Junior introduced into the Commons the *Bill for Regulating Private Mad-houses*, which resulted in the 1774 Act. In his address to the Parliament, Townshend also emphasized that «[…] it is shocking to humanity to think that any persons [sic] should be forced into these miserable receptacles of wretchedness» (Townshend, in Cobbett 1813, 838).

37-40)[29]. While Cheyne talked about a typical «English malady» (1733), even poetical tracts claimed that the nation «has been observed by Foreigners to abound in Maniacs, more than any other upon the Face of the Earth» (*Delirium Poeticum* 1745, 5).

In 1774, recognition that (wrongful) confinement of the insane had become a major issue was reflected in the *Madhouses Act*, which introduced for the first time regulations for private institutes, their licensing and supervision[30]. A Lunacy Commission was established, to be elected by the Royal College of Physicians; the new ruling included yearly inspections in private structures, which also had to pursue requirements of medical certifications and keep truthful records, under financial penalties for non-observance. Although the new system was only partially effective in controlling the situation of private provisions for lunacy, it prevented their misuse. Even more importantly, it represented a first step towards a new conception of the madhouse and its patients.

The mid-eighteenth century also saw the first signs of a changing attitude towards the treatment of the mad. St. Luke Hospital, founded in 1751, was conceived as an alternative to Bethlem and opposed therapies such as bloodletting and purges. Manchester and Newcastle «were the first provincial towns to provide hospital accommodation for lunatics» in 1763 and 1767 respectively, and they «allowed lunatics to appear as the physically ill, rather than possessed» (Pickstone 1985, 14). In short, within a couple of decades, most institutions started focusing on the 'management' of the insane rather than on 'medicine' and bodily treatment.

Today, this shift is sometimes discussed as a major improvement or development in mental medicine, even to the point of being associated with the beginning of modern psychiatry[31]. However, the degree to which we can consider the so-called 'moral' management of insanity more humane than earlier therapies is an object of intense scholarly debate. In a recent re-consideration of the last twenty years in 'mad' criticism, Andrew Scull associates the persistence of an «unsavory reputation of the pre-reform era» with a need for a sense of intellectual and social advancement, or «decisive evidence of our progress toward ever-greater enlightenment» (Scull 2006, 66)[32]. Together with Scull, various historians have warned against viewing mid-eighteenth-century treatment as enlightened, reveal-

[29] See also Arnold 1782 and Perfect 1787.

[30] The *Regulation of Madhouses Act*, 1744, Statute 17 Geo. III c. 49 is discussed in Unsworth 1993, 479-507.

[31] See, for instance, Coppock and Hopton 2000, 53.

[32] An example of this 'progressivist' view is provided by Edward Shorter, whose work includes references to the biological interpretation of mental illness as substantial improvement (Shorter 1997, vii).

ing its multifaceted or ambivalent aspects. In the same line of thought, they have tried to strip away the stereotypical idea that earlier periods were a time of cruel and barbaric practices.

Roy Porter's *Mind-forg'd Manacles* (1987a) was probably the first study to cast new light on the commonly perceived contrast between the 'brutal' attitude towards the mad in the eighteenth century and the sympathetic one in the nineteenth[33]. Since the 1990s, this line of investigation has been further expanded: Jonathan Andrews has repeatedly shown that eighteenth-century Bethlem was far from being a place of oppression and cruelty, and new hospital policies were not necessarily a sign of an emerging new sensibility towards the insane (Andrews 1988, 1994). Patricia Allderidge has emphasized that the popular image of Bedlam still 'obfuscates' historical, social and psychological perspectives on the institution, which tend to accept «the absolute and utter awfulness of Bethlem» in an un-objective way, and without relying on actual historical data (Allderidge 1985, 18). Dana Gliserman Kopans has suggested that the so-called 'moral' therapies could be as coercive as physical treatments, but in a more subtle way (2008, 125). In this respect, it is worth mentioning that in 1755 J.B. Le Roy started using electric stimuli and electroconvulsive therapy in «neurological and mental cases of paralysis and epilepsy» (Harms 1967, 67)[34].

A double stance is, to some extent, inevitable in dealing with insanity, as any aspect of it shows a constant ambiguity that does not allow for univocal readings. The question of public visits to mental hospitals may serve to illustrate the case in point. As is well known, for centuries Bethlem Hospital accepted paying visitors, and attending the 'mad-show' had become a fashionable pastime since the majestic new premises were opened at Moorfields. By 1770, Porter says, the practice of public visiting was radically limited (2000, 299)[35]. Today, we instinctively interpret the curtailment of visits as a re-humanization of a mad-zoo; however, this is a biased reading, grounded solely on current frames and values. As Paul Semonin demonstrates, putting difference on display was an ordinary practice from the 1100s to the 1850s; it could bear 'positive' outcomes, such as granting a living to physically impaired people who were unable to work (Semonin 1996, 69-81). In the case of Bedlam, the 'fair of madness' provided the institution with self-funding, permitting it to be a charity hospital and make provisions for the diseased pauper. Andrews emphasizes that many visitors were inmates' relatives and friends, oth-

[33] See also Porter 2001b and Porter 1981-1982.

[34] In the journal *Electricity and Medicine*, J. B. Le Roy detailed his experiments and described a case of hysterical blindness cured with three applications of electric shock.

[35] On this topic, see also Andrews *et al.* 1997, 178.

ers were 'persons of quality' invited to give donations; visits for 'idle' purposes were discouraged at all times (Andrews *et al.* 1997, 180-183). The 1770s limitation applied to visits to Bethlem presents indeed many levels of interpretation: it suggests a new respect for the patient, but also a more private approach to institutionalization, or even a new propensity to keep madness out of public sight.

The latter hypothesis seems to find support one year later, when the internationally influential treatise *Thoughts on Hospitals* was published by John Aikin (1771). Its section devoted to «Lunacy» details the advantages of keeping the insane in «a common receptacle», which includes their being «removed from the public eye to which they are multiple objects of alarm» (Aikin 1771, 66). It is probably with reference to the new policy in Bethlem that the author emphasizes «the very great impropriety and cruelty of allowing the poor unhappy sufferers to become spectacles for the brutal curiosity of the populace» (Aikin 1771,71). The phrase «very great impropriety» suggests that the display of madness had come to be regarded as socially and morally reprehensible, for reasons, we might infer, concerning both a new sensitivity towards inmates and a general sense of decorum. Aikin also positively comments on the recent opening of Manchester Hospital, insisting on the need for «houses appropriated» for the reception of the insane and «persons experienced in their management» (1771, 71). These observations probably have to do with private madhouses, and pave the way to a new awareness of the specific medical needs of the insane.

1.3 *The madness of interpretation*

When discussing the features of poetry and prose, the poet (and alleged madman) William Wordsworth wrote in 1800:

> Poetry sheds no tears 'such as Angels weep', but natural and human tears; she can boast of no celestial ichor that distinguishes her vital juices from those of prose; the same human blood circulates through the veins of them both. (Wordsworth 2005 [1798], 253-254)

Interestingly, Wordsworth's body-metaphor not only blurs the boundaries between verse and prose, but also connects literature to a living organism, which is subject to malfunctioning[36]. As if they were one only body, the writer, the text, and the reader share the same vital juices and health status. Wordsworth's imagery may be regarded as a striking anticipation of present-day theoretical discourses on studying madness in literature. Notably, it suggests that there is no 'inside' and 'outside' to insanity, or, to use Felman's words,

[36] For a more extensive discussion of Wordsworth's metaphor, see Ruston 2013, 15.

that «if there is madness […] it's also the very madness of interpretation; if there is someone who has a clinical status, it is as much the interpreter as the writer» (2003, 279). Allan Ingram notes that this has particularly to do with being included within a specific historical, cultural, and social frame. Since medical notions acquire sense only when historicized, we should be aware of relying on transient models of 'mental health' at all times, and question even the 'sanity' of our own reading of madness (Ingram and Faubert 2003, 4). Various scholars, including Susan Rubin Suleiman and Scott Brewster, have argued that the interpreter is «caught up, entangled with, contaminated by» his or her object of study (Suleiman 1988, 223), and especially when literary madness is at issue, there is no position «safely outside its flickering, enigmatic effects» (Brewster 2012, 481). This purports that, in the following pages, insanity is not only seen as a topic for scholarly discussion, but also and primarily as a rhetorical condition of reading.

Once again, this position is partially derived from Foucault's *History of Madness*, or rather, from the debate it engendered with Jacques Derrida. Foucault identifies the philosophical turning point leading to the Great Confinement in Descartes' *Meditations* (1678 [1641]); he understands the *cogito* as a 'refusal of madness' which might have resulted in «un nouveau statut de la déraison dans le monde classique» (Foucault 1972b, 156; Murphy 2006, 138: «a new status accorded to unreason in the classical world»). To be precise, Descartes' *cogito* is thought to be excluding the possibility of thinking in mad subjects who, similarly, in society come to be «à la fois toujours présente, et toujours exclue» (Foucault 1972b, 156; Murphy 2006, 139: «simultaneously always present and always excluded»). The reflection about Descartes is not only the groundwork on which Foucault develops his discourse on the new conception of madness in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, but also the primary point on which Derrida articulates his dissent (1978, 31-32). Although the interpretation of the *cogito* can hardly be regarded as the major issue raised by Derrida, its discussion is meant to erode the very foundations of Foucault's theories and demonstrate their instability. To Derrida, «Descartes ne renferme jamais la folie» (Derrida 1967, 86; Bass 1978, 67: «Descartes never interns madness»), nor rejects it; on the contrary, he embraces it in the moment of universal doubt (1967, 86; 1978, 67)[37], in transitorily allowing for the illusionary nature of reality[38]. Recognizing madness where Foucault had seen its rejection, Derrida

[37] Descartes writes: «manus verò has ipsas, totumque hoc corpus meum esse, quâ ratione posset negari? nisi me fortè comparem nescio quibus insanis […]» (Descartes 1678 [1641], 6; Cottingham 1996, 13: «how could it be denied that these hands or this whole body are mine? Unless perhaps I were to liken myself to madmen […]»).

[38] The moment of doubt, in Derrida's opinion, functions like a door opening on the un-thought and leading to a lack of self-determination. In Derrida's view, to some extent,

constructs an idea of *déraison* that is generated by the same discourse that excludes or objectivises it and, therefore, is both external and internal to it. Further, he shows that questions of doubt are resolved through a strategic use of fiction, thus establishing a point of contact between the idea of madness (and philosophical speculation at large) and literature[39].

Undoubtedly, Derrida's comments have marked a new scholarly turn towards perceiving the so-called scientific and fictional worlds as sharing chief similarities. It has been noted that, in a sense, we are reading science as fiction, and «much of the medical discourse on madness […] [as] part of medico-theoretical 'story telling'» (Suzuki 1992, 15). For instance, Allen Thiher sees literature as a «psychic activity that often overlaps with madness and […] coincides with science, insofar as literary texts also propose models of experience» (1999, 3). Literature can «bridge the gap between the medical mind and the insane», because the capability of creating fictions and, to some extent, the medical imagination necessary to describe madness spring from a 'partial insanity'; then, «madness, literature, and theory or knowledge about madness and literature all overlap», for they are «language games» meant to illustrate mental dysfunction (Thiher 1999, 2-3). Based on these premises, scholars such as Jennifer Radden (2000) and Max Byrd (1974) have treated literature as one of the archival sources of the history of madness, and demonstrated that historical, medical and fictional discourses intersect, multiplying the instruments for capturing the movement of the history of madness in texts[40]. As Ken Jackson suggests, literary scholars should be ready to engage in a broad and productive dialogue with historians, rather than relying solely on their sense of texts as 'cultural' products (Jackson 2005, 23)[41].

Descartes can be said to search his (rational) self by exploring the possibility of being mad (Derrida 1967, 72-74; Bass 1978, 31-32). Slavoj Žižek explains this position noting that the «*cogito* itself can only emerge through a 'mad' hyperbole (universalized doubt), and remains marked by this excess» (Žižek 2012, 328). The debate ensued between Foucault and Derrida has wide and complex implications that go beyond the question of madness and its study. Here, I only consider such debate to a very limited extent, emphasising a few aspects of it that particularly bear on the purposes of the present analysis. For a more comprehensive view on the Foucault-Derrida debate, see, for instance, Felman 2003, Boyne 1990, Melehy 1997.

[39] According to Derrida, Cartesian philosophical arguments are determined by literary and rhetorical practices. For Derrida's «evil genius» see Derrida 1978, 60-64.

[40] In this respect, the collection *Distraction Individualized*, edited by Silvia Bigliazzi, investigates the relationships between medical knowledge and literature in narrative, poetry and theatre of the Renaissance era (ed. Bigliazzi 2012).

[41] Ken Jackson's book (2005) analyses the 'show of Bethlem' in the seventeenth century, underlining that the representation of madness on the stage fuelled a literary dispute concerning the grounds of drama.

It is within the same intellectual tradition, after all, that Mark Turner has shown how «most of our experience, our knowledge, and our thinking is organized as stories» (1996, i) because narrative imagining is part of what cognitive scientists define as the «fundamental mind». According to Jim Geekie and John Read, when storytelling is «not intended to imply a form of fiction», but understood «in a much broader sense to cover the ways in which we make sense of a particular aspect of the world» (2009, 8), it proves to be a helpful framework to analyse different explanations of insanity. Indeed, investigating representations of madness is a process of historical interpretation as well as re-construction, in which the scholar imposes a sense of direction and of causal relationship. Re-construction is therefore creative, a sort of re-enacting and re-performing of the original process, which coexists with other rival constructions. In this sense, Nietzsche's conception of history as perspective is very effective (Foucault 1971 [1969], 162) and underlines its instability. In order to escape, at least partially, the webs of our own determinations, we should transcend the structures of reason and thought, structures that appear inescapable *a priori*.

The present study acknowledges epistemological and textual differences between various types of representations of insanity, while treating them all as fictional constructs. In this sense, I find that the 'storytelling approach' may reveal some weaknesses in problematizing the border between storying a personal experience of madness and talking about madness as an observer. Besides, storytelling is considered a central mode of human thought, as well as the basis for language production[42]; because it is the way we *make sense*, it cannot be applied to insanity without keeping in mind Derrida's remarks on the possibility of writing about «la folie elle-même» (Foucault 1972b, 162; Murphy 2006, 144: «madness itself»):

> il s'agit donc d'échapper au piège ou à la naïveté objectivistes qui consisteraient à écrire, dans le langage de la raison classique, en utilisant les concepts qui ont été les instruments historiques d'une capture de la folie, dans le langage poli et policier de la raison, une histoire de la folie sauvage elle-même, telle qu'elle se tient et respire avant d'être prise et paralysée dans les filets de cette même raison classique. (Derrida 1967, 56)

> it is a question […] of escaping the trap or objectivist naiveté that would consist in writing a history of untamed madness, of madness as it carries itself and breathes before being caught and paralyzed in the nets of classical reason, from within the very language of classical reason itself, utilizing the concepts that were the historical instruments of the capture of madness – the restrained and restraining language of reason. (Bass 1978, 40)

[42] On this point, see Bruner 1990.

Here, Derrida's focus is on the notion of language, which, according to Foucault, is «*la structure première et dernière de la folie*», upon which «reposent tous les cycles dans lesquels elle énonce sa nature» (Foucault 1972b, 255; Murphy 2006, 237: «*the primary and ultimate structure of madness*», «all the cycles in which it reveals its nature rely», original emphasis). Madness is, Derrida says, beyond articulation; therefore, expressing insanity through language implies drawing it back to reason. In applying language to madness, Foucault views its concept from within a system of thought that Derrida would later define as «the age of psychoanalysis», the grounds that made possible «the event of such a discourse» in the first place (Derrida 1994, 231-232)[43].

Rather than about insanity, the Foucault-Derrida debate was about establishing margins and limits. In this perspective, Foucault's response has not only negotiated a liminal space between the absolutes proposed by Derrida, but also provided a way to restore (and analyse) the dialogue between reason and madness. According to Foucault, it is through transgression that language «dit ce qui ne peut être dit», exploring «une expérience de la limite» (Foucault 1994 [1963], 249; Bouchard 1977, 51: «says what cannot be said», exploring «an experience of the limit»). Language, therefore, cannot transcend the thing itself, but can reveal the ruptures of the discourse, allowing for the surfacing of new perspectives:

> le philosophe [...] découvre qu'il y a, à côté de lui, un langage qui parle et dont il n'est pas maître; un langage qui s'efforce, qui échoue et se tait et qu'il ne peut plus mouvoir [...]. Et surtout il découvre qu'au moment même de parler il n'est pas toujours logé à l'intérieur de son langage de la même façon; et qu'à l'emplacement du sujet parlant de la philosophie [...] un vide s'est creusé où se lient et se dénouent, se combinent et s'excluent une multiplicité de sujets parlants. (Foucault 1994 [1963], 242)

> the philosopher [...] discovers the existence of another language [...] that he is unable to dominate, one that strives, fails, and falls silent and that he cannot manipulate [...]. Most of all, he discovers that he is not always lodged in his language in the same fashion and that in the location from which a subject had traditionally spoken in philosophy [...] a void has been hollowed out in which a multiplicity of speaking subjects are joined and severed, combined and excluded. (Bouchard 1977, 41-42)

[43] In 1991, on the thirtieth anniversary of Foucault's *Folie et déraison*, Derrida delivered a lecture for the International Society for the History of Psychiatry and Psychoanalysis. A version of this text was published in the acts of the conference: *Penser la folie: Essais sur Michel Foucault*; later, it appeared in English as *«To Do Justice to Freud»: The History of Madness in the Age of Psychoanalysis*. Because of the differences between the French first version of the essay and the English revised one, here I have chosen to refer only to the English text.

Derrida's claim that it is impossible to 'speak' the language of madness seems to be agreed; yet, if we take language towards its limit we are offered multiplicity, as the process of re-construction brings forward plural voices and reveals the mechanisms of inclusion and exclusion. The margin between madness and reason can be approached from a third and intermediate position, which, as Foucault seems to suggest, Derrida has neglected: transgression. This is the «irreducible third element that, while refusing accommodation with the structure of inclusion, was unable to be banished from the territory which that structure enclosed» (May 1993,14).

After Foucault's remarks, the concept of transgression has become increasingly central to a growing body of research on insanity. Despite the differing vantage points of such work, what it shares is a common stance on an experience that «is no longer *the* limit *par excellence*», and speaks within language to put into question entire systems of thought (O'Farrell 1989, 85). In addition, the paradox of a 'mad language' is often found to be akin to the antinomies on which the very possibility of literature rests. This issue has been pivotal to the study of literary insanity ever since Maurice Blanchot articulated his reading of *History of Madness* in these terms:

> […] si la folie a son langage, si elle n'est même que langage, celui-ci ne renvoie-t-il pas (comme la littérature quoique à un autre niveau) à l'un des problèmes auxquels notre temps a dramatiquement affaire, quand il cherche à maintenir ensemble les exigences du discours dialectique et l'existence d'un langage non dialectique, plus précisément l'expérience non dialectique d'un langage? (Blanchot 1969, 299)

> […] if madness has a language, and if it is even nothing but language, would this language not send us back (as does literature, although at another level) to one of the problems with which our time is dramatically concerned when it seeks to keep together the demands of dialectical discourse and the existence of a non-dialectical language, or, more precisely, a non-dialectical experience of language? (Hanson 2003, 201)

The possibility of literature itself becomes tied up with insanity insofar as they both are transgressions, defy language, and are nonetheless spoken of, thereby enacting a violence on the limits of speech. Therefore, a common question arises explicitly or implicitly in the scholarly community, and is also addressed in this study: «what is it in the language of madness that makes it different from the discourse of poetry?» (Cooper 1978, 27).

Although this question is probably unanswerable, it has helped focus the attention of studies coping with literature and insanity on the constraints and possibilities inherent in the acts of writing and reading. For instance, at the centre of Felman's *Writing and Madness* are destabilizations of language, rhetorical manipulations in the literary text, as well as the competing discourses emerging from the «ungovernable linguistic play» and its effects of subversion (Felman 2003, 252). Although in different terms, the 'literary structure' of madness and its process of transgression is also the main focus in DePorte's analysis of Swift and Sterne's works (1974), which

emphasises the practice of undermining established standards and certainties through constant shifts of perspective. DePorte reveals the constructs of madness in the Augustan Age by showing how the rationalization of unreason sometimes produced humorous paradoxes, and irony constructed or deconstructed the representation of the 'mad self'.

Attention to 'mad' rhetoric and linguistic constructs is also pivotal to Clement Hawes' investigation of the enthusiastic mode of expression in radical religious groups (1996), a mode which, Hawes says, influenced both Swift and Smart. Hawes identifies the historical roots of the 'manic' rhetoric (or what was commonly recognized as such), and describes the distinguishing features of its style, treating it as a distinct literary form. In particular, he connects manic style with Smart's *Jubilate Agno* (1939, written 1758-1763), which, as he observes, has long been read as an 'insane' text, although it is distinctly permeated by a mad rhetoric. Hawes' attentive historical contextualization especially concerns issues of social levelling in the revolutionary scene.

Mention of DePorte and Hawes' studies opens the way to consideration of another chief aspect regarding the study of insanity in literature. So far, we have seen how reason includes madness and vice versa, in a play on presence and absence which hints to an inherent structural continuity of the concepts. However, there are other aspects to the instability of this dichotomy. Among these is their permanent state of flux, and the idea that «exterior and interior, same and other […] will not have the same form or content or the same relation to each other in the future» (Carroll 1987, 77). This state of uncertainty is predominantly diachronic, and finds exemplary expression in a statement by Foucault that may be interpreted as bearing connections with the question of the *cogito*: «rien en l'homme – pas même son corps – n'est assez fixe pour comprendre les autres hommes et se reconnaître en eux» (Foucault 1971, 147; Bouchard and Simon 1977, 153: «nothing in man – not even his body – is sufficiently stable to serve as the basis for self-recognition or for understanding other men»)[44]. When discussing Foucault's work, Roland Barthes summarized the implications that need to be attended to by literary critics as the search for «unités de sens, dont la combinaison définit cette époque, et dont la translation trace le mouvement même de l'histoire» (Barthes 1991, 170; Howard 1972, 166: «sense units, whose combination defines the period and whose translation traces the very movement of history»). In the combination of synchrony and diachrony, one can observe the formation of «des complexes signifiants, selon une sorte de syntaxe historique qui varie avec les âges» (Barthes 1991, 170; Howard 1972, 167: «signifying complexes, according to a kind of historical syntax which varies from epoch to epoch»). Therefore, mad-

[44] Although Foucault does not overlook continuities, he is «fascinated by moments when structures break and transform» (Jones and Porter 1994, 7).

ness is shown as included in an interrelated web of concomitant constructs, a dynamic web that undergoes constant re-shaping and thus repeatedly re-defines its nodal points.

In the light of these observations, scholars today often advocate that the cultural and historical specificity of diagnostic categories are inescapable points of departure for analysis of madness and literature, in the belief that «subjectivity, behaviour, and the very definition and meaning of 'health' and 'illness' are constructed within social practices and rules, language, relationships and roles» (Ussher 2005, 37). The present study not only follows this line of thought, but also agrees with the recent orientation towards placing an accent on the historical relevance of the literary discourse. Among the scholars that call for this orientation is Helen Small, who emphasizes the importance of analysing «specific calibrations of authorship, genre and register conditioning the evidence of literary sources» (1996, 38). In her study about changing fictional representations of the love-mad woman, Small also argues that «instead of exploring the complex ways in which medical theory and practice remained independent of, yet also partly shaped by, literary models of insanity», literature has been used «too simply as a social complement to the institutional story» (Small 1996, 38).

Mutability, diachronic variation, and synchronic diversity of madness as a concept are central concerns of a number of recent studies from which I have drawn useful methodological guidance. Among these is Katharine Hodgkin's work, which offers new insights into the relevance of memoirs and conversion narratives in shaping the early modern medical discourse in England. Hodgkin problematizes the definition of 'autobiography' in the period, and emphasizes that «if one aspect of madness is about social definitions, another is about the self», and the articulations of identity in seventeenth-century writing (2007, 5). In a similar vein, Carol Thomas Neely's *Distracted Subjects* explores the interconnections between medical and dramatic texts, with special attention to gender issues. In her book, drama is seen as simultaneously creating, following or subverting other cultural discourses, «shaping attitudes toward madness and toward the human» (Neely 2004, 47)[45]. Incidentally, looking into gendered discourse about mental illness has been a fruitful development of studies in madness and literature, which produced, for instance, Philip W. Martin's investigation in Romantic literature (1987), Marianne Camus' analysis of Dickens' novels (2004), and Valerie Pedlar's study on male madness in the Victorian age (2006)[46].

[45] The presence of the medical world on early modern stages is also investigated by Roberta Mullini (Mullini 2011).

[46] Recently, emerging tendencies in research on literary madness are marked by a growing interest in post-colonial texts and extra-European contexts: see ed. Riem 1986, Josephs 2013.

The impact of literary representations of insanity on the history of madness is often at the core of studies concerning the Romantic era, and this book is especially indebted to some of them. In particular, Michelle Faubert's *Rhyming Reason* sheds new light on the relationship of disciplinary power to literature, shifting the focus from the 'patient' to the physician-writer: she analyses mad doctors' poetical works, revealing «how psychologists used literary methods to develop their professional identities and psychological theories» (2009, xi). Complex philosophical and psychological constructions of selfhood in the Romantic period are investigated by Frederick Burwick (1996), Ross Woodman (2005), and Alan Richardson (2001), whose innovative views on literature and neurology have marked a turning point in the study of literary madness.

From the previous remarks, one may be tempted to think that combining literary analysis with consideration of the socio-historical context is a generally accepted method in studies on literature and madness. In fact, other critical orientations are worth discussing: for instance, some recent scholarly tendencies focus on aspects of continuity within the development of the idea of madness. Duncan Salkeld has called attention to this methodological divide by defining Lillian Feder's approach «unsatisfactory» because it relies on «trans-historical ancient prototypes» and assumes that «the meaning of madness can be distilled to a single set of definitive terms» (Salkeld 1993, 10). A similar point could be made in relation to George MacLennan's *Lucid Interval*, a work on subjective identity in the insane poetry of the 'long' eighteenth century. MacLennan considers eight authors (among them James Carkesse and William Cowper) who were «viewed or treated as madmen» at some stage of their life, investigating the discourse of identity at work in their writings (MacLennan 1992, 1). However, the conception of madness underlying his study is not clearly stated: concerning the 'lucidity' of some mad poets, MacLennan says that «they were not […] necessarily mad when they wrote», without further explaining the criteria adopted for such evaluation (MacLennan 1992, 1).

Following John T. Hamilton, I believe that trans-historical abstraction can be a fruitful instrument of reflection as long as it still purports «paying attention to the specificity of represented madness and its philosophical implications rather than generalizing its force simply as one metaphor among other possibilities» (Hamilton 2008, 9). In the collection *Depression and Narrative* (ed. Clark 2008), for instance, there are no specific cultural boundaries to the choice of authors, suggesting that depression is viewed as a 'global' phenomenon, not grounded in a specific social context. In addition, the psychiatric meaning of «depression» appeared only in the twentieth century, thus suggesting that *Depression and Narrative* applies present-day theoretical frameworks to texts from various epochs. Likewise, a 'widened' view is applied to the concept of narration, as the collection contains studies about a number of semiotic practices, including films and serials.

Dionysus in Literature has a similarly broad focus and adopts a psychological/psychoanalytical approach. As emerges from Bradimir Rieger's productive introductory statements, throughout the collection madness is seen in its continuity rather than in its specific declinations. When stating that «many writers experience mental problems or *true* insanity» (1994, 6, my emphasis), Rieger seems to look at insanity as a universal condition presenting features that, in different epochs, have always fallen under the same 'label' of mental disease. It is probably on these grounds that, according to Rieger, «insanity» can be said to have «affected Lucretius, Nathaniel Lee, Christopher Smart, William Collins, Robert Southey, John Clare, Charles Lamb, Count de Sade […]» (1994, 6). In this view, the basic ontology of madness appears all-encompassing, and some of the determinations defining its 'essence' transcend social and historical time. Simultaneously, as is the case with *Lucid Interval*, such determinations are not illustrated: the borders between madness as a 'construct' and as a 'fact' seem to become more blurred when the critical discourse deals with alleged insane writers.

A final point can be made regarding the historicization of madness, especially in social and cultural studies. The overall tendency to consider specific contexts found different theoretical declinations in the 1970-80s and in later timeframes. In 1985, Porter's claim that «the sufferers' role in the history of healing – in both its social and cognitive dimensions – has been routinely ignored by scholars» (1985, 176) revealed the influence of critical trends concerning 'the history from below', new social historicisms, and Marxist schools[47]. Scull admits the influence that the 'vertical' conception of history in the sociological field exercised on his works, as well as on Porter and MacDonald's, and talks about fruitful later developments (2006, 5). Central to these developments, I believe, are Andrews' studies, which treat limited subjects without referring to specific hegemonic articulations (e.g. Andrews 1998b).

Relying on Thomas E. Brown's comments (1994, 267-295), James E. Moran provides a comprehensive view of the shift in scholarly perspective in the 1990s. Moran notes that recent scholarship «embarked upon ambitious archival projects that focused on micro-historical subjects […] in an effort to […] build an empirical base upon which to create a new interpretation of the history of madness and the asylum» (Moran 2000, 10). Paraphrasing Brown, he also adds that the neo-Marxist and post-structuralist theoretical grounds of such efforts were often not adequately stated by scholars (Moran 2000, 10). The turn towards 'empiricism' and the 'theoretical retreat' of the 1990s, however, can also be seen as a new shift towards less ideologically charged models.

[47] Such trends have given impulse to the investigation of micro-realities, especially single institutions, and sometimes less known ones. See, for instance, Digby 1985 and Dwyer 1987.

Studies from historical, social and literary fields now commonly embrace frameworks that elude the idea of history 'from below'. As emerges from Paola Pugliatti's work, flexible notions have been sought: this is the case with Peter Burke's horizontal model based on centre and margin, which, Pugliatti says, allows for

> [...] wiping out all difference of 'rank' between cultural practices. [...] [B]y weakening the usual hierarchical model, it encourages the consideration of all cultural phenomena [...] on the basis of diversification and specificity [...]. Furthermore, if we polarize the analysis on such ideologically charged models as dominant/dominated or hegemonic/subordinate, we fatally end up not only by conceptualizing differences on the basis of a complex/simple discrimination but also by envisaging a movement from 'higher' to 'lower', which is not always the case. Cultural formations are the product of a complex dialectic which is not always describable as an upward-downward traffic. (Pugliatti 2008, 8)

The latest tendencies concerning 'mad' studies have maintained special attention on the local realities that exerted particular influence in the construction of new productions of culture, thus «capturing the idiosyncratic and the particular simultaneously» (Scull 2006, 5); London's Bethlem is probably the most typical example in this sense (e.g. Arnold 2009, eds, Bartlett and Wright 1999). Similarly, thematic focus is often on the varying notions of the so-called 'fashionable diseases', such as melancholy, and their impact on society in different periods[48]. Gender differences are also re-considered according to novel points of view that go beyond traditional readings of 'male' and 'female' disorders (see Micale 2008).

With all the above issues in mind, here I have attempted to cope with the works of five imputed mad poets and the ways in which their works come to terms with the alleged disease. Each of the subsequent chapters, two through six, is devoted to one of the authors considered in this study, following a chronological order. Chapter two analyses James Carkesse's *Lucida Intervalla* (1679), a pivotal text for the study of madness in literature: apparently, this collection is the first documented testimony of poetry written during internment. The sense-making process is crucial to Carkesse's poetry, in that his struggle to reconcile self and world sometimes produces humorous paradoxes and satirical jokes. Seventeenth-

[48] See, for instance, Radden 2000 and 2009; Beatty 2012. In Italy, Roberta Mullini has engaged in detailed lexicographical study of early modern handbills printed by unlicensed medical practitioners (Mullini 2015). Mullini also discussed her early findings during the 2013 *IASMS* conference in Pisa, focusing especially on the lexicon of melancholy («Was Melancholy a Disease of the Well-off? Early Modern Evidence from the Medical Domain»).

century constructs of insanity are often caught in the barb of the writer's satirical wires, to the purpose of complicating the readers' confidence about the nature of social 'reality'. Chapter three is devoted to the poetry of Anne Finch, who is both the only female author analysed in this study and the only poet who did not experience actual internment. Here, I argue that Finch's interest in contemporary medical figures and theories permeates her work much more than commonly assumed. In addition, I try to demonstrate that for Finch the figure of the female 'patient' is representative of women's condition in contemporary society. Borrowing Virginia Woolf's words, we might say that Finch's 'melancholic persona' is a typical instance of the «fight between the victims of the patriarchal system and the patriarchs, of the daughters against the fathers» (Woolf 2015, 146).

Chapter four marks a shift in both the literary imagery and the scientific discourse connected to madness. The 1730s saw the rise of a new poetic mode; simultaneously, medical theories started re-evaluating the role that faculties such as imagination and perception played in the definition of mental disease. William Collins' *Odes on Several Descriptive and Allegoric Subjects* (1747) has often been read as indicative of the first change, whereas its concern with ongoing transformations in the scientific field has gone partially unnoticed. Moreover, by looking at some of the latest fragments now available of Collins' production I suggest that his interest in science was coupled (and possibly bound with) creating experimental poetry. Experimentation with poetic language becomes the focus of Chapter five, where I propose a reading of Christopher Smart's *Jubilate Agno*. Ironically, Smart's work has been considered as a symptom of mental illness since its very production, although its author does not consider madness as a medical affection. My analysis seeks to explain the devices Smart employs to widen an individual experience to a condition that concerns the whole creation and history of humankind.

In Chapter six, I turn to William Cowper's early poetry, in line with the chronological boundaries of this study. Particular attention is paid to Cowper's contributions to *Olney Hymns* (1779), written in collaboration with John Newton. Given its relevance to the focus of this study, I also consider a prose work, the conversion narrative *Memoir of the Early Life of William Cowper* (1816, written 1766-1767), later re-entitled *Adelphi*. Cowper reveals to be a liminal figure at various levels: his poems not only indicate that a new transformation in the conception of madness is in progress, but they also create a new image of 'mad poet', one that stands constantly on a threshold between integration and expulsion, sameness and otherness. Finally, Chapter seven draws together conclusions by identifying elements of continuity and discontinuity in the works under analysis. It emphasizes that all the authors considered in this study show constant preoccupation for vision, perception, and appearance, as suggested by the title of each section. The eye of the other on insanity, deviant sensa-

tion or impressions, together with false perception are not only key questions addressed by Carkesse, Finch, Collins, Smart and Cowper, but also central ideas in the understanding of madness in the years 1676-1774[49].

[49] For a different perspective on Collins, Smart, and Cowper's alleged insanity (and a different approach to literary representations of insanity) see Redfield Jamison 1993.

2

THE «DOCTOR'S PATIENT» VIEWS IN JAMES CARKESSE'S *LUCIDA INTERVALLA*

2.1 «*A Bethlehemite in Bedlam*»

Foucault claims that «la folie classique appartenait aux régions du silence» (Foucault 1972b, 535; Murphy 2006, 516: «classical madness belonged to the realms of silence»). Prevented from speaking, insanity was merely a subject, cited «comme exemple, à titre d'espèce médicale, ou parce qu'elle illustre la vérité sourde de l'erreur» (Foucault 1972b, 535; Murphy 2006, 516: «as an example, as a medical species, or because it illustrated the dull truth of error»). «En elle-même», continues Foucault, «elle est chose muette: il n'y a pas dans l'âge classique de littérature de la folie» (Foucault 1972b, 535; Murphy 2006, 516: «in itself, it was a silent thing: there was no place in the classical age for a literature of madness»). The idea that madness was silenced during the Classical Age can undoubtedly be shared; however, the forms of this silencing need to be further specified, as some sort of 'mad talk' flourished in seventeenth- and eighteenth-century England[1].

For one thing, many Bedlamites were known for being loquacious, and were given frequent opportunities to express themselves. Some of them had even a regular visiting public, such as Richard Stafford, «second son of John Stafford of Thornbury» and Daniel, «Cromwell's canting porter» (Andrews *et al*. 1997, 353-356):

> For at least six of the eight months Stafford was incarcerated, "a great Concourse of people" was allowed "daily [to] resort" to him, and he was permit-

[1] If «silence» is understood as the inability to articulate rational speech, it is apt to describe the concept of «idiocy», or intellectual disability of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. «Madness» and «idiocy» were discussed as separate discourses: for Locke, there was a «difference between Idiots and mad Men», and it was that «mad Men put wrong *Ideas* together, and so make wrong Propositions, but argue and reason right from them: Idiots make very few or no Propositions, and reason scarce at all» (1706 [1690], 94). Interestingly, the terms «idiots» and «lunatics» suggest an inner categorization of mental imbalance; Andrews convincingly demonstrates the «meaningfulness and coherence of the distinctions made between idiocy and insanity during early modern times» (1998a, 66).

I. Natali, «*Remov'd from human eyes*»*: Madness and Poetry 1676-1774*, ISBN (online) 978-88-6453-319-3
ISSN (online) 2420-8361, CC BY-NC-ND 3.0 IT, 2016 Firenze University Press

> ted to preach to them, was supplied with writing materials by them and able to issue a stream of "Pamphlets and Libels" deemed "treasonable" by the Board, through his cell window which directly overlooked the street. […] Charles Leslie, the basket man who had the charge of the lower southern gallery where Daniel was confined, did nothing about the "Persons" (mostly "Women") who "often come ... to hear him Preach", and who "wou'd sit many hours under his Window, with great signs of Devotion", turning the pages of "their Bibles" to Daniel's "Quotations". Open access to Bethlem continued to grant the insane a voice, indeed perhaps amplified it. (190)

Other 'attractions' for the public included dramatist Nathaniel Lee, interned from 1684 to 1688, who reputedly wrote a tragedy in Bethlem Hospital[2], and Alexander Cruden, first confined in 1738, author of a number of protest pamphlets (see Ingram 2002, 144-149). In the light of these examples, it can hardly be argued that Bethlem silenced the language of the mad, in both its oral and written form.

A reflection is needed, however, on the reasons why Bedlamites were allowed to express or publish even highly controversial statements. In the seventeenth century, printed materials were generally subject to rigid controls, as Romana Zacchi (2006) and Randy Robertson (2009) have demonstrated[3]; such controls, however, did not seem to concern 'mad' writing. The insane received a 'special treatment', of which «The London Spy» satirically provided an example in 1703. Ned Ward related speaking to a madman who «was holding forth with as much vehemence against Kingly government, as a brother of Commonwealth doctrine rails against plurality of livings» (Ward, in Byrd 1974, 4-5). When Ward told him that «he deserved to be hanged for talking of treason», the other answered: «we madmen have as much privilege of speaking our minds, within these walls, as an ignorant dictator, when he spews out his nonsense to a whole parish». The lunatic eventually invited his interlocutor to «come and live here, and you may talk what you will, and nobody will call you in question for it» (Ward, in Byrd 1974, 4-5)[4].

The point of these remarks is to show that belonging to the «régions du silence» for a lunatic did not necessarily imply being 'gagged', to use Foucault's terms (1972b, 535; Murphy 2006, 516: «the realms

[2] For information on the drama that Nathaniel Lee supposedly wrote in Bethlem see Brown 1760 [1707], 187-188. «Nat. Lee's Bedlam Tragedy – which was in 25 acts and some odd scenes» is also mentioned in Byron's letters (1976, 179).

[3] For instance, Romana Zacchi specifies that in 1676 coffee houses were ordered to prevent the diffusion of any «scandalous» publication against the Government (2006, 16).

[4] In the religious sphere, too, «those passions which totally abolish the use of reason, totally excuse from the guilt of sin, committed in those passions; as in the cases of frenzy and madness» (Mossom [author uncertain] 1711 [1651], 132).

of silence»). If a procedure of silencing was at play in seventeenth- and eighteenth-century England, it had to do with the value (or non-value) commonly attached to mad-talk: for the authoritative, 'rational' culture, it amounted to nothing. Andrews stresses that Foucault's idea of silencing does not apply to seventeenth- and eighteenth-century England by showing that loquacious bedlamites had a public: however, he does not consider that public in detail. The available documentation concerning Daniel's 'devoted' listeners specifically indicates a prevalence of women in the crowd, therefore emphasizing that his speeches were attended by a group whose brains were «claimed to be too "cold" and "soft" to sustain rigorous thought» (Kourany 2003, 213). Those who were 'in their senses', in most cases, would regard a mad effusion of words as something to enjoy or even to laugh at. As stated in Richard Sault's translation of Nicolas Malebranche's work, to be «counted a Madman», first of all a person «must be accounted Phrentick and Ridiculous by others» (1694, 247)[5].

The public gaze was essential in identifying insanity and continued to accompany the imputed mad once they were put away, although in a different form. Curiosity, says Andrews, was one of the first drives for visiting Bethlem; attending the show of transgression could often fit into a routine that included «shopping, dancing, [and] dining» (Andrews *et al.* 1997, 187). In this sense, the hospital assumed features similar to those of a theatre, and its inmates were regarded as actors; as is the case with the early modern women prophets discussed by Donatella Pallotti, madmen were close to performers. However, Pallotti's analysis reveals that the 'hidden theatricality' of the prophetic show was often stressed as a means to reveal the hypocritical and manipulative intents of the utterer; besides, controversial 'revelations' could lead to imprisonment (2008, 205-206, 226). Bedlamites already spoke from a condition of detention: their discourse was invalidated *a priori*, and any vindication of reliability or assertion of identity would have little to no impact.

The new Bethlem Hospital, which remained open from 1676 to 1815, was a regal building with a majestic façade. The entrance gate was surmounted by the two famous stone statues carved by Caius Gabriel Cibber, figures associated since the early nineteenth century with 'raving' and 'melancholy' madness (Porter 2001b, 157; Arnold 2009, 95). To use Christine Stevenson's words, «when it came to architectural display, the Bethlem governors were not merely eager, but ferocious» (1996, 254). Such grandiosity contributed to turning the place into a sort of mythical symbol of fear and punishment (Porter 2001b, 42-48); significantly, it is roughly in

[5] Nicolas Malebranche's original text runs: «pour être estimé fou, il ne suffit pas d'avoir de folles pensées; il faut outre cela, que les autres hommes prennent les pensées que l'on a pour des visions & pour des folies» (1749, 506-507).

the sixteenth century that the word «bedlam» began to stand for the general ideas of «an asylum for the mentally ill», «madness», and «a scene of mad confusion or uproar» (*Oxford English Dictionary*, <http://www.oed.com/>)[6]. The tendency towards attaching a symbolic or allegoric value to Bedlam coexisted in both popular culture and literature[7]. In *The Dunciad*, Alexander Pope associated the hospital with bestiality or violence[8] and employed its image, Lillian Feder says, as a metaphor of «the dissolution of high culture and with it civilization itself» (1980, 171). According to Porter, «Madness and madmen loom large in the writings of Restoration and Augustan men of letters such as Butler, Swift and Pope», and establish a clear moral message: «there is an utter gulf between madness and humanity, mad talk and truth» (1981, 43). The 'real' Bethlem and the 'imaginary' Bedlam were so closely interconnected that, even nowadays, it is impossible to talk about the former without considering the latter. This physical place of confinement has acquired fictional, or even literary levels of significance, coming to stand for «the individual's metaphorical containment within the 'madhouse' of language» (Ingram 1991, 7).

Fiction, speculation and real insanity coexisted in seventeenth-century Bethlem. Interestingly, its theatre-space retained much of the conventional expectations connected to the dramatic genre. Lunatics were supposed to follow a script, staging the fury of madness and expressing themselves in forms which could be considered appropriate to their condition. In particular, mad-talk was perceived as often possessing comedic features, because «Lunatick wits», who appeared to Blackmore as an «inconsistent Race of Men», were characterized by «surprizing Turn of Wit» and «entertaining Humour» (1725b, 267-268)[9]. Their ability to provoke irresistible hilarity is pictured through the words of a servant in John Webster's *The Dutchesse of Malfy* (ca. 1640 [1623]):

> A great Physician, when the Pope was sicke
> Of a deepe melancholly, presented him
> With severall sorts of mad-men, which wilde object,
> (Being full of change and sport)forc'd him to laugh,
> And so th'impost-hume broke […]. (54)

[6] The online edition of the *Oxford English Dictionary* is hereafter cited parenthetically as *OED*. On the figurative meaning of «Bedlam», see also Gilman 1982, 55-56.

[7] My formulation here simplifies the very complex issue of «popular culture». For an elaborate discussion on this topic, see Paola Pugliatti's theoretical investigation of pre-industrial concepts of 'the popular' (2013).

[8] In particular, Alexander Pope connected 'furious' madness with the Homeric Achilles (see Gregori 2008). See also Byrd 1974, 38.

[9] For a study of the connections between wit, humour and the notion of genius in the eighteenth century, see Bezrucka 2002, 28-29.

Many Bedlamites seemed to comply with their stage-role of entertainers: Ingram shows that for Cruden «everything seems to be put there to be made fun of and laughed at» (2002, 156). Nathaniel Lee similarly employed frequent aphoristic and humorous lines, such as the often-quoted statement on his committal to Bethlem: «they called me mad and I called them mad, and damn them, they outvoted me» (Lee, in Porter 2002, 88). Excessive flow of speech, satire, and punning characterized seventeenth- and early eighteenth-century mad 'performance', revealing not only a rhetoric of insanity typical of the period, but also an anxiety «to be recognised as once more within the fold of common sanity and common language» (Ingram 2002, 146).

This context is pivotal to understanding James Carkesse's work. Hospitalized for a total of about six months in Bethlem and Finsbury, then released on November 29, 1678 (see DePorte 1974, xi), Carkesse was one of the talkative Bedlamites who were capable of attracting the crowds. Actually, he might be said to have a special role among the loquacious inmates, as his collection of poems, *Lucida Intervalla: Containing divers Miscellaneous Poems Written at Finsbury and Bethlem by the Doctor's Patient. Extraordinary,* is the first documented testimony of poetry written during internment. *Lucida Intervalla*, published in 1679, consists of fifty-three poems characterized by a «*Satyr* brisk» (Carkesse 1679, 28)[10]. It tackles questions of legitimacy and feigned madness, discusses the theatricality of mental disease, and describes the treatments adopted to 'cure' insanity in Bethlem.

The title of the collection refers to a common seventeenth-century belief about raving madness, or mania: the diseased were thought to experience brief intervals of lucidity, which did not necessarily point to a betterment of their condition. In this regard, physician Gideon Harvey wrote that «if a madman, after he hath continued in a long raving Fury, falls into a long intermission of Silence» the only reason for this seeming recovery is the «great expence and waste of Animal Spirits», which need time to be restored (1700 [1699], 127). Therefore, madness has «reciprocal seasons» and is «intermix'd with intervals of Rational Discourse», generally followed by new relapses (127). The madman's lucid intervals, DePorte notes, could also represent moments of clarity that surpassed the average capability of understanding in 'healthy' individuals, allowing to see «thing as they are, stripped of the colors of imagination». The scholar further notices how this idea is exploited as a literary device to «lash out directly» in Swift's *A Tale of a Tub* (DePorte 1970, 48-49). The 'lucid interval' device, in other words, allows the madman-speaker the

[10] All quotations from Carkesse's poems are cited by page number only, following the convention established by most scholarship on *Lucida Intervalla.*

freedom and licence of raving Bedlamites, functioning as a sort of release from responsibility which opens the way to bitter criticism of certain aspects of society. At the same time, 'lucidity' points to the inclusion of such discourse in a consistent and 'sane' poetic rhetoric, or in the language of reason. A similar strategy could be at work in the title of Carkesse's collection, as a sort of justification for the satirical nature of the texts and the direct attacks they contain.

It should be noted, however, that Carkesse would have hardly chosen to represent himself as 'temporarily sane': throughout the whole collection, he insists to be 'temporarily insane' or, to be precise, momentarily playing the part of a lunatic. He also maintains that contemporary standards of medical illness have nothing to do with his condition and that he is «sound» (1679, 51; see §2.3). The phrase «lucida intervalla» was clearly devised by the bookseller, whose attempts at exploiting madness as a selling feature are evident in the complete title of Carkesse's collection. The book's peritext, therefore, deserves some attention, as it reveals an 'external glance' on Carkesse's work. In this sense, it immediately strikes us as relevant that the title page contains no mention of James Carkesse. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, omitting the author's name on front covers was not infrequent, especially when such a name was not particularly 'marketable' (see North 2003, 65). In this particular case, however, Carkesse's name is not merely absent, but substituted with a descriptive phrase which was apparently deemed sufficient to designate his identity, «the Doctor's Patient». Somehow, Carkesse seems to have undergone a sort of social death in which his self is lost, or overshadowed by his condition; he is probably aware of this mechanism when in the poems he defines himself «A *Parson*, that shall be nameless» (10). Anonymity was often connected to fear of social prejudice, but this concern does not seem to affect Carkesse, who is not interested in withholding his name. On the contrary, he is eager to affirm his identity in the poems, not only with frequent repetitions of his name and surname (e.g. 5, 26), but also through a number of other self-identification strategies.

Before entering into detailed analysis of such strategies, it is worth adding some facts concerning the historical figure of the writer. Information about his life is scanty and can be gathered in bits through various different sources. As far as the available documentation suggests, Carkesse was an occasional poet, who claimed to have engaged in verse writing only during his internment, as a sort of 'therapy'. He sees his poetic endeavour as closely connected to his experience of the madhouse, implying that he would only write as a detainee (27, 28, 32, 39-40), encouraged by his visitors who «supply'd» him with «*Paper*, *Pen* and *Ink*» (43).

Possibly, as I have already supposed elsewhere (2012, 288), he is the same «James Carkesse» who appears in the registers of Saint Mary Magdalen College in 1665 as a teacher, of whom John Bloxam says:

> James Carkesse succeeded Hooke as Usher in 1665, but resigned that office in about a year's time. In 1663, he was appointed Master, but did not long retain that situation, as his successor was nominated in 1664. He was elected Student of Christ Church from Westminster School in 1652; and took the degree of B.A. 3 Feb. 1656-7, but his grace had been refused four times. Before he was admitted B.A. he was compelled to make the following apology for some insult offered to the College, but the nature of which does not appear. "Feb 3, 1656-7, I do acknowledge myself to be very sorry for the wrong that I have done to the Society of Magdalen College; and I do promise for the future not to do the like again, and to give what further satisfaction in private they may think fit. James Carkesse. *Fuit iste Carkessius hypodidascalus Scholae Grammaticalis juxta Collegium Magdalenense procax et superbus. Die 7mo ejusdem mensis nominatus et admissus est Collector Senior pro Quadragesima sequente*". (1863, 176)

This teacher's unsuitable conduct seems to fit the Bedlamite Carkesse, strongly suggesting that the poet and the Magdalene College 'instructor' are the same person. Further support to this hypothesis comes from references to schooling in *Lucida Intervalla* (62) and from the fact that religious concerns were a matter of interest for both 'Carkesses'[11]. Religious delusion was indeed one of the possible reasons for the poet's internment in Bethlem: he talks about his missions to fight «*Popery*», with its «Hellish [...] designs» (18), and non-conformist Protestants, adding that he pursued such aims until «Seiz'd on for a Madman, only for having endeavoured to reduce the Dissenters unto the CHURCH» (17). Interestingly, available biographical sources show considerable inconsistency concerning Carkesse's religious beliefs: the *Dictionary of National Biography* reports that he «joined the Roman Catholic Church before 1679» (ed. Stephen 1887, 84), while, more recently, Nicholas Jagger considers this information as highly questionable (2004, <http://goo.gl/9sl282>).

So far, scholarly work on James Carkesse has relied on the assumption that he adopted the roles of 'parson' and 'minister', often underlining his lack of actual religious sensitivity (MacLennan 1992, 53). My searches of clergy databases of the seventeenth century, however, show that Carkesse might be stating the truth when he defines himself a priest. A «Carkesse James» is recorded as «licensed to receive the orders of deacon and priest» in December 1675 by Archbishop Gilbert Sheldon, in the Canterbury province[12]. If this were the same James Carkesse who wrote *Lucida Intervalla*, our perspective on the poems would need to be completely altered: probably, Carkesse is not insisting on an assumed or

[11] Bloxam mentions Carkesse's contrasts with another instructor, probably caused by religious differences (1863, 176).

[12] The day on the document is not readable. See *The Clergy Database*, CCed Record ID 92895, <http://www.theclergydatabase.org.uk> (01/2016).

feigned role, but on a feature which he perceives to be an essential part of his identity. A too zealous parson, he seems to have violated a «*Conventicle*», or some sort of unauthorised assembly for worship, breaking «the *Wall*» and thus committing «*Burglary*» (11). He also «tore his *Garment*» (1), an act which pointed to a complete lack of control over one's passions, as well as a «self-defacing» repudiation of «social pretensions» (MacDonald 1981a, 130-131).

Religious enthusiasm may be only one of the reasons for Carkesse's internment, as he apparently insisted in antisocial behaviour over the years. Samuel Pepys' *Diary* is a key source of information about the poet's life before his commitment to Bethlem; in its pages, James «Carcasse» is mentioned as a Navy Office clerk prosecuted for corruption in 1667. *Lucida Intervalla* substantiates this connection, hinting to a previous naval experience and old differences with Pepys, the poet's «*rival* […]/for the *Dukes* favor, more than years *thirteen*» (5). During the hearing which followed the accusation of bribery, on 17 August 1667, Carkesse revealed an eccentric character: Pepys says he «hath summonsed at least thirty persons», most of whom «do declare more against him than for him, and yet he summonses people without distinction», concluding: «Sure he is distracted» (1893, 65). Three days later, Pepys adds that «Carcasse do now give out that he will hang me, among the rest of his threats […]» (1893, 69).

The actual reasons for Carkesse's confinement are still unknown, or might be interpreted as a concourse of different factors. In *Lucida Intervalla*, the poet offers unclear explanations: he blames his «Shrewish Wife and her Relations» for his committal to the madhouse (38), suggesting that his family could have petitioned to negotiate his admission in an institution; the request was probably supported by a «City Jury» (61). Carkesse's physician, Thomas Allen, who was in charge of both Finsbury and Bethlem from 1667 to 1684, seemingly offered his medical expertise early on the case, as he «Reports to the King and the Court / that *Learning* had made the Man *Mad*», determining the poet's status as a lunatic (10). It is difficult, however, to gather factual information from the texts of the poem, since any reference to Carkesse's actual experience is heavily mediated by poetic devices and intertextual allusions. As mentioned above, the poet's wife is compared to Shakespeare's Shrew, who, in a reversion of roles, sends her husband «to be Tam'd» (38); the charlatan doctor is like Festus, who falsely accused Saint Paul of being insane for an excess of learning (10).

By constantly establishing a web of relationships between his condition and the literary or cultural tradition Carkesse adopts a procedure of inclusion and legitimization, which concerns both his self and his work. Not only does he establish multiple relationships between his poems and the most authoritative literary standards, but he also determines his

position as an imputed madman in regard to great figures of the past, including biblical characters like Saint Paul. Consequently, his personal experience assumes mythical proportions, and its representation reminds us of a sort of odyssey of the lunatic-hero in the world of madhouses. However, Carkesse's endeavour goes beyond a mere assertion of literary or self-identity in the light of established patterns; while evoking many of the *topoi* of his time, he also subverts them, re-moulding their association with madness as a means of revealing the conventional constructs on which human knowledge and judgement relies.

2.2 «*To Bedlam you aloud, Fop Mad-Quack calls*»

Lucida Intervalla opens with a plea to the King, which is also allusive of Carkesse's entrance into the realm of madness. The lunatic-Odysseus is a «*Shipwrackt* Man» (Carkesse 1679, 1), who finds his guiding principle in established authority:

> Great Sir,
> Both in you *Navy* and God's *Church*, the *Ark*,
> One *Storm* pursues the *Parson* and the *Clark*:
> But now I see the *Harbour*; on a *Rock*
> Defie the *Seas*, and *Fortune's* further *Shock*:
> Kind *Providence* casts into Your *Sacred Armes*
> The *Shipwrackt* Man, bids fear no future *Storms*. (1679, 1)

These lines embrace multiple references to cultural patterns about insanity, tracing a path into identity and otherness. It can be noted that the image of a «storm» touches a personal occurrence, namely Carkesse's committal to the madhouse and, at the same time, hints at a political event, Charles II's triumphal accession to the throne. A connection is established between the individual and society, for the storm represents both the absurd allegation of madness levelled against the poet and the 'mad' turmoil of the interregnum.

As a preliminary, it might be useful to note that stormy seas, ships and rocks were widely employed in sixteenth-century pleas to Queen Elizabeth, as Giuliana Iannaccaro and Alessandra Petrina have revealed. The dedications to the Queen included «quasi-Petrarchan comparison[s]» between the writer and a boat tossed by the sea, or other nautical metaphors which depicted the monarch as «a guidance and goal for the weary mariner» (Iannaccaro and Petrina 2014, 80, 84). Iannaccaro and Petrina observe that the imagery employed in early modern pleas «is not only revealing of a cultural climate, or of Petrarchan fashion, but also of the social climate», at a time when England was expanding its maritime and political power (84). Carkesse participates in a long-standing «common code of patronage and protection» (2014, 84) and shows that seventeenth-

century verse found new social and political contexts for application of earlier conventional tropes.

Beginning in 1660, the restoration of Stuart monarchy had been celebrated with epic tones, and recourse to metaphors of the natural world was commonplace. For instance, in 1661 John Covel talked about the interregnum employing imagery which bears close relationship to *Lucida Intervalla*: he mentioned the «Too rigid Fate» that «Had blasted Church and State; / And, with a boisterous storm, / Put all things out of form» (Covel, in Brent 2010 [1893], xxviii-ix). Paul Hammond emphasizes that the Restoration «is a moment at which ephemeral verses and quasi-dramatic texts are being rapidly produced for a wide readership in order to influence the emerging political settlement»; it is also a period of reconsideration for the literary canon and many writers «hastily reposition themselves» or «seize the opportunity to initiate a career» (2002, 389). The opening of the collection, therefore, seems aimed at placing the work within a discourse of canonical inclusion, revealing a concern for accessing to and participating in the established culture. This procedure finds further instances in *Lucida Intervalla*, where several poems praise the court as a protector of the downtrodden (e.g. Carkesse 1679, 25, 29, 33). The poet's aim to «reduce the Dissenters unto the CHURCH» (17), too, can be interpreted as a form of regard for a central authority.

The storm mentioned by Carkesse, however, «pursues the *Parson* and the *Clark*» rather than the whole nation; it is political, but it also regards the speaker as an individual. Through an allusion to the poet's experience in the Royal Navy, the opening lines metaphorically suggest the private turmoil caused by the imputation of madness. Even in this case, the references to Carkesse's internment are filled with cultural and literary overtones concerning insanity, which range from Shakespearean imagery – recurrently hinted at throughout the whole collection – to archetypal *topoi* such as the Ship of Fools. Additional connections between *Lucida Intervalla* and Sebastian Brant's *Narrenschiff* (1494) are established in various poems: Carkesse usually refers to Dr Allen as «Mad-Quack», describing him not only as a charlatan, but also as insane. While the incompetent doctor is an old traditional character in English literature, the incompetent *and mad* doctor is typical of the *Narrenliteratur*, and can be found in the lists of different kinds of madness, from the *Narrenschiff* onwards. *The Ship of Fools* (1509), Alexander Barclay's translation of Jacob Locher's Latin version of *Narrenschiff* (*Stultifera navis*) includes a section devoted to «*phesycians that no thyngevnderstonde*» (Brant 1874, 261); similarly, in his sermons inspired by *Narrenschiff*, Johannes Geiler von Kaysersberg shows foolish swarms of mad-quacks (Katritzky 2007, 137).

In the seventeenth century, the *topos* of the shipwreck, which was already typical of biblical narratives, became a standard image in literary iconology, combining moral allegory and topicality. In travel narratives, for example, a shipwreck usually drives the crew to a deserted island, an archetypical repre-

sentation of identity parameters and a recurring metaphor for the collective and individual self[13]. Carkesse's deserted island is the madhouse: he lands up in an elsewhere that places him outside the everyday social space, to which he appears anxious to participate.

The imagery employed in the opening of *Lucida Intervalla* presents further significant connections with contemporary publications in the medical field. The first lines of Carkesse's plea to the king find almost an ideal visual representation in the first edition of Thomas Browne's *Religio Medici*, where the title page contains an engraved frontispiece representing a man beside a rock, falling down from a height into the sea and caught by a hand that comes out from the clouds (1642). Carkesse was certainly familiar with Browne's work, since he mentions it repeatedly in *Lucida Intervalla* (1679, 5, 11, 61); we cannot exclude, therefore, that the engraving was in Carkesse's mind when writing the poem. In addition, sea travel and landing in remote, foreign soils were often employed in medical treatises as metaphorical representations of illness, especially of mental illness. Madness was often seen as an 'elsewhere', dominated by savagery and far from civilization: Thomas Willis, for instance, describes «the Hospital of Mad people» as «a new and monstrous nation of man, contrary to rational people, and as it were our Antipodes» (1685 [1681], 486)[14].

Michael George Hay (1979) looks into the most representative uses of metaphor by physicians from the seventeenth to the nineteenth century, demonstrating that travel literature provided vivid imagery to describe mental trouble. To this objective, he quotes from Richard Blackmore, who defined passing the 'frontiers of sense' as entering into «a wild uncultivated Region, an Intellectual Africa, that abounds with an endless Variety of monstrous and irregular minds» (1725b, 263). Like Willis, Blackmore sees madness as a 'monstrosity' of the mind that provokes both a sense of exotic fascination and a feeling of dread. Significantly, Nicholas del Techo defined the members of an Indian tribe «difficiliùs quàm ipsæ feræ cicurantur; nam plerumque vincula ferrea mordent, maniacorum in morem toto corpore spumantes» (1673, 252; trans. 1704, 764: «harder to tame […] than the wild Beasts, for they will bite Iron Fetters, foaming all over like Mad-Men»). According to the imagery employed in seventeenth-century tracts, Indians, Africans and maniacs all shared a subhuman condition, since they inhabited a territory of un-reason dominated by wildness and animality[15].

[13] For studies of the varying metaphorical meanings of island imagery, see ed. Ferrari 2000.

[14] This passage is also quoted in by Michael V. DePorte (1974, 48) and included in the collection of extracts edited by Richard Alfred Hunter and Ida Macalpine (1963, 192).

[15] Rossella Ciocca's study on the ideas of otherness emphasizes the multifaceted complexity of the topic and helps understand the various elements that are brought into play in the definition of diversity (1990).

Akin to savagery, madness (mania in particular) was believed to result from unruly and «vehement Passions» which produced «confusion» in animal spirits (Willis 1685 [1681], 479), casting the patient in a state of brutality. As we have seen when discussing raving and loquacious Bedlamites, in most cases maniacs were not thought to be accountable for their actions or for «speaking without Sense» (*A Treatise of Diseases* 1727 [1714], 17), for lunacy took «Possession of the Brains», like an invader who subjugated rational thought (Blackmore 1725b, 267). It was the doctor's task to engage in a fight against this enemy, a war which was far more than merely metaphorical. As DePorte suggests, in Augustan times «physician and mental patient are antagonists engaged in a struggle of wills, and [...] violent means – beatings, purgatives, caustic ointments – are required to wrest the sufferer from his delusions» (1974, 91).

Fighting and rebellion are indeed central to *Lucida Intervalla*, where the speaker is shown as involved in a constant battle against the physician, Dr Allen, and his treatments. Remarkably, when Carkesse depicts himself as a mythic hero battling for his freedom, his self-representation also relies on the seventeenth-century cliché of the raging 'fool', characterized by uncontrollable strength. So, «*Physick*» is «lost in [his] *Veins*», chains become «But straw / To the sinews of his *Armes*», to «let his same Gown-man blood / A Sword was more fit than a *Lance*», while he grows increasingly «fiercer» (12, 15, 38). Similarly, according to the beliefs of the time, the manic mad were unruly like «great and fearce Beasts», possessed «a stupendious strength of Body» (B.A. 1674) and could «break the strongest Bars of Iron with a single Impulse» (Robinson 1729, 80)[16]. By associating conventional notions about manic insanity with heroism, Carkesse attempts to re-define the concept of madness and the negative connotations attached to his passionate or 'furious' behaviour.

The madman's prodigious strength was generally coupled with «pervigilum incredibile, tolerantia inediæ & algori mirabilis» and beastly aggressiveness, which manifested itself in «Lycanthropiæ, Cynanthropiæ» (Boerhaave 1709, 288 [no. 1120]; [Unknown Translator] 1715, 302 [no. 1120]: «an incredible Wakefulness, a bearing to a wonder of Cold and Hunger» and «Endeavours to bite Men like Wolves, or Dogs»). As Foucault notes, «l'animalité, en effet, protège le fou contre tout ce qu'il peut y avoir de fragile, de précaire, de maladif en l'homme» (Foucault 1972b, 166; Murphy 2006, 148: «the mad were protected by their animality from all that was fragile, precarious and delicate in man». This alleged insensibility to pain, or to any kind of external and damaging influence on

[16] The madmen's state was close to that of the 'demoniacs', who combined violence and extraordinary strength, the latter being «one of the sure signs of possession» (Almond 2004, 36).

the body, made it even more reasonable to adopt invasive physical therapies to reduce the insane to 'tameness'. Dr Allen's prescriptions, which Carkesse illustrates and ridicules, largely adhered to Willis' suggested treatments for manic patients. In «The Poetical History of Finnesbury Mad-House», Carkesse satirically adopts the physician's voice, offering his own (often-humorous) comments and interpretations regarding the alleged purposes of the various cures:

> The *Doctor* his *Argument* urges;
> This *Parson* must needs be *Mad*,
> For on him, neither *Vomits* not *Purges*,
> Any Influence have had. [...]
> Nay, I prescrib'd Chains of *Iron*,
> To take him off his Mettle; [...]
> Moreover I him in the *Hole*
> As under a Bushel, confin'd [...]
> In a Place I did him stow,
> Where *Rats* and *Mice* do swarm [...]
> I laid him in *Straw* for a *Bed*,
> Lest *Feathers* should make him *light-headed* [...]
> Without either Shirt, or Clothes
> I lodg'd my merry Mad Youth [...]
> His *Diet* was most of it *Milk*,
> To reduce him again to a *Child*; [...]
> I order'd his Keeper, at Large,
> On occasion to ply him with Blows,
> That what Jugular did not discharge,
> The mad Blood might come out at his Nose. (1679, 12-15)

As previously stated (§1.2), most of the 'remedies' mentioned here were widely endorsed by the medical world, and they all focused on physical restrain and 'weakening' of the patient's 'pride and fierceness'[17]. «Vomits», «Purges», «Chains of Iron», and «Blows» were all consistent with Willis' line of thought and intended to restore an order in the movement of animal spirits, curing the physiological or organic dysfunction which afflicted the madman's body. Together with standard prescriptions usually associated with raving insanity, in these lines Carkesse refers to other procedures, such as stripping the mad of their clothes, making them sleep in straw and prescribing a very sparse diet. The latter consisted of foods that, as the poet himself remarks, were commonly associated with the

[17] This seeming inhumane treatment, Patricia Allderidge says, stemmed both from a «deeply held belief in the nature of insanity or the animality of the insane» and «the total inadequacy of everyone concerned when faced with the very real fact of violent and dangerous patients» (1985, 27).

'meekness' of women and children. All of the aforementioned prescriptions are also forms of deprivation, which suggest that a connection was perceived between the mad, the poor, and animals. Seventeenth-century tracts, in fact, often extended the savagery that characterized both madmen and animals to rogues, vagrants, and beggars[18].

In «The New Distinction», Carkesse mentions additional remedies adopted by Dr Allen:

> [...] in *frost* and *snow* hence *Pot* does come,
> To cool hot *Lunatiques*, and Wits benumme.
> By contraries to Cure, thus *Doc* takes pains,
> Our much, *with different heat*, distemper'd *brains*. (1679, 28)

The «cold Method», or cold baths, was fit only for the «unruly, and raving [...] especially, if any religious Despairing be in the Case»; combined with «Bleeding and Purging» and «a cool spare diet», cold immersions were believed to cure the patients in a few months' time (Floyer 1715 [1702], 445-446)[19]. Carkesse, however, seems to perceive these treatments as a brutal form of punishment which he is unjustly submitted to. 'Real' madness, to Carkesse, is related to sin; «there's no harm» in his mission against the dissenters, which is meant to «Build up the *Church*» (11). His doctor, however, «knows not *Good* from *Evil*», so that «*Religio Medici*'s left in the lurch» (11). In various occasions, Thomas Browne suggested that certain faults were worse than lunacy, as is the case with «avarice», defined as «not so much a vice, as a deplorable piece of madnesse; to conceive our selves Urinals, or bee perswaded that wee are dead, is not so ridiculous, nor so many degrees beyond the power of Hellebore, as this» (1642, 153-154).

The multiple connections with contemporary medical discourse should not mislead us into seeing Carkesse's poetry as objectively documenting the condition of inmates in Finsbury or Bethlem. The speaker's

[18] Rogues, vagrants and beggars were defined «beasts and vermin», to be treated like «beasts of prey», and hunted «like wolves» (see *Free Briton* 1734, 15; *Reflexions upon the Moral State of the Nation* 1701, 19; Boyer 1729, 90). Paola Pugliatti explores the 'parasitism' of beggars and identifies fascinating connections between beggars and actors in Pugliatti 2003.

[19] Floyer's text appeared under two different titles: see Floyer 1697. According to Thomas Bewley, «baths in various forms were widely used in asylums, mainly to calm excitement. One of these was the "bath of surprise", a reservoir of water into which the patient was suddenly precipitated while standing on its moveable and treacherous cover. There were also other various types of baths [...] all with water temperatures below 75°F, and the hot bath [...] with temperatures at or above 85°F» (2008, 8). The ballad is documented in 1690 with the title *A new mad tom of Bedlam, or, the man in the moon drinks claret with powder beef turnip and caret, the tune is Grayes Inne mask*.

descriptions of life in the mad house are also indebted to seventeenth-century stereotypical images of madmen in poetry and popular texts. It might suffice to think of the anonymous limerick of insane and naked Tom O'Bedlam, or the subgenre of 'mad' songs including *New Mad Tom of Bedlam: or, The Man in the Moon drinks Clarret*, where «poor naked Tom of Bedlam» mentions having left behind him his «sad and darksome Cell» (line 1)[20]. Similarly, *The Mad-Mans Morrice* presents a love-mad speaker lying on a «pad of Straw», «bound with chains» in Bedlam (Crouch 1637[?], Part II, lines 16 and 22).

When discussing the treatments employed at Bethlem in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, Andrews notes that too much scholarly emphasis has been placed on the brutality of the methods adopted by the physicians who worked at the hospital. He adds that:

> The oft-rehearsed account of uniform physicking at Bethlem in particular merits closer analysis when, even in the seventeenth century, Dr Thomas Allen was explicitly instructed by the governors on his appointment, to "be careful to see and speake w[i]th every Lunatike before hee p[re]scribeth any physicke for him from tyme to tyme". Dosages were supposed to be adapted to a patient's constitution. (1994, 72)

Interestingly, Carkesse seems aware of the medical standards that were supposed to be followed in the hospitals of his time, as he particularly complains that Dr Allen «never thought» to «feel his *Pulse*» and saw him «but once» in a month (1679, 14); with his cures, the doctor is «sending Post [his] *Patient* to the *Grave*» (28). Criticism of Dr Allen concerns not only his methods, but also his ability to diagnose patients and identify madness: the poet is an example of such incompetence, for he is confined despite being entirely sane.

To be precise, Carkesse's claims of sanity are not consistent in his collection: he says that he is «no *Lunatick*» (35), but also that «Poets are Mad» (50). According to MacLennan, Carkesse does not deny being insane, but specifically rejects the definition of 'lunatic', because he thinks that the moon's influence can only cause a morbid temperament; his *furor* and intense emotions are not to be ascribed to the moon, but to the fierce and invigorating effect of Phoebus Apollo, the God of the Sun (1992, 40-41)[21]. In my opinion, the influence of Luna and Apollo is only one of the

[20] The full title of this ballad is *New Mad Tom of Bedlam: or, The Man in the Moon drinks Clarret, With Powder-beef, Turnep and Carret. The Tune is, Grays-Inn-Mask* (in Chappell, ed., 1874, 259). The date of publication of the ballad is unknown; Chappell mentions a source dated 1673 (1874, 260).

[21] The «sheer ambivalence» of Carkesse's claims is emphasized also in Porter 1987c, 264.

aspects underlying Carkesse's discourse. When the poet states that he suffers from «*Poetick fury*» (1679, 52), he does not admit to be affected by an actual mental disease, at least not in a medical sense. Carkesse redefines the doctor's scientific notion of madness, attaching to it a meaning which evades the scopes of contemporary medicine. Lisanna Calvi rightly observes that «poetry and madness are made to coincide with each other» in the collection (2013, 150): Carkesse's notion of insanity goes back to the authoritative classical tradition and relies on long-established connections. As a novel Callimachus, Carkesse repositions any allegations of madness as a reference to the poetic mania of the *Phaedrus*:

> Your *Physick* cures, but I complain
> It works with me the clean contrary way,
> And makes me *Poet*, who are *Mad* they say. (1679, 32)

Dr Allen is said to push a «Sober, Sound» individual into 'poetic' madness through his treatments (4). The only form of insanity suffered by the writer is a divinely inspired one; therefore, «Guilty, the *Verdict* of a City Jury / can bring him in, but of *Poetick Fury*» (61). In addition, because Apollo is the god of both poetry and medicine, the patient becomes a «self-curing Poet» (36), a physician on his own right. The reversal of roles, however, is not complete: the doctor cannot qualify as one of Bethlem's inmates, because «Whoe're is *Mad*, he first had *wit* to lose» (31).

Carkesse's role as a physician is never overtly stated in *Lucida Intervalla*, but it coexists with other assumed or real identities that the writer explicitly bestows upon himself throughout the collection. Carkesse chiefly claims to be a poet and a parson; we have already seen that, according to the available documentation, he could have actually received the orders in 1675. He also defines himself an actor, or «*Mad Tom*» (5), the counterfeit vagrant beggar whose image was inspired by Edgar's disguise in *King Lear*. Finally, Carkesse frequently appears as a poet in arms: he pictures himself as ready to fight for his freedom with the weapons of satire and lampoon. The latter two professed identities deserve further attention, as they define the attitude of the writer towards both his alleged illness and his reading public. In particular, when assuming the roles of 'poet in arms' and actor, Carkesse enacts a strategy which is primarily aimed at negotiating a legitimate position from which to speak.

2.3 «*A Sword in the hands of a madman*»

In Carkesse's opinion, his being «hot-headed» (1679, 49) bears no relationship with contemporary standards concerning insanity. This is the reason why he seeks to disentangle his «*Anger*» and «*Passion*» (63) from the idea of manic madness; he believes that his «Zeal for God»

(17) was mistaken for raving, an error which caused his committal to Finsbury and Bethlem. In the madhouse, Dr Allen's treatments have the only effect of transforming him into a poet, bringing along a second mistaken diagnosis: his divine inspiration and poetical fury are now taken for lunacy. Carkesse, therefore, engages in a fight against wrong medical assumptions regarding his own condition; simultaneously, from the madhouse he continues to carry out his mission against religious dissenters. The two battles he wages as a patient and parson are so harsh that joining an actual military operation would be, in comparison, more tolerable. Hence, Carkesse addresses the following lines to «the Duke General of the Artillery Ground»:

> Summon me to your *Tent*, I'm *Sober, Sound*;
> Call me from *Finnes-burrough*, to th'*Artillery Ground*;
> For tho there's *War* Proclaim'd twixt *Armes* and *Gown*
> Yet here it does receive the deeper Wound.
> Better be Kill'd, than *Slavery* endure;
> Thus the Sword's *Weapon-Salve*, and serves to Cure;
> To this Restraint my Self I can't inure;
> Where you are *General*, in the Field I'm sure. (1679, 4)

Lucida Intervalla dramatizes a battle against the medical world, which is fought with the weapons of language (19), in particular with those offered by the satirical tradition. As a poet 'in arms', Carkesse also reminds us of Archilochus, whose iambic verses venting anger and vengeance shaped the image of the 'fighting poet' in ancient Greek and Roman cultures.

Satire, after all, has long been related to warfare. The very origins of this discursive practice, as Rupert Glasgow reveals, are to be found in tribal aggression; later, satirical expressions were often believed to be as damaging as weapons for the enemy, even on a physical level (1995, 242). At the same time, satire written with anger and purposive fury bears resemblance to manic impulsiveness, as it rhetorically represents a loss of control over the passions. Seventeenth-century satirists were indeed «furious, disgusted, or terrified, and increasingly so in the 1670s and 1680s» and, as Dryden did, they often indulged in «genuine animosity» (Marshall 2013, 74, 76). In this sense, satire and lampoon well fit the 'lunatic wit', the group of the mentally deranged that Blackmore saw as possessing both aggressiveness and a clever sense of humour. Connections between madness and satire, therefore, were not limited to figurative terms; one potentially involved the other, so that certain literary expressions could become a «very dangerous unlawful Weapon», «like a Sword the Hands of a Madman» (Jacob 1723 [1718], xxiii).

Satire stages a 'disordered order', a different form of order that is meant to reveal through subversion; it is simultaneously inside and outside the discourse it questions and criticizes. Even more importantly, this stylistic practice is both inside and outside the realm of madness, evoking and de-

nying insanity at the same time. For instance, Jonathan Swift can be said to represent the «physician's literary counterpart» (Elliott 1960, 292), as he aimed to make society healthier, curing «the vices of mankind» (Swift 1981 [1739], 616); yet, madness also informed the very nature of his satire, in that, Clement Hawes argues, enthusiasm became his primary stylistic vehicle (1996, 103). Through a similar procedure, satire and lampoon offer a means of legitimization for Carkesse's alleged mad-speech, enabling him to stand on a threshold and be both a doctor and a patient, both sane and insane at the same time – incidentally, like the lunatic experiencing a lucid interval. The speaker's position seems intended to take advantage of 'satirical insanity', which authorizes violations of sanctioned behaviour, such as dipping his «*Pen* in *Gall* and *Rancour*» (56), while still speaking from within an orthodox system. Part of a complex manoeuvre towards re-inclusion, lampooning also allows Carkesse to question directly the discourse that identified him as deviant.

Appearance and substance, Carkesse seems to suggest, are often mistaken when dealing with madness. If satire and lampoon are a mere stylistic representation of insanity, such 'posturing' should be readily recognized and understood by Dr Allen. The physician, instead, «both *Fool* and *Knave*», is unable to make any distinction, and «[f]or Lunacy, *Lampoon* and *Satyre* takes» (Carkesse 1679, 63-64). When the doctor tells his patient that he should «leave off the *Poet* and *Lampoon*» to «*Sober* be, and [...] defie the *Moon*» (27), he confuses a rhetorical practice akin to insanity with the disease itself. Carkesse consequently addresses him, «You Sot, I say, don't you know *Mascarade* / From down-right *Madness*?» (31).

Acting and masquerading are essential motifs in *Lucida Intervalla*, and recur in most of the poems. Both are exploited as means of empowerment and inclusion in the cultural arena, and they are closely connected; however, some distinctions are needed, as in Carkesse's work they take on different meanings and implications. I believe that the «Madness in *Mascarade*» has chiefly to do with the practice of satire and lampooning in the poems, whereas Carkesse's self-representation as an actor focuses on the ontological uncertainty inherent in insanity and points to the spectacle of the mad offered by Bethlem's 'theatre'.

Various texts of *Lucida Intervalla* substantiate the hypothesis that the idea of «*Mascarade*» is linked to the stylistic representation of insanity inherent in satire. Dr Allen is said to «call *Lampoon*» the «*new Madness*» imputed to Carkesse after his confinement (40). The physician is seen as identifying a disease with a rhetorical strategy, which is adopted «with design» (45). In the same vein, the poet addresses the ladies, asking: «in your *Mascarade*, / Are wit and senses lost?» (63). Since Dr Allen does not know the basics of poetic modalities of expression, Carkesse suggests him to return to school – where, as we have seen, the writer had probably taught – and expects him:

[…] among my *Boyes*, by *Rod* and *Smart*,
To learn, though late, the *Rudiments* of Art.
I find that my old *School-Boy* cannot spell,
Nor ***Satyre*** from familiar *Satan* smell:
This makes the *Child*, for ***Poet***, read ***Possest***
(A ***Boy*** well *taught*, might better sure have *guesst*)
This *Owl* no difference makes 'twixt ***Sun*** & ***Moon***,
And calls at Random, *Lunacy*, my *Lampoon*. (1679, 62)

The doctor's diagnosis is shown to be even more absurd, in that, like Carkesse, the learned men at the court of Charles II regularly «adapted the forms and methods of political satire to their own purposes», writing direct personal attacks in libels and lampoons (Wilson 1976, xii). Carkesse emphasizes this incongruence: instead of being considered along the same line of the elites and receive equal legitimization, he is committed to Bethlem. Probably, the writer says, «hither the *King* designs forthwith to send» the courtiers and lampoon writers John Wilmot, Earl of Rochester and George Villiers, second Duke of Buckingham, together with Fleetwood Sheppard and John Dryden, in an attempt to «rid the State, / Of this *Poetick*, *Wanton*, *Mad-like* Tribe, / Whose *Rampant Muse* does *Court* and *City* Gibe» (1679, 51). Carkesse notably uses the word «*Mad-like* Tribe» when including himself into the group of contemporary lampooners, emphasizing two different ideas: on the one hand, satirists employ brutal modes of expression in passionate, unrestrained, and therefore savage attacks. On the other, they speak for a community, and their practice itself establishes a sense of belonging and self-identification.

Similar mechanisms of empowerment and participation are at work when Carkesse defines himself an actor staging the show of insanity[22]. In the first place, it is worth noting that the history of humanity reports an early example of feigned madness in the biblical character of David. Chosen as the new sovereign of Israel, David provoked the envy of King Saul, who planned to have him killed; the former, then «changed his behaviour […], and feigned himself mad […], and scrabbled on the doors of the gate, and let his spittle fall down upon his beard» (1 Samuel 21:11)[23],

[22] Incidentally, Carkesse's ways of feigning insanity can make us think of similar procedures adopted in Shakespeare's *Titus Andronicus*. Mariangela Tempera remarks that «to feign madness, Titus assumes *personæ* that must be perceived as being totally removed from his previous self» (1999, 51). Carkesse's various roles in *Lucida Intervalla* (poet, parson, actor, warrior and physician) can be hardly reconciled even with each other.

[23] In the present book, all Scripture quotations are from the *King James Bible*, ed. Scofield 1967.

staging actions coded as insane to escape his enemies. Like David, the figure of mythic hero that Carkesse fashions for himself in *Lucida Intervalla* is persecuted and humiliated for his faith.

Simultaneously, through claims of pretended madness Carkesse seeks to place his own predicament and work in the contemporary cultural mainstream. Suggesting that Puritan prejudice was ungrounded, he finds in the theatre a very apt representation of society; therefore, it is a useful tool to understand its mechanisms of inclusion and exclusion. Through drama, Carkesse establishes continuity for his experience in the cultural tradition, and situates himself within established conventions of behaviour. To this purpose, he frequently mentions theatrical works which contain both real and imitated insanity, such as John Fletcher's *The Humorous Lieutenant* (1697, first folio edition 1647) . When the poet refers to «*Mufti and Mamamouchi*» (Carkesse 1679, 15), allusions go to both Molière's *Le Bourgeois gentilhomme* (1972 [1670]; *The Bourgeois Gentleman*, 1987 [1672]) and Edward Ravenscroft's *Mamamouchi, or The Citizen Turn'd Gentleman* (1675 [1672]). In the latter text, the fake physicians Trickmore, Cleverwit and Cureal diagnose Simon Softhead with «Hypochondriack melancholy» and transform all his subsequent efforts at demonstrating his soundness into further symptoms of the disease, until they resolve: «Worse and worse, he has been a fool from his Cradle» (1675 [1672], 31-32). Molière's play ridicules the affectations of social pretention, but hinting to this playwright calls to mind primarily his satires on medical professionals and their preoccupation with corporal functions.

Most famously exploited in Shakespeare's works, the theme of insanity became increasingly popular in seventeenth-century drama, where it figured in terms of both a real and a pretended condition. 'Real' madness was frequently used as a device to either motivate or close action, especially in revenge plays, as is the case with Thomas Kyd's *The Spanish Tragedie* (1603) and John Marston's *The Malcontent* (1604). However, it pervaded also a wide range of sub-genres, including Philip Massinger's *A New Way to Pay Old Debts* (1633) and John Ford's *The Louers Melancholy* (1629). Incidentally, towards the turn of the century plays portraying real insanity seemed to enjoy a somewhat poorer reception; even Shakespeare's *King Lear*, which combined real and performed madness, was revisited in 1681 by Nahum Tate, who modified its ending. The Bedlamite Nathaniel Lee's works, which often explained the characters' actions in the light of pathological mental and humoral states, were bitterly criticized in 1675:

> When Lee makes temperate Scipio fret and rave,
> And Hannibal a whining amorous slave,
> I laugh, and wish the hot-brain'd fustian fool
> In Busby's hands, to be well lash'd at school. (Wilmot, Earl of Rochester 1800, 16)

If perhaps genuinely mad characters enjoyed slighter success, those who pretended madness filled the Restoration scenes. The most popular and represented plays of the time included Ben Jonson's *Bartholomew Fayre* (1641 [1631]) and John Fletcher's *The Pilgrim* (1700 [1647]), while Thomas Middleton and Wiliam Rowley's *The Changeling* (1653) was revived. Not only do characters who feign madness speak from an authoritative position, but their artificial, temporary condition also affords them a freedom of speech and behaviour which crosses the boundaries of social appropriateness: in this view, it is easy to see how Carkesse's 'acting' and satirical «*Mascarade*» are closely linked. Even more importantly, pretended madness dramatized the difficulty of distinguishing between feigned and real illness, posing the question of judging about unreason at large. Dramatic characters seemed often at risk of verging towards real insanity: Justice Overdo disguises himself as a fool, and then he is «forced to confront his own presumed former wisdom as a kind of madness» (Bevington 2000, 87)[24], while Antonio's counterfeit insanity shows how «identity becomes a malleable concept, in a state of suspended uncertainty» (Scott 1999, 171). Similarly, Carkesse's references to acting emphasize that identifying madness was a process based on vision and interpretation of outer appearances. On the one hand, sense perception might easily lead to error; on the other, the signs of mental distress were oversimplified and stereotyped into constructs by the mainstream discourse. The poet highlights how unreliable the available criteria for identifying madness were, and how appearance and reality could be difficult, if not impossible, to take apart.

In the seventeenth century, the legal world expressed similar concerns regarding the identification of insanity. Matthew Hale (1609-1676), famous judge and jurist, emphasized the «easiness of counterfeiting this disability», but still placed his complete faith in the decisional capacity of the jury on mental health matters (1736, 32)[25]. The mad, Porter says, were believed to bear their stigma as something visible, worn 'on the flesh'; thus «in satires and on the stage, the insane figure is ferociously bestial, naked or clad only in rags, with locks dishevelled and matted with straw» (2001, 43). Such popular conventions regarding insanity characterize the anonymous text *A Satire of the Poets*, whose author was later identified with Samuel Butler. Here, Butler warns young people to abstain from verse writing, which could open the gates of Bethlem for them. In this context, he offers a cliché image of their possible future state:

[24] On this topic, see also Robinson 1961, 69. Lucia Nigri has analysed feigned selves that escape the disguiser's control in Thomas Middleton's work (2014).

[25] Hale's text is analysed in Gliserman Kopans 2006, 29.

There witty raving wretches howl and cry,
And with their woes divert the standers by:[…]
There, in a den, remov'd from human eyes,
Posses'd with muse, a brain-sick poet lies,
Too miserably wretched to be nam'd,
For plays, for heroes, and for passion sam'd:
Thoughtless he raves his sleepless hours away,
In chains all night, and darkness all the day.
And if he gets some intervals from pain,
The fit returns, he foams, and bites the chain,
His eye-balls roll, and he grows mad again. (1754 [1715], 120, lines 14-24)[26]

The divinely inspired poet, who remains nameless, makes a show of his insanity in Bethlem: in a few words, this satire encloses some of the key ideas expressed in *Lucida Intervalla*, and the «intervals from pain» also echo the title of Carkesse's collection. The lines «[…] he foams, and bites the chain, / His eye-balls roll, and he grows mad again» are a quotation from Nathaniel Lee's *Caesar Borgia* (1696), where love-mad Borgia compares himself to a seemingly sound lunatic who falls into a fit when someone mentions his obsession. The representation of raving insanity in authors such as Lee and Carkesse is presented as a ridiculous and conventional pose; yet, the border between fictive and factual discourse is unstable, as both Lee and Carkesse were actually interned.

Carkesse's work especially highlights that the worlds of theatre and medicine were not distant in the seventeenth century. We may remember that one of the most authoritative essays on mental disease of the time, Burton's *Anatomy of Melancholy*, represents its speaker as on a stage: Democritus Junior self-diagnoses melancholy and defines himself as an «antick or personate actor» who «insolently intrudes upon this common theatre to the world's view» (1638, 1). In general, medical investigations involved observing symptoms, or interpreting external 'performances' of illnesses; according to Sydenham, the physician's knowledge was «in a manner limited to the surface of things» (1742, 473). In addition, research on the human body was conducted in anatomy theatres, where crowds gathered to see public dissections of corpses[27].

If the essence of insanity could not be grasped through autopsy, its manifestations were categorized and typified in the equally visual mad-

[26] Butler's text has been anthologised and quoted since the second half of the seventeenth century, but the date of its first publication is unknown.

[27] The connections between medicine and the theatre find their roots in the sixteenth century. Medicine was a site of theatrical performance, and it was also put on stage (See Mullini 2011). In addition, it can be useful to consider that medicine was not the only 'theatrical' practice at the time: Carla Dente has demonstrated that there were fascinating interactions also between the law and the theatre (2012 and 2014).

show of Bethlem. Even the outer structure of the hospital, Scull observes, was pretentious and theatrical, for the «paradoxical juxtapositions between inner and outer, ditch and palace, deprivation and ornament» (2006, 17). Carkesse says about his arrival in this institute:

> From *Finnes-burrough*, to *Bedlam* I am come,
> To be a *Sober* man, not Act mad *Tom*:
> My name is *James*, not *Nokes*, and yet an *Actor* [...]. (1679, 5)

The popular pastime of visiting the inmates in Bethlem comes immediately to mind upon reading these lines. James Nokes, whose first name coincides with Carkesse's, was a comic actor generally involved in female roles. The poet appears as an object of ridicule, disempowered, and possibly also emasculated; yet, he seems to feel bound to comply with the hospital's 'stage indications' and satisfy the demands of the public, enacting standard signs of madness.

Various poems in *Lucida Intervalla* describe the spectators while feeding the insane like animals in their cages, or flaunting their polite sensibility with charitable gifts. Among his numerous visitors, Carkesse praises a «kind» lady for throwing him some «*Apricotts*», other women who offered him «Sixpence» each, and a Mr. Stackhouse, who gave him a «Periwig» (1679, 43, 49, 57). His friends, instead, seem to prefer a more detached approach: they send him food or even pieces of furniture, but without visiting (44, 58). Despite his reluctance to play «mad *Tom*», Carkesse always generously celebrates his public, often comparing them to paradisiacal visions and welcoming their interest in him, as well as their gifts. None of the visitors is the object of Carkesse's bitter lampooning; in fact, the poet dedicates them poems of praise, similar in form to the verse epistle.

Verse epistles are hardly ever mentioned in seventeenth- and eighteenth-century poetic treatises; for instance, they do not appear in Edward Bysshe's popular *The Art of English Poetry* (1714 [1702]). According to Jay Arnold Levine, this «manner of writing» was intended to give the reader an impression of spontaneity and intimacy, marking a «truly rhetorical relationship between the speaker and his audience» (1962, 662, 669). Further, Levine says, verse epistles were often used in the form of appeals and exploited to win the reader's sympathy. Carkesse uses this poetic form in conjunction with lampooning, when addressing possible patrons and, most importantly, when giving praise to his visiting public. The poems devoted to visitors particularly substantiate the tendencies Levine identifies in seventeenth-century verse epistle; indeed, Carkesse attentively constructs his discourse in rhetorical movements. A revealing example in this sense is offered in the poem titled «*A Bethlehemite in Bedlam, one of the small Prophets and a minor Poet to the lady Sheriffesse*

Beckford, Mrs Catherine Heywood, and Mrs Johnson […]» (1679, 45). The text opens with an initial address, where the three visitors become the Graces, summoned together with the Muses as a jury intended to decide over Carkesse's mental condition. Then, through rhetorical questions and exempla, the poet progressively confutes any allegation of madness made against him and focuses on Dr Allen's ill medical practice. The poem closes with a final address, in which the writer seeks to win the reader's goodwill. In a word, Carkesse's verse epistle is rhetorically persuasive and is meant to manipulate the response of his audience.

The personal tones of which verse epistles provide an illusion are countered by a constant dialogue with the readers and attentive awareness of the reception that the poems would produce. One of the reasons why Carkesse praises his visitors could be that the people who attended the mad-show of Bethlem also constituted the greater part of his potential readers. Through carefully considered rhetorical devices, the poet elicits their sympathy in *Lucida Intervalla*, addresses them both directly and indirectly, and opens his work to political subjects that might arouse their interest. Carkesse's poetry creates his public persona; in this sense, the writer's concern with the particular historical moment is pivotal to negotiating his place in society. The speaker puts himself on display on a stage that is both theatrical and political, to take part in and shape ongoing public discourse.

Lucida Intervalla often deals with political topicality in that it alludes to the Restoration in its initial address and often refers to the «late Horrid Plot», the alleged catholic conspiracy to kill King Charles discovered by «*Titus Oates*» (Carkesse 1679, 18, 68). In 1678, rumours were spreading that English Jesuits had colluded with Louis XIV to devise a plan which would re-establish the Roman church and grant the conquest of England for France. Charles did not take those rumours seriously, and the matter was assigned to the controversial figure of the convert Oates. Committing perjury, Oates offered testimony of a plot to massacre Protestants and kill the king; this led to general panic and to an explosion of anti-Catholic feelings.

Carkesse, like many of his contemporaries, seems to believe Oates' accusations. At the least, in *Lucida Intervalla* he takes advantage of the wave of widespread indignation and the ensuing propaganda as a further means of self-inclusion in society. Not only does the poet clearly offer his stance on the issue, but he also appears to seek the participation of the public and provoke their reaction. By joining in a phenomenon which affected collective consciences, sharing beliefs and emotions with the world outside Bethlem, Carkesse finds a terrain for mutual response. Thus, in *On the Late Horrid Plot*, for the first and only time he feels endorsed to use a plural first person pronoun, including himself in English society: «We therefore hope […]» (18).

Significantly, public and private spheres conflate once again in Carkesse's remarks concerning the plot, as in the opening plea to the king. In an extended metaphor, the poet depicts an insane political world, wondering: «What *Purgatory* can wash out the *Spot*?» (18). The word «*Purgatory*», apart from its obvious religious reference, alludes to the purges and 'cleansings' adopted as a therapy in Finsbury and Bethlem; further references to «*Wound*» and «*Blood*» may also allude to blood-letting. England is compared to the body of a madman who needs to be released of excessive humours. The treatments to which Carkesse is subject in the hospital would be fit to cure the insanity of the nation, the distempered body of which may risk further relapses (and further threats to the monarchy) if not fully cured.

If England is a diseased body, the king is its physician. Charles was indeed considered as such even outside of metaphor: one of the supernatural privileges of royalty was an allegedly miraculous healing force. Traditionally, the sacred touch of a divinely chosen authority was believed to cure scrofula, or «King's Evil». Charles II had re-adopted the touching ceremony of the diseased, after it was interrupted during the Interregnum, and his power and efficacy was widely praised. «Some even thought», Elizabeth Lane Furdell says, «that the king, the nation's first physician, could cure diseases like the French pox, scurvy, rickets, and goiters» (2002, 87).

«Physicians are like Kings», famously states Ferdinand in *The Dutchesse of Malfy*, when rejecting the doctor's therapies in favour of a non-scientific interpretation of his condition (Webster 1640 [1623], 66, Act V, Scene 2, line 65). Figuratively, the doctor and the monarch shared theatricality and authority, as for both categories prestige depended upon rituals and demonstrations of power. Both these roles, besides, granted the faculty to exercise control and govern others, but also implied the responsibility to provide help and support to those who were perceived as weaker, or subordinate. The physicians' ability to rule, which is subtly hinted at in Carkesse's *Lucida Intervalla*, acquires a pivotal function a decade later in the poetry of a woman writer, Anne Kingsmill Finch, to which the next chapter of the present work is devoted. Both Carkesse and Finch's represent insane, incompetent, but 'king-like' physicians, whose authority is constantly questioned. Incidentally, their poetry may call to our minds a key figure of the history of madness, King George III, whose insanity has long been regarded as a symbol of disintegration of every principle of control and destabilization of the paradigm of sovereignty (see §7.2).

3

PERSPECTIVES ON DOCTORS AND DOCTORING IN ANNE FINCH'S PRODUCTION

3.1 «*So here confin'd, and but to female Clay*»

Moving forward in time from Carkesse's to Anne Finch's poetry also purports shifting to a different poetic attitude, style, and form. Even more importantly for the topic at hand, *Lucida Intervalla* (1679) and *Miscellany Poems* (1713) offer dissimilar textual representations of madness. To some extent, this is due to the fact that the mental affections discussed by the two writers vary in kind and degree: Carkesse was believed to suffer from mania and/or lunacy, whereas Finch was diagnosed with melancholy, or 'half-madness'. Despite the evident divergences, Carkesse and Finch's poems share similar thematic concerns, showing a degree of continuity in the conception and experience of madness. Namely, both authors exploit imagery related to fight and warfare, and they both express their dissent against contemporary medical notions and practitioners in a satirical way. Although Finch's protest is articulated in more indirect and allusive terms, her discussion of bodily treatments and 'quack' physicians calls to mind *Lucida Intervalla* in many respects. Like Carkesse, in addition, Finch addresses questions of appearance and feigning with regard to insanity, suggesting that unreliability and manipulation were often perceived to be part of the observer's experience of madness.

Among the alleged mad poets analysed in this study, Anne Kingsmill Finch constitutes an exception from various perspectives. In the first place, she was never interned in a hospital or madhouse; however, she often sought relief from her melancholic condition in Astrop and Tunbridge Wells, resorts which were especially intended for treatment of hypochondriac and hysteric disorders. Secondly, Finch's marginalization was not limited to the stigma of mental illness, but also included questions concerning her gender and political status. Before focusing on the representation of insanity in Finch's texts, I would like to address these distinguishing aspects of her nonconformity, as their intersections determined her borderline social position.

Scholars generally agree that Finch suffered from «isolation and intermittent bouts of depression, then termed melancholy or spleen» (McGov-

I. Natali, «*Remov'd from human eyes*»: *Madness and Poetry 1676-1774*, ISBN (online) 978-88-6453-319-3
ISSN (online) 2420-8361,

ern and Hinnant 1998, xvii), a condition which is repeatedly at the centre of her verses. Apparently, however, her affliction was never considered as severe as to require hospitalization. Our knowledge of Finch's symptoms and experience of the disease is primarily based on the fictionalized descriptions she offers in her poetry, so it is not possible to establish what medical criteria were adopted for deciding her therapeutic regime. Undoubtedly, Finch never indulged in behaviour which could be detrimental to her public image, or seen as socially inappropriate, as Carkesse apparently did. «Melancholics», Clark Lawlor notes, «were, if anything, likely to flee society rather than make trouble in it» (2011, 39). Questions of dangerousness to public order were probably decisive in establishing the need for hospitalization; «raving [and] furiousness» in particular were «the terms of maniacal symptomology thought to justify confinement» (Kromm 2002, 120)[1].

On a medical level, in addition, melancholy «was not thought to disengage the individual from reality completely, as would occur in a 'raving' and psychotic lunatic»; therefore, internment was hardly ever taken into account for melancholic subjects, who «were perfectly capable of functioning in society most of the time» (Lawlor 2011, 39). This is not to say that melancholy was thought to be a 'minor' mental disorder: contemporary medical discourse often emphasized the sufferings that melancholy brought about, which included «care, fear, sadness, despair, envy and many evils more besides» (Culpeper 1666, 244). Its threats were a key object of the physicians' attention, as it was believed that «a melancholy disposition growing worse brings a Fury», to it «so far ally'd» (Willis 1685 [1681], 478). In order to prevent melancholy from turning into madness, a variety of therapies were suggested. Some of them, Jeremy Schmidt says, had more to do with a philosophical or moral treatment rather than with a medical one, as they chiefly recommended the patient not to be idle, or to seek diversion and company (2007, 37). Bodily mechanisms, anyway, were not disregarded. Humoral imbalances could be treated through a number of herbal cordials, syrups, essences, and oils, on which Nicholas Culpeper and William Salmon offer a considerable amount of information; these physicians commonly deemed «a Decoction of Thistle in Wine being drunk» as sufficient to make «a man as merry as a Cricket» (Culpeper 1666, 244).

What emerges from the previous considerations is that Anne Finch occupied a liminal position between sanity and madness, a situation that could spare her internment in an institution, but required constant attention. Two different aspects of her disease were to be kept under control: the medical one, as the condition had to be prevented from worsening,

[1] See also Foucault 1972b, 71 (Engl. trans. Murphy 2006, 59).

and the social one, that is to say, how her mental health state was perceived by others. In this regard, Virginia Brackett interestingly hypothesises that Finch's formal choices in writing poetry were partially devised to «prevent claims of 'hysteria' against her» (2008, 379). After all, «melancholy is traditionally the first stage of madness» (Byrd 1974, 116), and the isolation that generally accompanied it could be viewed as foreshadowing the maniac's complete departure from reason.

Max Byrd, Michael DePorte and Michelle Faubert concur in recognizing that the Augustans judged isolation as an unhealthy practice, since it could lead to an «improperly constituted subjectivity» and, therefore, to insanity (Faubert 2009, 38). «Solitude», the nonconformist minister and physician Richard Gilpin wrote, «increaseth Melancholy, fills the Soul with dismal apprehensions; and withal doth so spoil and alter the temper of it, that it is not only ready to take any disadvantageous Impression, but it doth also dispose it to leaven» (1677, 15). Solitude was simultaneously a cause and an effect of melancholy; and isolation, as Barbara McGovern emphasizes, forcibly dominated much of Finch's life (1992, 89).

In her early years, Anne Finch was Maid of Honour to Mary of Modena, wife of the Duke of York. At court, where she enjoyed a stimulating literary environment, Finch met her husband Heneage, then groom of the bedchamber to the Duke of York. The couple enjoyed a further betterment of their social status after 1685, when the duke became King James II. However, the 1688 Glorious Revolution marked a turning point in their lives: the Finches remained loyal to the house of Stuart and refused to take oath of allegiance to the new king. A social stigma was attached to non-jurors, who were condemned to a marginal social position; as Finch says in *The Petition for an Absolute Retreat* (1713, 33-49), she was «Blasted by a Storm of Fate / Felt, thro' all the *British* State», and «Fall'n, neglected, lost, forgot» (lines 160-162)[2]. The poet was suddenly deprived of her wealth and residence, and removed from the political and social scene; she sought refuge in the countryside, with relatives and friends. In 1689, the Finches were offered a permanent lodging in the country mansion of Eastwell, in Kent, by Heneage Finch's nephew Charles, the Earl of Winchilsea, thus enjoying at least partial tranquillity.

Current criticism often tends to investigate the reasons of Finch's melancholy state and see its primary cause in the hardships she went through after the revolution. For instance, Charles Hinnant argues that, even when Finch's poetry does not explicitly address political issues, «it is difficult not to link her obsessive preoccupation with melancholy, loss, mourning, care, and the spleen with the abdication of James II» (1994, 198). Barbara

[2] When first mentioned, Finch's poems are followed by indication of the edition I have used and page number; subsequent quotations from the same text are cited by line number.

McGovern concedes that some biographical events had a role in Finch's state of mind, but considers melancholy as a condition which affected the poet's whole existence and cannot be limited to a particular period of her life (1992, 61, 160). In this line of thought, one might see Finch as isolated and removed from society on three different levels: as a melancholic, as a Jacobite who lived during the Glorious Revolution, and, not last, as a woman writer, who, in Charles Hinnant's words, «may already be considered to be [an exile] from the mainstream of late seventeenth-century culture» (1994, 33).

As is the case with most seventeenth- and eighteenth-century women writers, much of Finch's production remained long in manuscript form and appeared in print as late as the twentieth century[3]. Indeed, Finch has always enjoyed some fame as a poet, but her work has only recently obtained renewed critical attention. She was subject to the pattern of appearance and disappearance that Germaine Greer describes as distinctive of women's writing since the mid-seventeenth century (Greer, in Hinnant 1994, 15). Hinnant also emphasizes that Finch's place in the canon is still precarious, for she is «often seen as a typical minor poet» (17).

Finch's first poetic efforts are dated as early as 1683, when her manuscripts started circulating among a coterie of peers at the court of Mary of Modena. She published some religious verse anonymously in the 1690s, but her first success was the poem *The Spleen* (1701), which appeared in Charles Gildon's *A New Collection of Poems for Several Occasions* (1718). Later, *The Spleen* was often reprinted as a single volume and in other collections; significantly, in 1723 it even accompanied William Stukeley's medical treatise on the same subject[4]. In particular, this poem was republished together with some of the texts that Finch wrote throughout her literary career in *Miscellany Poems, on Several Occasions, Written by a Lady* (1713). All of Finch's works appeared anonymously, with a single exception: the 1714 re-edition of *Miscellany Poems* included her name and title, publicly disclosing her identity as an author, which before then had been known only by relatives and friends.

In 1713, the unexpected death of the Finches' nephew Charles changed the course of Ann's life; the poet and her husband inherited the titles of Countess and Count of Winchilsea, officialised after some financial and legal difficulties. Both Ann Messenger and Barbara McGovern argue that the decision to republish *Miscellany Poems* as *the Right Honble Anne, Countess of Winchilsea* had to do with the social authority Finch acquired after the conferral of the new status (Messenger 1981, 27-37). However, the issue is still an object of critical debate, as elevation in rank could be

[3] See Finch 1903, 1988, 1998.

[4] See Stukeley 1723 and McGovern 1992, 93.

also seen as a further impediment to authorship, or an even heightened need to conform to social expectations. Finch was very reluctant to make a display of her person, as is apparent in her overt gender-based apology in the Preface to *Miscellany Poems* and her use of the pastoral sobriquet Ardelia[5]. It cannot be excluded, therefore, that «the printer made an editorial decision to exploit her ascension and alter the title-page accordingly for advertising purposes» (Murphy 2008, 90)[6].

Much of the scholarly discourse regarding Anne Finch has focused on questions related to female authorship in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, as well as on the poet's subtexts of protest against a male-dominated society[7]. Critical attention has also been attracted by Finch's representations of mental distress, with particular regard to *Ardelia to Melancholy* (1713) and *The Spleen*. My perspective aligns more closely with the latter orientation, but it is worth noting that, in this case, one approach does not necessarily exclude the other. I believe that Finch's definitions of her identity as a woman and as a melancholic intersect to the extent that they often overlap.

Gendered studies of the poems have frequently revealed this connection: Hinnant suggests, for instance, that the mention of the disease as a cruel tyrant in *Ardelia to Melancholy* can be interpreted as portraying «an ambivalent figure of patriarchal power». Furthermore, Desiree Hellegers compares the black jaundice veiling the eyes of the speaker in *The Spleen* to the procedures of poetic appraisal in a world which denied any legitimacy to women poets (1993, 209). Apparently, talking about Finch's idea of melancholy often means dealing with her 'gendered' view on society and vice versa. The following lines from *The Spleen* (Finch 1713, 88-96) are exemplary in this respect:

> [...] my Employment thought
> A useless Folly, or presumptuous Fault:
> Whilst in the *Muses* paths I stray,
> Whilst in their Groves, and by their secret Springs
> My Hand delights to trace unusual Things,
> And deviates from the known and common way;
> Nor will in fading Silks compose
> Faintly th' inimitable *Rose*,
> Fill up an ill-drawn *Bird*, or paint on Glass
> The *Sov'reign's* blurr'd and undistinguish'd Face,
> The threatning *Angel*, and the speaking Ass. (lines 79-89)

[5] On this topic, see Gould Gibson 1988, 82; Hinnant 1994, 68; Backscheider 2005, 59-60; Wright 2013, 24.

[6] See also Hinnant 1994, 21.

[7] See, for instance, Mermin 1990; Hinnant 1994; Keith 2005; Kim 2014.

The 'deviance' represented in these lines is clearly that of the woman writer and the melancholic at the same time[8]. As a female poet, Finch vindicates her right to disregard the occupations which were thought to be more suitable for her gender and to find an expression for her poetic inspiration, despite the attacks of the male world. Simultaneously, Finch copes with the deviance caused by the spleen, which causes her poetry to depart from any norm and makes it even more susceptible to criticism. Blamed as an obstacle to writing, melancholy actually offers an altered view on things, a unique vantage point which grants access to «secret springs». The speaker declares that her view on the world does not comply with the norm in many respects; to prevent disapproval, she satirically reminds her readers of other ways of representing a distorted reality («an ill-drawn bird», «the sov'reign's blurred and undistinguished face») which appeared acceptable, or were even encouraged by society.

Melancholy and femininity are inextricably linked in Finch's poetry. The writer does not suggest that women are more vulnerable to mental disorder, as most contemporary medical conceptions would advocate; rather, she perceives that women and the insane share a structurally analogous place in social topology. At that time, both questions of gender and mental health could determine the subject's marginal position, or secondary status, in relation to the logic of a 'sane', male-constructed system, and result in social restrictions which differed in degree rather than in kind.

Elaine Showalter demonstrates that a network of cultural associations has traditionally linked femininity and madness. In particular, the scholar shows that the nineteenth century marked a shift from the 'beastly' image of the madman to the «appealing» one of the mad-woman, who became a «prototype of the confined lunatic» and «a cultural icon» (Showalter 1985, 8). While concurring with Showalter, I wish to stress that a 'feminization' of the concept of madness was probably at work much earlier. The influential Dutch physician Levinus Lemnius, whose *De miraculis occultis naturae* (1583; *The Secret Miracles of Nature*, 1658) was translated into English almost a century after the author's death, described women as «procax […], stolida, ferox, etiam in reges imperiosa, lubica, varia, mutabilis», «omnibus affectionum ac perturbationum generibus […] obnoxias», due to the «animi impotentia, mentique ac iudicii imbecillitate in hoc sexu» (Lemnius 1583, 442-444; [Unknown Translator] 1658, 272-273: «shamelesse, foolish, fierce, and imperious, […] slippery, various, mutable […] subject to all passions and perturbations» for their «weaknesse of mind, and lack of judgement»). Robert Burton noted that women were especially inclined

[8] For other interpretations of these lines, see Feder 1980, 174-176; Kaplan 1986, 69-96; Rumbold 1989, 151; Williamson 1990, 118-119; McGovern 1992, 171-172; Parisot 2013, 96.

to «pride, envy, inconstancy, weaknesse, malice, selfewill, lightnesse, insatiable lust, jealousie», all faults which he also mentioned among the causes of insanity (1638, 559). Being a woman could already imply inhabiting a border space between reason and unreason: mental deviation was believed to characterize the female sex organically. As a result, women were denied autonomy and subjected to the supervision of the rational wisdom and logical mind of patriarchal figures[9].

Madness and femininity shared common features: both the insane and women lacked the privileges of patriarchy, including control over one's person and possessions, or ability to participate in social, legal and political processes. Significantly, three male writers analysed in this book come to terms with imputed madness and alleged lack of manliness simultaneously. The most blatant case is William Cowper, who, according to nineteenth-century rumour, was «a hermaphrodite»[10]. Less evident, but not less important are the frequent re-assertions of masculinity one can encounter in Carkesse and Smart's works, which suggest that imputations of madness were perceived to draw male individuals into a sphere of femininity. James Carkesse was believed to suffer from lunacy, which, as MacLennan emphasizes, was «gendered in female terms»; the poet resolutely denies this condition by referring to the influence that Phoebus, brother of Luna, exerts on him (MacLennan 1992, 52). In addition, Carkesse defines his role as an actor in opposition to James Nokes, a performer who acted chiefly female roles. A similar preoccupation with affirming, or re-affirming one's masculinity characterizes Smart's *Jubilate Agno*, where the speaker blesses God for «the strength of my loins and for the voice which he hath made sonorous»[11]. The text also contains recurring mentions of the man's «horn», expressing the need to «recover» it and the idea that «when men get their horns again, they will delight to go uncovered» (C128, 132). According to Clement Hawes, in *Jubilate Agno* the horn is a sign of «paradoxical masculinity – simultaneously abject and exuberant, exposed to all yet unashamed» (1996, 189)[12].

More than any other condition, mental disorder was viewed as mining the individual's sovereignty and autonomy, concepts that were then defined in decidedly masculine terms: the alleged insane were reduced to subordinated objects of external disciplining and control. Similarly to women, imputed mad men needed a regulating and guiding principle of reason, which was commonly identified in the physician. Mad-doctors acquired control

[9] On this topic, see, for instance, Flather 2007, 20 and Goodey 2011, 231.

[10] Probably, this rumour about Cowper was spread by Robert Southey (1774-1843). The issue is investigated for the first time in Ryskamp 1959, 135-144.

[11] All quotations from *Jubilate Agno* are taken from Smart 1980. Hereafter, this text will be cited parenthetically by section and line number.

[12] On Smart's treatment of sexuality in *Jubilate Agno*, see also Hawes 1995.

over both the patient's body and behaviour, establishing a wide-ranging process of re-domestication: Thomas Willis remarked that there was «always need of a care and governance of the Diseased [i.e., the madman]; both that as to his diet, and way of Life, he be kept always in an even and moderate Temper» (1685 [1681], 486). Carkesse and Smart's discourses suggest that «men in madhouses were, essentially, feminized – that is, with the privileges of patriarchy revoked, they occupied the same position as did women» (Gliserman Kopans 2006, 107). According to Dana Gilserman Kopans, the physician's management of the insane was «specifically coded as a husbandly, fatherly, even a patriotic power» (2006, 188). Although the scholar sees this representation of the mad-doctor as typical of the mid-eighteenth century, I would argue that its seeds were already present and evident about one century earlier. Mentally troubled women, therefore, occupied a double deviant status and, Rousseau notes, they «remained weak, ignoble, in need of intervention usually administered by men» (2000, 82).

If femininity was commonly linked with irrationality and madness, female creativity possessed an even heightened tradition of concealed insanity. Women writers were often defined by their male counterparts as possessing an aberrant, almost maenadic 'energy'; an instance of this attitude is offered by Alexander Pope, who wrote in 1713, «[i]t is observable of the female poets and ladies dedicatory, that there (as elsewhere) they far exceed us in any strain or rant» (1806 [1713], 416). Two terms employed here, «strain» and «rant», allude to extravagant, excessively passionate utterances that were commonly ascribed to enthusiasts and lunatics. In addition, as Anne Finch underlines in *The Spleen*, public response to women's work was often dismissive, and their literary endeavours were received as insignificant, or peripheral. Lacking in reason, women «have a more extensive and lively imagination than men» and «triumph in all those matters, that require more imagination than thought»; however, their writings cannot be as ingenious as men's, as women indulge «only [their] imagination, which describes things more or less strongly, as it has been more or less affected» (La Roche 1726, 335)[13].

Clearly, the cultural derogation we have mentioned in connection with insanity (§2.1) also concerned femininity. Roy Porter argues how «muted women had to be» in the eighteenth century, adding that «[m]uch of evidence about what women were like and thought – or were expected to think – comes from men, from sermons and courtesy manuals, from male diarists, writers, painters and doctors» (1991, 22-23). It can be noted that the terms of Porter's discussion share common traits with Foucault's discourse on the silencing of madness, condition which «est citée comme exemple, à titre

[13] The author is here commenting on Justus Van Effen's French-language 'Spectator', called *The Misanthropist* (*Le Misanthrope*, 1711).

d'espèce médicale» and «ne peut apparaître qu'au médecin et au philosophe» (Foucault 1972b, 535; Murphy 2006, 516: «was merely cited as an example, as a medical species» and «could only appear to doctors and philosophers»). As we have already observed, arguing for the complete voicelessness of the insane in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries would be inaccurate; a similar case can be made for the condition of women, who wrote letters, novels and tracts. Indeed, the «fundamental imbrication of femininity and madness» has been used as an instrument for problematizing Foucault's «absolute terms of repression and silencing» of insanity in the Classical Age. The philosopher's perspective, says Lois McNay, can be tempered or re-read through a more complex view, as «the implication of madness within a more general notion of female irrationality» suggests that «the social significance of madness exceeds a monotonous logic of exclusion and silence» (1994, 34).

Anne Finch's liminal position implicated constructions regarding both femininity and mental disorder. Twice dispossessed, she employed strategies meant to gain legitimization as a woman writer and a splenetic simultaneously. As a woman, Finch was excluded from art, which was a masculine realm; if female writers were to obtain access, Jaqueline Pearson notes, «it could be only with the assistance of the male» (1996, 85). As a melancholic subject, she needed again assistance of the male, because physicians would grant permanency (or re-admission) in the domain of reason. Finch's frequent protests against the world of medicine, to which the following section is devoted, should thus be read as a double discourse: doctors are the authoritative symbols of a normative society as well as male principles of patriarchal power, who could govern both the (female) body and behaviour.

3.2 «*A sort of men she spied / Call'd doctors*»

There were complex and multifaceted aspects to the notion of melancholy in seventeenth- and eighteenth-century England[14]. On a medical level, melancholy was associated to humoral imbalance and malfunctions of the spleen, the digestive tract (hypochondria), and the female womb (hysteria), which variously influenced the animal spirits and the nerves. In this perspective, melancholy was perceived as negatively affecting the individual through its disabling physical effects, and as posing a danger to reasoning. Yet, Klibansky, Panofsky and Saxl remark that other dimensions of the idea of melancholy coexisted with the scientific conception, with frequent crossings and intersections. From the Middle Ages onwards, melancholy acquired a 'poetic' meaning, which, in contrast to the

[14] On this topic, see also Laura Bandiera's comments on Swift, Young, Johnson, and Sterne (1995).

'scientific' one, tended towards a representation of this state as subjective and transitory (1979 [1964], 218). The temporary poetic mood found its expression primarily in literature, where it was «essentially an enhanced self-awareness» which John Milton achieved in *Il Penseroso* (1645-1646) through «echoes of [...] a world of [...] heightened sensibility where soft notes, sweet perfumes, dreams and landscapes mingle with darkness, solitude and even grief itself» (230-231).

The concept of poetic melancholy was independent from, yet connected to an additional notion of this condition: melancholy as a positive intellectual impulse to creativity. The eighteenth-century relationship between melancholy and artistic inspiration, Schmidt notes, found its roots in the «Florentine celebrations of melancholic genius» of the humanist tradition, which developed from re-considering Aristotelian concepts, including the pseudo-Aristotelian *Προβλήματα* (*Problemata*), written between the third century BC and sixth century AD (Schmidt 2007, 2). Pseudo-Aristotle brought together the Platonic discourse on melancholy and the humoral theory, moulding a new image of the divinely inspired poet as a distempered subject.

Anne Finch's oeuvre deals with all three different notions of melancholy and often intersects them in her verse. Some of Finch's poems, McGovern says, can be seen as consistent with the traditional discourse of poetic melancholy, as they represent the speaker while dwelling in such a disposition: *A Nocturnal Reverie* (1713), pervaded by the typical images of moonlight, ancient ruins and shadows, is exemplary in this respect (1992, 78-83). Similarly, Nadine Ollman emphasizes how Finch often 'blesses' the «world of shadow and darkness» in her poetic production (1988, 89). Scholars generally consider *The Spleen* and *Ardelia to Melancholy* as departures from the conventional mode, since these poems introduce two innovative elements in the representation of melancholy. Firstly, here the speaker – commonly aligned with the author – does not celebrate her melancholic disposition, but rather fights and opposes it. Secondly, as McGovern says, *The Spleen* and *Ardelia to Melancholy* are dominated by a «stark realism and a rigorous analytical approach», because Finch tackles the medical dimension of the condition with frequent references to contemporary scientific tratises (1992, 167).

Although it is true that some poems more evidently adhere to standard literary discourses, I find it difficult to establish a distinction between tradition and innovation in Finch's production. For one thing, the 'medicalization' of the literary and philosophical traditions of melancholy, which is often seen as part of Finch's originality, hardly constituted a novelty at the time: such a procedure characterized Robert Burton's foundational *Anatomy of Melancholy* (1621), as Angus Gowland has demonstrated (2012, 221-257, <http://goo.gl/daX5zD>). Burton's essay had already opened the way to new interconnections between different discourses

in the notion of melancholy, while establishing this condition as a popular literary motif. Besides, I believe that the attention paid to the medical discourse in *The Spleen* and *Ardelia to Melancholy* appertains to a scientific approach which is much more pervasive in Finch's poems than commonly assumed. This approach can also be seen in *A Nocturnal Reverie* (Finch 1713, 291-294), which illustrates the wonders of the natural environment surrounded by darkness:

> […] cool Banks to pleasing Rest invite,
> Whence springs the *Woodbind*, and the *Bramble*-Rose,
> And where the sleepy *Cowslip* shelter'd grows;
> Whilst now a paler Hue the *Foxglove* takes […]. (lines 12-15)

The observer's attitude in the detailed enumeration of plants seems similar to that of a botanist. Upon closer examination, these lines reveal a double focus: the plants mentioned here were objects of interest not only in botanical dictionaries, but also in manuals indicating the medicinal uses of herbs. «Woodbind» (more often spelt «woodbine») is mentioned by Bacon among 'peculiar' plants for its diffusion and was often used as a medical remedy (1733, 298)[15]. The term «Bramble-Rose» rarely appears in seventeenth- and eighteenth-century descriptions of vegetation, but in 1749 «Bramble Flowers» and «Honeysuckles» (another name for woodbines) occur together as means to 'correct the humours' (Short 1749, 192). Cowslip and foxglove, the latter being a species of digitalis, also recur more often in botanical dictionaries, gardening tracts and herbals than in literature. As a further reinforcement of the link between observation of flora and medicine, it might be worth emphasizing that Sydenham defined the physician's task as similar to that of «botanic writers in their treatises of plants» (1742, iv).

Finch's catalogue of spring flowers and plants combines attention to the scientific world with intertextual patterns and allusions to other literary texts. Both «woodbine» and «cowslip» are mentioned in Shakespeare's *A Midsummer Night's Dream* (1600; Act II, Scene 1, line 630, Act II, Scene 1, line 377, 382 and Act V, Scene 1, line 2177); the first term appears in conjunction with «musk-roses», which also find a partial echo in Finch's «Bramble-Rose»[16]. In *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, flowers supposedly have magical effects on the protagonists; the numerous descriptions of vegetation in the play have often been analysed with regard

[15] On the medical uses of the «Bramble-Rose», see also Gordon 1625 and Short 1746, 278.

[16] See also John Milton's *Lycidas*, where «The Musk-rose, and the well attir'd Woodbine / With Cowslips […]» are mentioned (2003 [1957], 124; lines 146-147).

to the medicinal use of plants in the Elizabethan era[17]. In *A Nocturnal Reverie*, Finch apparently re-reads Shakespeare's 'herbal' of magic or medicinal flowers in terms of contemporary science and focuses chiefly on those plants which were believed to be effective for melancholy disorders. For instance, *A Midsummer Night's Dream* refers to the traditional assumption that cowslip was beneficial to the skin (Act I, Scene 5, line 2177); in Finch's time, however, it was mainly recommended for «all infirmities of the Head, Brain and Nerves, coming of Cold, Wind, or Moist Humours» (Salmon 1710, 226).

Finch's works often bring together cultural and scientific overtones, re-reading traditional *topoi* in the light of contemporary medical discourse. An instance of this procedure can be found in *All is Vanity* (Finch 1713, 4-20), a Pindaric ode written in the 1690s which deals with the perishable nature of the world and participates in the conventional theme of vanity of all human wishes. The poem describes a «studious boy» (line 29) who develops «[a] fever, seizing the o'er labour'd Brain» (line 57), an image which partially relies on the established tradition of the maddening, or melancholic scholar rooted in Marsilio Ficino's thought[18]. Yet, Finch describes the studious boy's condition in terms of an actual physical illness which («perhaps») leads him to the grave (line 58), thus hinting to the fact that excessive study was commonly believed to be detrimental for the body in seventeenth- and eighteenth-century medical texts. Sydenham, in fact, observed that «hard Study, or continual or intense Thinking», together with other «Errors of Life» often «perverted the various Ferments of the Body and oppress'd the Animal Spirits» (1729 [1696], 363). Thomas Short thought that «too Great Application of the Mind» could lead to humoral imbalances (1740, 221), and Ephraim Chambers linked excessive study with fevers and other disorders (1743 [1728], «Peripneumonia»).

Medicine is obviously at the centre of Finch's scientific approach. Even when illness and doctoring are not explicitly mentioned, they indirectly emerge as a constant concern, associated with fear and suffering. Thematically close to *All is Vanity*, the poem *To Death* well illustrates the case in point (Finch 1713, 122-123). It can be read as a conventional Christian resignation to the «King of Terrors» (line 1), who should not be feared in the light of heavenly reward. However, the physical process leading the body to its demise causes anxiety and apprehension: the speaker admits to «tremble» at death's «swords», «racks» and «wheels» (line 8).

[17] Roberta Mullini offers a 'medical' perspective on the entire Shakespearean corpus, complete with tables of occurrences (2013). On *A Midsummer Night's Dream* and medicinal plants, see also Reynolds and Sawyer 1959; Dent 1964; Young 1966, 20.

[18] For Marsilio Ficino's assessments of the melancholic temperament, see Klibansky, Panofsky and Saxl 1979 [1964], 261.

The transition to death is viewed in its corporeal, material aspects, with mention of «scorching fevers», «raving» and «contagious darts» (lines 9-11), phrases which add a medical dimension to the conventional theme of human mortality. The end of life is worrisome only as far as illness and physical sufferings are concerned.

Finch's interest in medicine is generally coupled with detailed attention to the human body, its symptoms and the remedies adopted to treat them, as *An Epistle from Alexander to Hephæstion in his Sickness* demonstrates (1713, 97-101). The incipit of this poem introduces an image of ill health which, at first, can be confusing to the reader:

> With such a Pulse, with such disorder'd Veins,
> Such lab'ring Breath, as thy Disease constrains;
> With failing Eyes, that scarce the Light endure […]. (lines 1-3)

This description might be expected to concern the sick Hephæstion; instead, as the fourth and fifth lines of the poem clarify, it illustrates the state of apprehension which accompanies 'sane' Alexander while writing his letter. The boundaries between health and illness are blurred and represented as mutable: the body's 'symptoms' when subject to strong emotions and in a state of sickness are essentially the same. «[U]pon Anxiety, Concern, and earnest Expectation», Cheyne wrote, «the Pulse is found quick and small, and the Breath thick and difficult» (1725 [1724], 154); moreover, Parkinson said, 'excited' blood and humours can affect the eyes and «hinder the sight» (1640, 616). If the body can show the same signs in health and disease, the criteria to distinguish between the two conditions are arbitrarily established by the physician, and their difference rests on theoretical grounds rather than on physical evidence. Illness can be a construct of the scientific world, and its definition is flexible enough to allow subjective and unreliable diagnosis.

An Epistle also focuses on Finch's recurring symbol of male reason and objectivity, the (quack) physician. As in various other texts of the poet's corpus, the doctor is treated here with suspicion, derision and resentment. Alexander has long watched over the «doubtful Cure» (line 4) administered to Hephæstion and manifests his contempt for the incompetent practitioner who has him under his care. Finch's verses suggest that, since doctors have an almost divine power of life and death over their patients, they should be responsible for their malpractice to the point of sharing the sick person's fate:

> More thy Physician's Life on Thine depends,
> And what he gives, his Own preserves, or ends.
> If thou expir'st beneath his fruitless Care,
> To *Rhadamanthus* shall the Wretch repair,
> And give strict Answer for his Errors there. (lines 41-45)

Alexander's words apparently imply that the physician can now exert complete control over his patient's life, but he will eventually respond to an authority higher than his.

Some of the arguments raised by Finch in *An Epistle* were also treated in a pamphlet published in 1701 entitled *The Present State of Physick & Surgery in London*, consisting of *A Letter from a Merchant in London, To a Dispensary Physician* followed by the doctor's answer. The document tackles three main questions: the tension between apothecaries and physicians, the responsibility of administering the correct cures and the expenses related to treatments and doctoring. The pamphlet aims to re-assert the authority of physicians with respect to apothecaries, who are shown to lack the scientific knowledge needed for effective treatment of patients. Apothecaries are defined as the first resources of sick people looking for an inexpensive cure; their incompetence and abuses in pricing could be avoided by applying directly to doctors, especially to those who prepare their own medicines.

Doctors are thus presented as completely autonomous models of health care management, who should govern on the realm of medicine as sovereigns. Any question of power concerning physicians and apothecaries is indeed expressed in terms of a political struggle, with frequent metaphors concerning reigning and kingship:

> [Physicians] have been many years under the dread of the Apothecaries power, who avowedly own, they Command in all the Families […]. They observe, they Govern as a Tyrant his Subjects, make them obedient by the grievous Taxes they are forced to Pay. The People from the exorbitant Payments to them, dare not consult a Physician, unless at the last extremity of a Disease. The Physicians would govern their Patients, only by their own Reason. They have the Liberty of having very cheap Physick [...]. (*The Present State* 1701, 4)

The physicians' patriarchal authority is represented here, to use Gliserman Kopans' words, as «a corollary of that of the king» (2006, 188). A 1702 pamphlet, presumably written as an answer to *The Present State of Physick & Surgery in London*, shows the same tendency towards employing political metaphors in dealing with the various areas of competence in medicine. In addition, it represents the medical field as an organism, in which the various parts should cooperate for proper functioning:

> […] I think it highly unreasonable, that the College of *Physicians* should have any such Power in them to Censure and Condemn the other two Bodies of Surgery and Pharmacy; or that they should have a Power to practice all the parts of *Physick*, and to vend Medicines […]; For I think it the highest Injustice to make 'em a Body Politick, and afterwards restrain 'em to the Jurisdiction of another, since the Incorporating of any Persons, is with Design to bring 'em under the Limitation only of their own Laws and Government: Therefore we are to enquire who were the first Aggressors. (*A Pill to Purge* 1702, 5)

In *The Present State of Physick & Surgery in London*, the lack of success of the physician's cures is ascribed to external causes. First, it appears due to the apothecary's interference in the doctor's relationship with patients, which can delay a correct regime of treatment. Second, the patient's demise is part of a natural course of things that is independent from the doctor's skill, or rather caused by «Events» that «are not justly imputable to the Artist, if he is not visibly *deficient* in his Skill and Address», just as the master of a ship would not be considered responsible for a violent storm (*The Present State*, 18). Third, and most importantly, patients are often the cause of their own trouble: not only do they wrongfully choose to consult apothecaries instead of experienced doctors, but they also «corrupt [their] Constitutions» through «*Interperance*, *Luxury*, and the gratifications of [the] *Senses*» (19).

Finch's poems directly attack the idea that physicians possessed specialized scientific qualifications, describing their practice as useless, their knowledge as superficial, and their overall function as more detrimental than beneficial. For one thing, physicians are the first to be subject to the «distempers» that they blame on their patients: they are drawn to medicine by immoderate greed, since making money is their ultimate purpose. In *To D^r. Waldron: A Fellow of All Souls College in Oxford, Who in a Letter acknowledged his mistake in having lefte that Society & the Muses to follow the Practise of Phisck* (Finch 1903, 106-107), Finch identifies a typical instance of this situation. Commenting on a doctor who regrets having abandoned academic research for the practice of medicine, Finch writes:

> 'Tis true Mirtillo 'twas a fault
> To have been by glittering profit wrought
> To quit that seat of thoughts refined. (lines 1-3)
> A Miser's guilty hand to hold
> And feel his Pulse, to feel his Gold
> Who startles att the name of thee
> And in suspence 'twixt Life and Fee
> How to determine seems so loth
> Till by delay, he parts with both. (lines 11-16)

Possibly, the opening address to the doctor as «Mirtillo» refers to *Il pastor fido* (1585; *The Faithfull Shepherd*, English translation by Richard Fanshawe, 1647) by Giovan Battista Guarini[19], where Mirtillo rejects the temptations of the senses in favour of a higher idea of love. The doctor, similarly, regrets indulging in excessive passion for money, instead of pursuing nobler ends.

[19] *Il pastor fido* could have been in Finch's mind: Guarini's tragicomedy was adapted by Giacomo Rossi on 22 November 1712 at the Queen's Theatre (London). On 18 May of the same year, Händel presented a new version of this play.

These lines combine some of the ideas we have already encountered in Finch's verses: the physician's under-achieving ineptitude is central to *An Epistle* and the patients' fear of doctors and medicine is suggested in *To Death*. In *To D^r. Waldron*, however, Finch departs from her usual tone and directly lampoons the physician, criticizing together with him all those practitioners who 'construct' illness in both young and old bodies, «sick only of [the] nintieth year» (line 24). The speaker's attitude in this verse epistle is not much different from James Carkesse's, when protesting against Dr Allen's therapies; however, Finch uses Waldron's figure as an epitome of all practitioners and extends her views on the single case to the whole category.

Finch's perspectives on satire and lampoon have already been analysed in a number of essays, with particular attention to their relationship with gender issues. Although the poet generally repudiates both forms as libellous (Hinnant 1994, 36), she recognises a distinction between the 'lowly' lampoon and 'high' satire (Canfield 2003, 115). According to eighteenth-century literary standards, in fact, satire was considered «a poem, in which, the folly and wickedness of the times, are severely censured; written with an intent to reform» (Trusler 1766, 37). By contrast, lampoon contained personal invectives, and was therefore «scurrilous»: while satire was «beneficial to a state», lampoon writers «may be well compared to a bee, whose sting, wounds but slightly, and, whose malicious act, is sure to be punished by the whole swarm» (37). A prose preface to Finch's poems, which was published posthumously in 1903, reveals that Finch was reluctant to associate herself to satire, but definitely rejected lampoon, together with «all sorts of abusive verses» (1903, 10). In commenting Finch's position, most scholars have underlined that satire, at the time, was felt as an inappropriate practice for women; once again, however, stereotypes concerning gender and mental health seem to conflate. In *Ardelia's Answer to Ephelia* (Finch 1903, 38-46), Finch writes that «Lampoons, where only spite is seen» are «Not fill'd with female witt, but female spleen» (lines 200-201). Arguably, Finch perceives a connection between the 'rage' of satire, or lampoon, and mental disease, similarly to James Carkesse. Both gender conventions and the 'fury' associated with satire led the writer to claim that she eschewed this vehicle; yet, «outbursts of satire» actually characterize most of the poems that Finch devotes to medicine and doctoring, including *The Spleen* and *Ardelia to Melancholy* (Kennedy 2013, 23).

This is also the case with *For the Better* (Finch 1713, 137-139), which contains bitter satirical attacks on the figure of the physician and takes up again the idea of the doctors' growing rich at the expense of their patients[20].

[20] Regarding the title of this poem, it might be interesting to point out that in 1703 Francis Manning's comedy *All for the Better: or, the Infallible Cure* was staged in Theatre Royal at Drury Lane. In the play, the protagonist, Don Alphonso, uses music to relieve his melancholic humour.

According to Finch, the diagnosis of certain 'nervous disorders' were arbitrarily set by incompetent practitioners. The poem especially questions the existence of the so-called «female diseases», which were often discussed and variously classified in medical treatises[21]. In *For the Better*, «A Quack, to no true Skill in Physick bred» (line 1) visits his male patient, whose health is progressively worsening. He claims that his condition «proceed[s] from Vapours» and should be cured with «Steel» (line 17), provoking the man's harsh reaction:

> No more of Vapours, your belov'd Disease,
> Your Ignorance's Skreen, your *What-you-please*,
> With which you cheat poor Females of their Lives,
> Whilst Men dispute not, so it rid their Wives.
> For me, I'll speak free as I've paid my Fees;
> My Flesh consumes, I perish by degrees:
> And as thro' weary Nights I count my Pains,
> No Rest is left me, and no Strength remains. (lines 20-27)

Vapours were considered as a typically female malady, and their conception was rather confused and varying. Melancholy, as we have already mentioned (§1.2), was believed to be generated from the failure of the spleen in processing black bile, so «the spleen» was a common term for referring to low spirits in both sexes. Spleen dysfunctions could also heat up the black bile, which thus generated vapours and affected the brain, or other organs. The female womb was especially thought to generate «dark Fumes and Exhalations», together with «Sufferings in various Parts of the Body» (Blackmore 1725b, 99-100). Vapours, in their turn, caused «great Distraction and Confusion» of the Animal Spirits, bringing along a variety of disorders, and often 'clouding' one's thoughts (100).

Remarkably, in this poem, Finch articulates her dissent towards the medical world through a male persona, thus obtaining two different effects. On the one hand, a male voice would be perceived by contemporary readers as more authoritative and objective than a female one; on the other, this strategy partially shifts attention from the speaker to the subject, since at the time a passionate attack on medical theories and practitioners would appear as more appropriate and credible when coming from a man. It might be noted, however, that Finch's poetic persona also represents an instance of a 'feminized' male patient, subject to the doctor's control and stripped of the symbolic features of his gender. Not only is the patient di-

[21] See, for instance, John Leake's distinction between «acute» and «chronical» maladies «incident to women» (1777, 11) and their treatment. Interestingly, it seems that women's «periodical discharge» can be accounted among the 'chronical diseases' (43). On «Vapours» and «Fits of the Mother», see also Blackmore 1725b, 99-100.

agnosed with vapours, a typically female disorder, but he also claims to have lost all his strength (line 27). To the latter complaint, the physician readily responds that «Men of Vigour» are more readily killed by fevers (line 33) – arguably, one may add, because they would not «docilely and gratefully participate in [the] treatment» and submit to the doctor's authority (Gliserman Kopans 2006, 188). Medicine is represented as a usurping power structure; it strips men of their gender identity and, by conveniently devising its notions of illness, it unduly avails itself of women's disadvantaged position within the patriarchal scientific discourse.

The patient protests against the physician's annihilation of his masculinity, thus making his point: the theory of vapours is a sort of umbrella-concept, which can embrace a vast array of symptoms and diseases. The whole idea of vapours is unreliable for both sexes, and it is an excuse for those doctors who are not able to identify 'real' disorders. The physician's reply consists of a smug expression of scientific and moral authority, dotted with tranquillizing statements and further commands (lines 28-38). The fatherly figure of the doctor indulgently sees the patient's 'rebellion' as a sign of good health and rejoices because «they're most Patient who the most are seiz'd» (line 35). After all, the man's «Gust of Passion» (line 34) confirms a common opinion, according to which splenetic patients are inconstant in their «Temper and Passions» (Blackmore 1725b, 26). The quack's behaviour calls to mind that of comedic clichés, not last the fake practitioners of *The Citizen Turn'd Gentleman* mentioned by Carkesse (§2.3): once the physician has defined the man as sick, he entraps him in that definition and disparages any form of expression coming from him as a further symptom of disease. In *For the Better,* cultural and medical references encounter again, for the quack also recommends assumption of «steel» (line 2), documented in the use of vapours in Blackmore and Purcell's treatises[22], and «Treacle-water» (line 38), a cordial mentioned by Ambrose Paré (also spelt Parey), Thomas Willis, and William Salmon[23].

Accusing his doctor of a lack of knowledge, the patient refers to his own «*Flesh*» (line 25): once again, Finch's poetry focuses attention on concrete and visible mechanisms of the human body, while casting doubt on any belief regarding intangible processes, as well as on the equally evasive logic which conceived them. The clinical identity of the disease referred to as spleen or vapours was, indeed, rather puzzling and obscure in the eighteenth century. Finch was not alone in advocating the absurdity of vapours, for in 1711 Bernard Mandeville stated that:

[22] See Blackmore 1725b, 74 and Purcell 1707, 208.

[23] See Paré [or Parey] 1649 [1634], 540; Willis 1685 [1681], 370; Salmon 1710, 982.

> I never dare speak of Vapours, the very Name is become a Joke; and the general Notion the Men have of them, is, that they are nothing but a malicious Mood, and contriv'd Sullenness of wilful extravagant and imperious Women, when they are denied, or thwarted in their unreasonable Desires. (1730 [1711], 270)

More than twenty years later, Cheyne would definitively strip away any credibility to the notion of both vapours and the spleen, writing – very much in line with Finch's argument – that they were «of so general and loose a Signification, that [they are] a common Subterfuge for meer Ignorance of the Nature of Distempers» (1733, 194). The groundwork for Mandeville and Cheyne's assumptions was laid by Sydenham, who had reservations about distinguishing between hypochondriac and hysteric disorders: he re-located such affections in the nerves and the brain, refuting any specific influence of the female sexual organs in the disease (Sydenham 1742, 368-369). To this idea, Mary Wortley Montagu responded with enthusiasm in 1758, explicitly emphasizing ideas which are present *in nuce* in Finch's work:

> I am charmed with [Sydenham's] taking off the reproach which you men so saucily throw on our sex, as if we alone were subject to vapours: he clearly proves that your wise, honourable spleen is the same disorder and arises from the same cause; but you vile usurpers do not only engross learning, power and authority to yourselves, but will be our superiors even in constitution of mind […] Ignorance! (1837 [1758], 272)

As emerges from *For the Better*, Finch not only had a direct experience of physicians and doctoring, but was also familiar with the emergent scientific medical discourse, with particular attention to man's intervention on women's bodies, thoughts and behaviour. These two interconnected levels of Finch's relationship with medicine are revealed in *Fragment at Tunbridge Wells* (Finch 1713, 229), which has received critical attention especially in the light of its religious undertones[24]. In a satirical vein, the poetic fragment discusses medical puzzlement in front of splenetic affections. The title sets the scene: Tunbridge Wells was a fashionable resort often reached for its medicinal springs, which a 1703 play by Thomas Baker (*Tunbridge Wells*, Act I, Scene 1) satirically describes in these terms:

> Like most publick assemblies, a Medly of all sorts, Fops majestic and diminutive, from the long flaxen Wig with a splendid Equipage, to the Merchant's Spruce Prentice that's always mighty neat about the legs; Squires come to Court some fine Town-Lady, and Town-Sparks to pick up a Russet Gown; for the Women here are wild Country-Ladies, with ruddy Cheeks

[24] For a different perspective on *Fragment at Tunbridge Wells*, see Ellis D'Alessandro 1989, 6.

> like a Sevil-Orange, that gape, stare, scamper, and are brought hither to be disciplin'd […]. (Baker, in Phippen 1844, 29-30)

More importantly, contemporary physicians believed that this resort was «most eminent for relieving of Hypocondriacal Affections» (Blackmore 1725b, 76). According to Blackmore, «Chalybeate and other Mineral Waters, not purgative, are very beneficial» because they «[carry] off the noxious Humours collected in the Stomach» and «corroborate and restore by their astringent Quality the Tone of the Nerves, and the membranaceous Fibres, and contract and confirm the animal Spirits» (1725b, 78-79). As can be seen in Blackmore's text, three different systems were called into play when discussing splenetic disorders: humours, nerves, and animal spirits, which interacted in complex (and often unclear) ways. Finch was among the splenetics who visited health resorts, presumably following her physician's advice.

Finch's recurring themes reappear in this poem, since the speaker notes that corporal symptoms are treated with empty words and abstract theories, which prove ineffective on the body:

> For He, that made, must new create us,
> Ere *Seneca*, or *Epictetus*,
> With all their serious Admonitions,
> Can, for the *Spleen*, prove good Physicians.
> The Heart's unruly Palpitation
> Will not be laid by a Quotation;
> Nor will the Spirits move the lighter
> For the most celebrated Writer.
> Sweats, Swoonings, and convulsive Motions
> Will not be cur'd by Words, and Notions. (lines 1-10)

The authoritative medical discourse is represented as vain and empty: the words of the ancient, on which contemporary doctors still based their practice, are only learned quotations and cannot offer much to the new science[25]. When mentioning Seneca and Epictetus, Finch is especially re-

[25] Interestingly, in 1675 another female writer, Mary Trye, voiced her contempt against a physician who insulted the memory of her deceased father, a «Chymical» doctor, and expressed a similar opinion about contemporary medical practice. She wrote: «For a Man to come and talk of Physick, to call himself a Teacher of it, and stand up to guide the whole World therein, in such an ingenious, knowing and intelligible Age as this is, without any other abilities to back him, then [sic] words, seems to me not only a Riddle, but almost a Miracle […] in so many hundred years the Art of Learned Physick is no more improved; Physicians that desire to be Honoured with the name of Learning, are no more able in their Science, then [sic] their Masters of Old were near Two Thousand years before them» (Trye 1675, 52).

ferring to Burton's *Anatomy of Melancholy*, where the author often quoted their moralizing maxims, or «serious Admonitions» (line 3)[26].

By describing the movements of the spirits and the body's convulsive fits, Finch seems to accept Willis' view on «Hypocondriacal Affects»: the physician maintained «that the chief Symptoms of this distemper are convulsive and depend immediately upon the Irregularities of the Animal Spirits, and Nervous Juice», rather than on other «Dyscrasies of the Viscera» (Willis 1685 [1681], 309). In the seventeenth and early eighteenth century, Willis' views on hysteria and hypochondria were often discussed together with other competing ideas; for instance, according to Nathaniel Highmore, «the Weakness and Laxeness of the tone of the stomach and its Fibres» was to be accounted as the chief cause of the condition (*Philosophical Transactions* 1670, 1090). The latter theory also assumed that most forms of melancholy-based affections were commonly accompanied by «Apepsy, Belchings, and Flatulencies» (Pitcairn 1718, 289). It is not surprising, thus, that literary authors commonly adhered to nerve theories to represent the speaker's, or the character's melancholic condition, as also Heather R. Beatty notes in connection with Richardson's novels (2012, 23). Shifting attention from «Colicks» to «Palpitations» and «Swoonings», Willis' theories laid the foundations to viewing melancholy as a fashionable nervous weakness, or an «exquisite and painful sensibility» of the most «tender nerves» (Berkeley 1744, 50) and allowed medical perspectives on the subject to be more easily associated with its poetic, or philosophical notions.

The connections between *Fragment at Tunbridge Wells* and Thomas Willis' thought are further reinforced in the following lines of the poem:

> Then live, old *Brown*! with thy Chalybeats,
> Which keep us from becoming Idiots.
> At *Tunbridge* let us still be Drinking,
> Though 'tis the *Antipodes* to Thinking: [...]. (lines 11-14)

Incidentally, here the ironical mention of «old Brown» is partially obscure. The line might refer to Sir Thomas Browne, who discussed chalybeates in *Pseudodoxia Epidemica* (1646-1672), but the surname is too widespread to attempt any precise identification: Finch could also be talking about Joseph Browne, author of a treatise including *Advice to the Water Drinker at Tunbridge, Hampstead, Astrope, Nasborough, and all the other Chalibeate Spaws* (1707)[27].

[26] See Burton 1638, 12, 33, 42 and *passim*. On this topic, see also Lund 2010, 193.

[27] The idea that Finch might have had this essay in mind has been put forward by David McNeel (2006, <http://www.jimandellen.org/finch/poem134.html>, 01/2016).

Significantly, the phrase «Antipodes to Thinking» is reminiscent of a passage from Willis' work in which he compares the «Hospitals of mad People» to «our Antipodes», already mentioned here with regard to James Carkesse (Willis 1685 [1681], 486). Apparently, Finch perceives the melancholic condition as giving way to a sense of isolation and otherness which does not significantly differ from the displacement of the 'furious mad' in mental hospitals. Like the manic insane, melancholics also metaphorically inhabit a different region, which Blackmore was to describe some years later as «Boeotian Territories, which are barren of Understanding, are extended in a frigid Climate, and are visited but with weak and languishing Rays» (1725b, 273)[28].

With this, I am not implying that Finch associates melancholy and mania in her lines: when the speaker caustically credits chalybeates for maintaining splenetic patients within the borders of reason, the allusion goes to Willis' idea that melancholic affections should be prevented from worsening into a fury. Different strategies seem to be simultaneously at play in *Fragment at Tunbridge Wells*: in the first place, the poet suggests that melancholy treatments at Tunbridge are a form of removal, similar in essence to mad hospitals. In the second place, Finch's satire on physicians is constructed here through hyperboles («Idiots», «Antipodes to thinking»), probably to reflect medicine's excessive emphasis on the seriousness of some mental disorders. Finally, Finch pervades these lines with subtle references to the moral judgement inherent in the medical discourse on mental affections: idiocy was often exploited as the «epitome of error, self-delusion, or moral and intellectual blindness» (Andrews 1998a, 69), whereas Willis' reference to «Antipodes» alluded to savagery, or inability to restrain one's impulses and passions.

Fragment at Tunbridge Wells can thus be said to regard the moral and social dimension as central to the definition of mental disorder. Instead of treating the patients' bodily symptoms, physicians judge their behaviour as deviant through conventional frames of reference, without allowing for diversity. These concepts are further developed in other texts by Finch, especially *Democritus and his Neighbors,* analysed in the next section of the present work together with *Ardelia to Melancholy, The Spleen*, and *By Love persu'd*. These poems share a common feature: the main poetic figures, or the speakers, are represented as melancholic subjects.

3.3 «*My old inveterate foe*»

Fables are recurring poetic forms in Finch's canon, and they especially characterize *Miscellany Poems*. This genre, Gillian Wright remarks, was

[28] On this topic, see Hay 1979, 51.

«newly modish in the 1690s and early eighteenth century», although the scholar underlines that literary fashion alone is not sufficient to explain their predominance in Finch's production (2013, 150). Undoubtedly, revisiting fables offered the opportunity to participate in the literary tradition and legitimizing women's (or splenetic) writing within the domains of established culture. Finch's fables, however, go beyond mere procedures of self-empowerment through imitation: in fact, her renderings of the original texts are «ostentatiously flawed», so that, Jayne Lewis says, «literary authority» is transferred «from an authoritative text to its transfiguring reader, Finch» (1996, 129).

It has already been noted that most of Finch's fables are «charged with gender politics» (Backscheider 2005, 18), or cope with «matters of justice and power» (Hinnant 1994, 184). Less attention has been devoted to the fact that various texts, such as *The Gout and the Spider*, add to Finch's discourse on medicine and doctoring. In this line of thought, I would like to focus on a fable which directly deals with melancholy and its public reception, entitled *Democritus and his Neighbors* (Finch 1713, 285-288). The text expressly draws inspiration from Jean de La Fontaine's *Démocrite et les Abdéritains* (1668; *Democritus and the Abderitans*, trans. by G. Pirie, 2008), deriving in its turn from the so-called Hippocratic Apocrypha[29]. In bold strokes, both the apocryphal letters and La Fontaine's text relate that Hippocrates was summoned by the citizens of Abdera, who were deeply concerned about the seemingly irrational behaviour of the philosopher Democritus; once there, Hippocrates found the alleged insane to be completely sound.

Finch's reference indirectly goes to *Anatomy of Melancholy*: Burton relates this story when explaining the adoption of the nom de plume «Democritus Junior». Some elements of Burton's narration, indeed, conflate with La Fontaine's pre-text in Finch's version, which once again combines a scientific and a literary view on the subject. In all, *Democritus and his Neighbors* preserves the focus of the French original, characterized by derision of prejudice and common assumptions regarding the authoritativeness of *vox populi*. As in La Fontaine's text, the last lines of Finch's fable pictures Hippocrates while pitying «a Man of Sense, judg'd by a Croud of Fools» (line 71). This conclusion is not devoid of political overtones in Finch, but, more interestingly for our case, it also suggests people's inability to distinguish madness from mental sanity.

From Burton's treatise, Finch derives a reference to Democritus' laughter, absent in La Fontaine; laughing, the philosopher displays a mani-

[29] La Fontaine's fable was published for the first time in La Fontaine 1668 (text XXVI). On Hippocrates' apocryphal letters and their contents see Potter 1992, 287-289.

fest lack of respect and no recognition for the «most solemn Words and Deeds» of his fellow villagers (line 54). Democritus' fault is, therefore, social; he fails to conform to what other Abderitans believe to be the «Purposes» to which «all Men were born» (line 60). By asking Hippocrates to «make him Wiser, tho' against his Will» (line 52), the citizens suggest to re-educate Democritus to appropriate modes of behaviour. In particular, they want him to adapt to their mediocrity, repressing his interest in high philosophical and scientific ideas and forcing him to consider down-to-earth issues, such as «Bulls and Rams» (line 64).

In Finch's fable, laughter has yet other implications: Democritus can be viewed as a melancholic and a satirist simultaneously. Here, Finch does not re-trace the foundations of satire in principles of anger, damage, and aggression, but rather in what Kay Himberg defines a «blend of world-weary wisdom and world-mocking laughter» (2002, 75). Digressing for a moment, at this point we may draw a distinction between Finch's implicit and explicit discourse on satire, summing up what has emerged so far regarding the poet's relationship with this genre. Whereas she declared herself as alien to satire, she commonly adopted it in tackling the world of medicine and its practitioners. In *Ardelia's Answer to Ephelia*, she suggests a connection between lampoon and spleen, and in *Democritus and his Neighbors* she re-shapes the web of associations commonly linked to satire, defining it as the 'wise laughter' of the melancholic wit when confronted by the foolishness of the world. Finch conceives and uses satire differently than Carkesse, but both writers perceive this practice as particularly apt to their condition. Form and content are closely related in the poems that Finch devotes to melancholy, and satire plays a key role in her representation of mental trouble.

The differences between La Fontaine and Finch's fable are not limited to Democritus' laughter. The most relevant procedures that Finch adopts to re-read the French pre-text consist of additions[30] and concern the Abderitans' perspective on Democritus' symptoms: he is repeatedly said to suffer from «wild and frantick Fits» (line 10), signs of a «broken Pate» (line 29). Moreover, Finch enters into detail when illustrating Hippocrates' role as a physician. He is supposed to mend the man's «Pericranium» (line 15), so he arrives in Abdera:

> Of Recipes and Med'cines full
> To check the giddy Whirl of Nature's Fires,

[30] It is worth remarking that Finch also eliminates two elements from La Fontaine's text: the mention of Democritus' theory of atoms, and reference to his excessive love for learning.

If so th' unruly Case requires;
Or with his Cobweb-cleansing Brooms
To sweep and clear the over-crouded Scull,
If settl'd Spirits flag, and make the Patient dull. (lines 17-22)

Hippocrates is represented as a seventeenth- or eighteenth-century physician, ready to treat two different affections: mania («giddy Whirl of Nature's Fires»), or low animal spirits, which would make the patient melancholy and «dull». These modifications of the original French text have some important consequences: Finch 'medicalizes' La Fontaine's fable, re-reading it with particular emphasis on the scientific discourse, and employing terms commonly used in the medical field. Democritus, who experiences 'fits' and 'ravings', is presented as a typical melancholic according to contemporary standards; significantly, Hippocrates denies his supposed deviance and considers him a «Sage» (line 68). Finch's fable reshapes the original to suggest additional meanings: melancholy is subject to prejudice, even if (or because) it elevates one's thoughts above narrow interests and inclines towards satirical criticism of society.

Through Democritus' figure, Finch exploits here the model of the melancholy genius, or the «sorrowful belief that grief and weariness are the constant companions of profound speculation» (Klibansky, Panofsky and Saxl 1979 [1964], 245). Although such a model is here represented in masculine terms, melancholy overcomes gender distinctions and becomes an opportunity to define the poetic self. In fact, «it is [the] hallucinatory aspect that appears to be the basis of the famous association of genius with melancholy» (Lawlor 2011, 31), an aspect which does not appear to have sexed or gendered boundaries, and authenticates the abilities of introspection and inspiration of the melancholic poet. «Poetry», Finch writes in the fragment *Enquiry after Peace*, is «the feav'rish Fit, / Th' o'erflowing of unbounded Wit» (1903, 68; lines 40-41).

As is the case with satire, the connection between melancholy and genius is tackled in Finch's poems through a double discourse. In *The Spleen* (Finch 1713, 88-96), low spirits are said to deprive the speaker of her ability to write, as they make her «verse decay» and her «cramped numbers fail» (line 76). The ambiguity of this statement is manifest: the impossibility of writing is put here into verse. Finch's ironic procedure is apparent on many levels, for *The Spleen* is entirely devoted to the same malady that she blames for hindering her poetic ability. In addition, as I have previously mentioned, the 'deviance' caused by spleen allows the speaker to access «secret springs» and «trace unusual things» (lines 82-83); in other words, the disease offers a genuine source of inspiration and opens the way to an original view on the world. Through a process of 'contradictory negation', Finch reaffirms the connection between genius and melancholy in female writing. Lawlor notes that in *The Spleen*:

> Finch invokes Longinus', and later Pope's, notion of the great poet as being able to deviate from accepted conventions and maps it onto her own poetic wanderings in the country retreat of male genius. By a metaphorical sleight of hand the splenetic woman becomes a melancholic poet of the most genuine kind. (2011, 45)

Melancholic identity, according to Finch, not only allows the subject to positively deviate from society's established paths, but also becomes an instrument for examining and criticizing that society, as suggested in *Democritus and his Neighbors*. The fact that *The Spleen* is formulated as both a personal and a broader social discussion is suggested by the Pindaric ode, the poetic medium Finch chooses to explore the implications of the disease. Finding its origins in the verses Pindar composed for the Olympic games, this kind of ode was said to be suitable to «any subject of social or public – as opposed to private – importance, which possesses associations of a distinctively emotional sort» (Shafer 1918, 26).

Indeed, melancholic wit and social satire are closely interconnected in Finch's *The Spleen*, as evidenced by the description of the coquette's feigned pose:

> When the *Coquette*, whom ev'ry Fool admires,
> Wou'd in Variety be Fair,
> And, changing hastily the Scene,
> From Light, Impertinent, and Vain,
> Assumes a soft, a melancholy Air,
> And of her Eyes rebates the wand'ring Fires,
> The careless Posture, and the Head reclin'd,
> The thoughtful, and composed Face,
> Proclaiming the withdrawn, the absent Mind,
> Allows the Fop more liberty to gaze,
> Who gently for the tender Cause inquires;
> The Cause, indeed, is a Defect in Sense,
> Yet is the *Spleen* alledg'd, and still the dull Pretence. (lines 99-111)

In these lines, Finch addresses and criticizes a social phenomenon; simultaneously, she explores ideas of feigning and acting similar to those problematized in Carkesse's *Lucida Intervalla*. She places less emphasis than Carkesse on ontological issues connected with distinguishing 'seeming' from 'being' in mental disease: her focus is on the idea of melancholy as a 'fashionable' condition, and not necessarily because of its relation with creativity or wit.

In the first place, in fact, Finch's satire is aimed here at the human ability to differentiate unreason from the pretence or appearance of it. In *The Spleen*, Finch explores various aspects of the power of the visible in dealing with mental issues. Sight lies at the heart of *The Spleen* not only as an (unreliable) means to identify mental disorder: in the text, this sense is

represented as the first to be affected by the disease itself, which «cheat[s] the eyes» with «antic specters» (lines 16-17). «Seeing is equated with knowing», notes Hay in relation to seventeenth- and eighteenth-century mental medicine, and «[k]nowledge of madness can […] be defined in terms of what the disease looks like, for it is the […] visible surface of it, which stands in for an appreciation of its essential quality» (1979, 25). Differently from her physician contemporaries, Finch expresses distrust in sight and appearance, here stressing their deceiving function in creating social and sexual identities[31].

Secondly, but perhaps more importantly, the idea of appearance pervades these lines on another level: the spleen is pictured as an emerging new fashion. Lawlor illustrates well how the beginning of the eighteenth century signalled a new tendency towards viewing melancholy as a sign of social privilege, and he quotes Cheyne as one of the most influential figures in establishing this pattern of thought (Lawlor 2011, 30, 42). Physicians noticed a marked impact of melancholy on the social elites and stressed it in their works; being affected by this condition became, thus, a sign of status, refinement and enhanced sensitivity. Revealingly, when the philosopher George Berkeley discussed mental disorders and their possible remedies, he pointed out that «the hardness of stubbed vulgar constitutions, renders them insensible of a thousand things, that fret and gall those delicate people, who, as if their skin was peeled off, feel to the quick every thing that touches them» (1744, 50).

Finch's satire is directed against those who feign melancholy out of sheer vanity, thus diminishing the real purport of the disorder, which is accompanied by pain and distress; the spleen is exploited by the coquette for vain and mundane ends, namely attracting the attention of 'fops'. The poet's invective, however, does not spare the puritan, who uses the disease to pretend genuine piety, and «The fool», who simulates splenetic fits «to imitate the wits» (line 64)[32]. Pretending melancholy in order to obtain men's attention or to claim cleverness is foolish: what gives the melancholic poet his or her heightened feeling, vision and understanding is the real, corporeal experience of suffering, which is central to Finch's poem.

The abuses of spleen, Finch underlines, come in unexpected ever-changing forms. The disease is devoid of identity or cause, and can abruptly change from the dullness of the «Dead Sea» to the fury of «a storm» (lines 6, 8). Like Carkesse, Finch employs a sea metaphor to illustrate the speaker's condition; according to John Baker, this kind of metaphor is very common in poems concerning melancholy, because «[t]he liquid

[31] See also Hinnant's analysis of social fiction in *Alcidor* (Hinnant 1994, 65).

[32] For an exhaustive study of feigned Puritan melancholy in *The Spleen*, see McGovern 1992, 175.

element allows the poet to illustrate and play out the drama of changing and contrasting moods» (2011, 92).

Adopting a procedure which, by now, we may define as typical of her poetry, Finch 'medicalizes' the suffering brought about by melancholy and scatters her verses with a stream of references to contemporary scientific discourse on mental health. Such a procedure is clearly at work in both *The Spleen* and *Ardelia to Melancholy* (Finch 1903, 15-16). In the latter poem, Finch lists a number of treatments that also appear in Robert Burton's *Anatomy*, where «many pleasant sports, objects, sweet smells, delightsome tastes, musick, meats, herbs, flowers» are advised to «recreate [the] senses» (1638, 307). Yet, the poetic persona Ardelia objects,

> [...] I by struggling, can obtain
> Nothing, but encrease of pain, [...]
> Tho' I confesse, I have apply'd
> Sweet mirth, and musick, and have try'd
> A thousand other arts beside, [...]
> Unable they, and far too weak, to save [...]. (lines 3-12)

According to contemporary medicine, fixed ideas are at the heart of melancholic disorders; mental balance could be re-established only «withdrawing [...] the Mind from its usual Object», or hobbyhorse, and «raising artfully, if possible, another Passion» (Lynch 1744, 425)[33]. Music, which for Ardelia is «too weak» to distract from grief, was famously suggested as a «powerful» remedy by Burton (1638, 295). Doctors seem unable to provide patients with helpful cures; the speaker claims she has derived no relief or betterment from commonly suggested therapies. Similarly, in *The Spleen* the speaker says she tried to «In vain all Remedies apply, / In vain the Indian Leaf infuse, / Or the parch'd Eastern Berry bruise» (lines 129-131). Here, Finch's discrediting of medical advice is further supported through mention of «skilful [Richard] Lower» (line 142), a physician who not only failed to identify the nature of melancholy, but was himself a victim of this condition, «And sunk beneath [its] Chain to a lamented Grave» (line 150).

Insightful analyses of Finch's medical sources in *The Spleen* have already been provided by John Sena (1971), Katharine M. Rogers (1989) and John Baker (2011), among others. In the poem, these scholars have identified connections with the works of Robert Burton, John Purcell, and Thomas Sydenham; further, they analysed its lines in the light of theories of Richard Blackmore, Nicholas Robinson, John Armstrong and George Cheyne.

[33] The same idea appears in the satirical text *Observations on the Spleen and Vapours*: «[n]othing contributes so much to wear off a settled Imagination, as the giving Birth to some new Passion» (Midriff [pseud.] 1721, 6). The identity of the writer hidden behind the pseudonym «John Midriff» is still unknown.

With Sena, we can assume that Finch's 'melancholic' poetry perfectly depicts the ideas of her age; in addition, it can be stressed that she composes a detailed picture of contemporary medical beliefs and notions to the purpose of dismantling them. In *The Spleen*, no medical discourse proves reliable or valid in the treatment of the disease: the protean nature of the spleen, discussed in the first lines of the poem, seems the only certainty available to the scientific world.

Katharine Rogers aptly remarks that Finch's relying on personal experience helped her produce «a more accurate clinical picture than did even her physician contemporaries» (1989, 17). Evidence shows that Finch's physician contemporaries seemed to share this idea: in 1723, Dr William Stukeley included *The Spleen* in his treatise on this topic, based on the Gulstonian Lecture he had delivered before the Royal College of Physicians one year earlier. To Rogers' observations I wish to add that, at the time, Finch's use of personal details did not imply crossing the boundaries of the scientific method, or fusing two different perspectives: mental medicine commonly relied on subjective impressions. It might suffice to mention that Burton's *Anatomy* was partially founded on the author's self-observation. Various physicians, in addition, employed both fictional and autobiographical testimony to investigate melancholy: Bernard Mandeville, for instance, structured his *Treatise of Hypochondriack and Hysterick Passions* (1711) as an informal dialogue between a patient and his doctor, where the first offers a first-person description of his feelings, thoughts, and fears[34]. It can be argued, thus, that Finch appropriated herself of the typical contemporary medical discourse, de-structuring it from 'the inside'.

In the light of the relationships that we have previously established between the medical world and the patriarchal system, we might add that Finch appropriates herself of both the scientific and the masculine authoritative discourse simultaneously[35]. Through a series of ironic turns, she demonstrates the unreliability of the male rational view by having it uttered by a (supposedly irrational) splenetic woman. Maleness and irrationality are further associated through the poetic form of the Pindaric ode, which was as hard and rough as to appear «distinctly male», but was also characterized by structural inconstancy (Meek 2007, 120). The Pindaric ode, Desiree Hellegers underlines, was associated with both masculinity and «an aesthetics of 'discontinuity' and 'randomness'», thus combining a formal representation of maleness with one of mental disorder (1993, 211). Thus, two different aspects to the Pindaric ode deserve attention: it not only allows spleen to pervade Finch's poem on a thematic and formal level simulta-

[34] Extracts from Mandeville's *A Treatise of Hypochondriack and Hysterick Passions* are included in ed. Ingram 1998, 49-53.

[35] On this point, see also Hellegers 1993 and Meek 2009.

neously, but it also 'de-feminizes' her expression, pointing to a connection between masculinity and melancholy.

It is worth noting that *The Spleen* explores the link between mind disease and manliness also in terms of imagery: like Carkesse in *Lucida Intervalla*, Finch's 'unfeminine' speaker is on a metaphorical battlefield. Armed against the disease, the fighting poetic persona of *The Spleen* heroically opposes grief's «fantastic Harms» (line 112), even if she eventually must «resign of the contested Field» (line 59) and admit her defeat. A speaker 'in arms' also characterizes *Ardelia to Melancholy*, where Ardelia addresses the following lines to her affliction:

> All, that cou'd ere thy ill gott rule, invade,
> Their uselesse arms, before thy feet have laid;
> The Fort is thine, now ruin'd, all within,
> Whilst by decays without, thy Conquest too, is seen. (lines 39-42)

Interestingly, the imagery of warfare and fighting is not only connected to a conventional construction of masculinity, but is also specifically reminiscent of the kind of metaphors often adopted by mental medicine in seventeenth- and eighteenth-century tracts. For instance, Blackmore's *A Treatise of the Spleen and Vapours* stages the physician on a war theatre, where he commands his «Regiments»:

> [No] single Recipe, has any virtue to suppress and conquer the Distemper, then two hundred lifted in the Service will be unavailing, and will continue so, though a Squadron of two hundred more Auxiliaries should be raised to join them [...]. (1725b, 78)

The battling speakers of both *The Spleen* and *Ardelia to Melancholy* can thus be said to assume the role of physicians; they actively seek to fight the disease, describe its nature and symptoms, and scientifically comment on the available treatments, demonstrating that their knowledge surpasses that of their doctors.

Finch's *For the Better*, as we have seen, shows awareness of the patterns of 'feminization' of mind disorders, and especially of male mental patients, deprived of their gender identity by the world of physicians. According to the medical descriptions of the period, in fact, «[h]ypocondriacal Men are, for the most part, meagre, thin and unmuscular», lacking in strength and, therefore, in virility (Blackmore 1725b, 15). By contrast, hysteric women's animal spirits are «enraged» to an extreme «degree of Fury and Impetuosity», so patients are a prey to «violent and frightful» symptoms (1725b, 15)[36]. Finch exploits the violence implicit in the medical discourse on female

[36] Francesca Saggini (2012) remarks that both eighteenth-century drama and fiction commonly exploited the conventional contrast between passive and violent madness.

hysteria to propose an alternative model of the typical melancholic: she parodically inverts the common imagery linked to the disease by picturing the typical splenetic as possessing masculine features.

As Charles Hinnant notes, Finch's work is permeated with ironic shifts and reversals, including inversions of gender. In some poems, she «adopts an implicitly male perspective – implicit because the gender of the speaker is never precisely specified» (1994, 48); among these texts, Hinnant considers the song beginning «By Love persu'd»[37]. Although this poem has never been included in Finch's 'melancholic' production, I wish to demonstrate that it depicts a case of love melancholy, consequently strengthening Finch's association between disordered states of mind and masculinity.

In line with Hinnant, we may suppose that the speaker is here gendered in male terms; at least, it can be assumed that according to seventeenth- and eighteenth-century conventions the reader would recognize a masculine voice in this expression of longing for Sylvia's love:

> By Love persu'd, In vain I fly
> To shades, as lost and wild as I;
> Cold earth my hopes, sharp thorns my cares,
> Here lively paint, and urge my tears;
> Fancy, makes all things bear a part.
> And shews a Rock, for Sylvia's heart.
> In vain, I from the object goe,
> Since my own thoughts, can wound me soe;
> I'll back again, and ruin'd be
> By hate, by scorn, or Jealousie.
> Such real ills attend us all,
> Lovers, by fancy need not fall. (Finch 1903, 128-129)

The imagery of the first four lines conjures up the idea of melancholy: the speaker seeks a retreat in the «shades» of darkness and solitude, tormented by «thorns» of pain that reduce him to «tears» (lines 2-4). Burton devotes a whole section of his *Anatomy* to love melancholy, stating that «lovers […] pine away, and look ill with waking, cares, sighes, […] with grones, griefe, sadnesse, dulnesse, want of appetite &c» (1638, 499). Finch's speaker calls to mind Burton's typical love-melancholic, but possesses less dignity, as he abandons himself to the unmanly act of weeping.

The adjective «cold» (line 3) can also be allusive of melancholy, as such was believed to be the dry humour responsible for the disease. Heated passions, however, simultaneously animate the speaker, as «melancholic

[37] The original title of the text is *A Song*, but scholars commonly refer to this poem by citing its initial words, «By Love persu'd» (Finch 1903, 128-129).

humour is […] a mixture of hot and cold; for nature consists of these two elements» (Pseudo-Aristotle, *Problemata*, Eng. tr. W.S. Hett 1957, in Radden 57-58). The poetic I defines himself as «wild» (line 2) and foreshadows feelings of «hate», «scorn», and «Jealousie» (line 10). Actually, line 10 of the poem is ambiguous: the first two nouns seem to describe the woman's feelings towards the man, but the presence of «Jealousie» suggests that the speaker himself is caught in opposing emotional states. This fluctuating condition would be typical of the melancholic lover, who, according to Burton, is prone to «fear» and «Suspition without a cause» (1638, 598-599). Burton devotes much attention to jealousy, which he sees as distinctively masculine and affecting husbands in particular; he defines it «[a] most violent passion […], an unspeakable torment, a hellish torture, an internall plague» (596). If not treated, Burton says, melancholic love can lead the subject «from suspition to hatred, from hatred to frenzie, madnesse, injurie, murder and despaire» (613). In asserting he will be «ruin'd» by hate, scorn, and jealousy (lines 9-10), Finch's poetic persona is claiming both that his beloved's indifference will worsen his condition and that he might succumb to immoderate passions, following the climax suggested by Burton.

Although Burton commonly coupled love melancholy with the image of a male tragic hero, from the mid-seventeenth century onward «love-madness is increasingly associated with women in drama, ballads and poetry», whereas «[w]omen's melancholy, also often driven by love, has less heroic dimensions» (Hodgkin 2007, 178)[38]. In contrast with the period's tendency, the distress of Finch's speaker is definitely unheroic: «persu'd» by love, in tears, indecisive and on the verge of madness, the male figure represented in these lines seems to suffer from the typical signs of 'feminine' melancholy. In this view, the poem reinforces the reversal of conventional imagery present in both *Ardelia to Melancholy* and *The Spleen*, representing melancholy and weakness as gendered male.

Gendered discourses of melancholy are only one of the connections between *By Love persu'd* and *The Spleen*. The first poem focuses on a specific aspect of mind disorder when the speaker says that «Fancy, makes all things bear a part» (line 5). The man's imagination distorts and deforms all things, making him conventionally see a rock in the place of the beloved's heart[39]. «Phantasie, or imagination», Burton says,

[38] The idea that Burton conceived the love melancholic as a male tragic hero is also suggested in Small 1996, 6-7.

[39] Before the 1780s, there was no clear or significant distinction between the concepts of «fancy» and «imagination» in both literature and scientific essays. In 1712, for instance, Addison claims that the two terms can be «used promiscuously» and emphasizes how «loose and uncircumscribed» their meaning is (*The Spectator*, no. 411,

> […] is an inner sense which doth more fully examine the species perceived by Common sense, of things present or absent, and keeps them longer, recalling them to mind againe, or making new of his owne. […] [M]any times [it] conceives strange, stupend, absurd shapes, as in sicke men we commonly observe. […] In melancholy men, this faculty is most powerfull and strong, and often hurts, producing many monstrous and prodigious things […]. (1638, 23)

Similarly, the poetic persona's thoughts are said to wound him when he is far from the object of his love. The illusions this speaker falls into are similar to the «boding dreams» described in *The Spleen*, where «airy phantoms» can be mistaken for reality (line 19). «For what are Dreams», wonders Henry More, «but the Imaginations and Perceptions of one asleep?» (1712 [1662], 3)[40].

Finch's attention to both organicist processes and the role of imagination in the definition of mental deviance reflects a tendency of the contemporary medical discourse, which describes how the «defective Modification» in animal spirits also «affects the superior Powers», especially «Fancy and Imagination» (Blackmore 1725b, 35). Connecting mental disorder with a deviant imagination was part of a pattern of thought proceeding from Hobbes and Locke, who both stressed how fancy was pivotal to understanding melancholy and mania (Hobbes 1750, 5). Locke famously exposed the concept of the association of ideas in connection with his remarks on the insane thought; in his opinion, excessive, or distorted imagination caused madmen to «put wrong Ideas together, and so make wrong Propositions, but argue and reason right from them» (1706 [1690], 94).

In the seventeenth century, Hobbes and Locke's conceptions dominated the philosophical field, as if the workings of the body and the study of the mind were irreconcilable. In the first decades of the eighteenth century, there emerged a new attempt to find bodily justifications to mind processes, and the two philosophers' legacy progressively acquired more relevance in the medical discourse. In the 1720s, John Maubray stressed that «Imagination hath [great] Power over the Body» (1724, 58), and Isaac Watts maintained that «A Delirium is but a short Wildness of the Imagination; and a settled Irregularity of Fancy is Distraction and Mad-

21 June 1712, in Addison 1721, 487). For this reason, in this book the words «fancy» and «imagination» are interchangeably used to refer to «the power or capacity to form internal images or ideas of objects and situations not actually present to the senses» (*OED*).

[40] See also *Two Dissertations Concerning Sense, and the Imagination* 1728, 187-188. This essay has been attributed first to Zachary Mayne, then to Chales Mein, and its authorship is still under question (see Buickerood 2002, 51-86).

ness» (1729, 201)[41]. In 1749, much in the same vein with Locke, the physician David Hartley wrote:

> It is observed, that mad Persons often speak rationally and consistently upon the Subjects that occur, provided that single one which most affects them, be kept out of View. […] it must follow, that a particular Set of Ideas shall be extremely magnified, and, consequently, an unnatural Association of Sameness or Repugnancy between them generated, all other Ideas and Associations remaining nearly the same. (1749, 401)

This shift in the conception of insanity is framed in an overall transformation which deeply concerned the literary field; with the works of William Collins, analysed in the following chapter of the present study, we are faced with a new idea of creativity, as well as with a new conception of man.

[41] It should be stressed that Thomas Willis, too, discussed deranged imagination; however, I believe that in his works this concept received much less attention than in the medical tracts of subsequent decades. For further information about imagination in Willis and Locke, see Keiser 2014, 63-65.

4

SHIFTING IMAGES AND «OBSERVANCE» IN WILLIAM COLLINS' POETRY

4.1 *«Poor dear Collins»*

By the 1730s, the risk that «Fancy», as Finch wrote in *By Love persu'd*, could make «all things bear a part» (line 5) was constantly addressed by the medical discourse. Ephraim Chambers' *Cyclopaedia* (1728) reported that «Phantasie» was «very strong» in both melancholic and mad people, «representing many extravagant and monstrous things; and framing its images as lively as those of sensation: whence the visions and deceptions those persons are liable to» (1743 [1728], «Phantasie»). In 1729, the Bethlem governor Nicholas Robinson coupled the 'bodily' conception of medicine with questions of perception, memory and fancy: a too intense imagination could «prove too strong for the feeble Brain to support», thus «[disconcerting] the tender Fibres, and [shattering] the whole Magazine of most beautiful Ideas» (1729, 81).

Locke's theories on sensation, fancy and memory increasingly found new medical explanations in the functioning of the nerves. Scientific focus was on one central question: both sensation and fancy produced images, and these different kinds of images could be mistakenly interpreted as being equally real. «Judgement» and «discerning» were pivotal, then, to the correct working of the mind, and a corruption of these intellectual faculties could be the only cause of a distempered mind. David Hartley, in particular, offered an organicist re-reading of Locke's notion of madness, remarking how deviant «trains of ideas», caused by «the power of imagination or fancy», were typical of mental disease (1749, iii). In 1758, William Battie not only associated deluded imagination with the essence of insanity, but also defined as mad only those who believed in such delusions. «Again», W. Gerald Marshall comments on this point, «there is the volitional sense of madness: one has freely allowed the imagination to get off track» (1989, 412).

It was also commonly believed that «[a] strong Imagination hath [...] very extraordinary Effects upon our Sensations», as well as on the body (*Two Dissertations Concerning Sense* 1728, 78). Seventeenth-and eighteenth-century popular tracts included a number of curiosities regarding

I. Natali, *«Remov'd from human eyes»: Madness and Poetry 1676-1774*, ISBN (online) 978-88-6453-319-3
ISSN (online) 2420-8361, CC BY-NC-ND 3.0 IT, 2016 Firenze University Press

such 'material' effects of fancy: women, for instance, were often believed to be subject to monstrous births after some powerful emotion[1]. To use Marie Hélène Huet's terms, the monster «faithfully reveals his resemblance to the innermost being of the woman who conceived him in the madness of her imagination» (1993, 59). In 1673, Wanley reported of a boy who was born with his internal organs «all naked below his Navel» after his mother had witnessed the evisceration of a calf (1673, 94) and, in 1726, Mary Toft was famously assumed to have given birth to rabbits because one such animal had scared her during pregnancy[2]. Stories of this sort were becoming so widespread that the physician James Augustus Blondel devoted an essay exclusively to demonstrating how «absurd» it was «to believe that the Mother, by her *Imagination*, has a greater Influence over the Child, than upon her own body» (1729, 95). While contesting the reliability of some such episodes, Blondel also deemed it necessary to admit that «the Effects of *Imagination* are very considerable» (95).

Monstrous births are relevant to our case in two different ways. First, they establish imagination as an element connecting human perception and creativity: they show that a passively received image of a sensible object was believed to rest in the mind, and then re-actuate itself in a translated form. Secondly, such births are connected to mental disorder, and they are often related together with typical instances of delusional ideas and emotional excess[3]. In other words, monstrous births show that «the *Imagination*, when under the Conduct and Direction of *Reason*, is the Instrument of that noble Faculty of the Mind, called *Invention*» (Berkeley 1754, 72); when unrestrained by reason, it can generate aberrancies and foibles. In particular, Dennis Todd argues that monstrous births were obliquely but deeply connected with religious enthusiasm, as «both involved extraordinary transactions between the body and the mind, and both shared a common aetiology, determined and directed by the same agent, the imagination» (1995, 94). «Enthusiasm is imagination», wrote the minister Charles Leslie, and when not moderated by adherence to canons and norms, the latter could become wild, mad, and diabolical (1721, 263).

[1] For a study of English loci of monstrosity, see Clegg 2002.

[2] The episode of the little boy, together with many other examples of the power of imagination, is related to a collection of «Wonders», or surprising events. Mary Toft's monstrous birth (and public hoax) is discussed in Fissell and Cooter 2008, 149-150.

[3] Under the heading «*Of the Imagination or Phantasie, and the force of it in some persons, when depraved by melancholy, or otherwise*», Wanley reports cases of 'curious' births as well as stories of people who believed themselves to be frozen, dead, or made of wax (1673, 94-96).

The connections between imagination, enthusiasm, faith and creativity found new expression in the eighteenth-century conception of poetry. Religious enthusiasm started being re-considered as a poetic force at the end of the seventeenth century; after all, as Charles Gildon argued in 1718, the origins of poetry were to be found in religion[4]. By the mid-eighteenth century, the equilibrium between reason and fancy «had tipped towards the imagination as a form of poetic faith» (Irlam 1999, 56)[5]. Poets – and authors of the so-called 'new' lyrical odes in particular – were increasingly perceived as bordering on insanity, associated with «enthusiastic imagination», or described as «raptured» while creating «animated imagery» through «figurative syntax and even licentious diction» *(Art. LI* 1755, 434). Nowadays this innovative, «enthusiastic» literary tendency has been variously defined as mid-century, post-Augustan, pre-romantic, or graveyard poetry. Among its literary exponents are William Collins, Joseph and Thomas Warton, Mark Akenside, and Edward Young. Preferring lyric forms, especially the ode, to narrative poetry, these writers consign satirical and didactic verse to the realm of philosophy (Joseph Warton's *Ranelagh House*), exalt the mingling power of imagination (Akenside's *The Pleasures of the Imagination*), and connect it with genius and originality (Young's *Conjectures on Original Composition*).

William Collins' reputation rests chiefly on *Odes on Several Descriptive and Allegorical Subjects*, a collection of twelve poems which appeared on 12 December 1746, dated 1747. His previously published works include the *Persian Eclogues* (1742), later renamed *Oriental Eclogues* (1757), which are often considered as «youthful» pastoral experiments (Curran 1986, 95). Similarly to the Wartons, Akenside and Young, Collins addresses fancy and imagination among the chief subjects of his work: a computer assisted analysis of the *Odes* reveals that «fancy» is the third most frequently employed term in the collection, with 12 occurrences out of 4814 words, excluding 1749 pronouns, articles, prepositions, conjunctions, and common verbs and adverbials[6].

Of course, the innovation of Collins' poetic efforts does not simply lie in a renewed interest in the ode genre and a specific set of themes; odes were often written by the so-called Augustan writers, and fancy was a common concern of their verses. The English ode has always been aligned with

[4] Gildon summarizes the history of poetry in these terms: «This Method obliges me to trace Poetry from its Original, to shew, that it was the Daughter of Religion; that, in Process of time, it was debauch'd and vitiated; and lastly, that it was brought under the Rules of Art, which assisted in the Correcting the Failures of Nature» (1718, 131).

[5] See also Parisot 2013, 43.

[6] In Collins' *Odes*, the most frequently used word is the adjective «wild», with 18 occurrences; the second most employed term is «eye(s)», with 17 occurrences.

imagination and indebted to classical authors such as Pindar, Horace, Anacreon, Alcaeus, and Sappho. Yet, now poets begin to explore extensively the transport and emotional elevation typical of the Pindaric, challenging (or embracing) the dangers of excess which Horace described in his Odes (*Carmina*, Book IV, Poem II, lines 5-8). Collins, together with other poets of the mid-century, brings about a completely new poetic direction, which nowadays is often defined in terms of an inside/outside opposition: the new lyric poetry is interior, designed for self-reflection and analysis[7]. Even more importantly, the ode adopts a new speech form, probably inspired by the revival of Longinus' *Περὶ Ὕψους* (1554; *Peri hypsous, or Dionysius Longinus of the height of eloquence*, 1652) and the renewed discussion of the rhetorical instruments which had the «Power of raising the Passions to a violent and even enthusiastic degree» (1996, 23)[8].

The term «enthusiastic» appears thus very apt to define the works of mid-century lyric poets. It is repeatedly employed, for instance, in the lectures of the Scottish minister and rhetorician Hugh Blair, who also defined the new, 'disordered' poetic tendencies as follows (*Lecture XXXIX*):

> The Poet is out of sight, in a moment. He gets up into the clouds; becomes so abrupt in his transitions; so eccentric and irregular in his motions, and of course so obscure, that we essay in vain to follow him, or to partake of his raptures. I do not require, that an Ode should be as regular in the structure of its parts, as a didactic, or an Epic Poem. But still, in every Composition, there ought to be a subject; there ought to be parts which make up a whole; there should be a connection of those parts with one another. The transitions from thought to thought may be light and delicate, such as are prompted by a lively fancy; but still they should be such as preserve the connection of ideas, and show the Author to be one who thinks, and not one who raves. (1783, 155-156)

The emerging model of poetry, typically expressed in the metrical irregularity of the ode, is defined here as close to irrationality, or confronted with the danger of losing control of subject matter and expression, as in a 'fit of passion'. The poet is pictured as potentially inconstant, incoher-

[7] See, for instance, Henighan 1982, 36.

[8] Here, I am not able to quote directly from the original manuscripts of *Peri hypsos*, or from the *editio princeps*, due to the complexity of the essay's history. It may be useful to specify that nowadays the most authoritative manuscript of *Peri hypsos* is Paris MS 2036; on this text, Francesco Rotobello based his translation (and the first publication) of the treatise in 1554 (*editio princeps*). John Hall translated *Peri hypsos* into English in 1652 (*Peri hypsous, or Dionysius Longinus of the height of eloquence. Rendred out of the originall*); later English texts followed Nicolas Boileau's French version (1674), and included translations by John Ozell (1712) and Leonard Welsted (1712). The attribution of *Peri hypsos* is still uncertain. See also Kellner 2005 and Axelsson 2007.

ent, detached from practical concerns, and interested in the powers of the mind which go beyond reason and understanding. The mid-century ode writer has apparently absorbed the obscure and 'raving' mutability previously associated with feminine imagination, re-shaping it through a new concept of sensitivity. Somehow, in a few decades the representation of male-gendered melancholy that Finch provocatively put forward in *The Spleen* became a new poetic mode. The mid-eighteenth century man was, in fact, «a feminised, even an effeminate being, still wrestling with his own passions and hysteria and with interior and exterior forces let loose by his fantasies and appetites» (Pocock 1985, 114). Male writers re-constructed their masculinity in terms of «*highly* differentiated selves», endowed with an exceptional sensitivity and the ability to cope with the «supreme discourse of sympathetic engagement» (Ross 1998, 201-202, original emphasis). Feminist readings of eighteenth-century poetry have emphasized that the transport of the sublime, as well as the challenge it posed to reason, became a distinctively gendered «experience of masculine empowerment», which opened the way to self-recognition and confirmed the subject's sanity through an encounter with deviance (Mellor 1993, 85).

Not only did Collins follow the new canons of highly sensitive and imaginative poetry of his age, but he also contributed to their establishment – or even exceeded them, at least according to some of his contemporaries. In a comment on *Ode on the Poetical Character*, probably the most famous text of *Odes on Several Descriptive and Allegorical Subjects*, Samuel Johnson wrote:

> This ode is so infinitely abstracted and replete with high enthusiasm, that it will find very few readers capable of entering into the beauty of it, or of relishing its beauties. There is a style of sentiment as utterly unintelligible to common capacities, as if the subject were treated in an unknown language; and it is on the same account that abstracted poetry will never have many admirers. The authors of such poems must be content with the approbation of those heaven favoured geniuses, who, by a similarity of taste and sentiment, are enabled to penetrate the high mysteries of inspired fancy, and to pursue the loftiest flights of enthusiastic imagination. (1779, 309)

Johnson's remark presents many points of contact with Blair's ideas regarding the new tendencies of the ode. However, it is more explicitly reminiscent of the poet's divine inspiration and Bacchic frenzy discussed in Plato's *Φαῖδρος* (*Phædrus*) and *Ἴων* (*Ion*). Phrases like «unintelligible» and «in an unknown language» suggest that the ode's speech eludes the rational or conscious control of the speaker and possesses an 'insane' expressivity, unintelligible to most. Johnson qualifies Collins as a sort of mad and raptured genius, an enthusiast fallen under the spell of his excessive imagination and passion, who can be understood and appreciated only by equally «heaven favoured»

individuals. Imagination also appears the point of contact between matter and spirit, or the means to achieve a higher dimension: it allows the poet to reach the sublime, which is, as Johnson twice repeats, «abstracted», separated from reality – therefore, almost verging on the delusional[9].

Enthusiasm, traditionally linked to both melancholy and religious nonconformism, consisted in imagining a non-extant divine inspiration, an illusion which chiefly derived from humoral imbalance, as Henry More repeatedly suggested (1656, 17). Seventeenth- and eighteenth-century views on enthusiasm contested it as a form of irrational fervour but, at times, did not completely exclude the possibility that non-bodily influences contributed to the passionate afflatus. Shaftesbury, for instance, states that he «cannot but at this present apprehend a kind of *Enchantment* or *Magick* in that which we call ENTHUSIASM», which «inspires us more than ordinary, and raises us above our-selves» (Cooper, Earl of Shaftesbury 1714 [1711], 29, 30-31)[10]. This ambiguity is apparent in Johnson's discourse, where Collins' creative power is seen both as an effect of excessive fancy and a divinely inspired gift.

Associating creativity with an individual 'gift' was by no means a novelty at the time; however, one might notice a shift in emphasis in the mid-eighteenth century. Asserting the uniqueness and authenticity of the poetic compulsion developed into a priority, and the creative act became increasingly a matter of irrational forces and affective powers. A thin line separated inspiration from insanity, as well as the inexplicable from the unreasonable. «Poetical Enthusiasm», John Dennis wrote, «is Passion guided by Judgment, whose cause is not comprehended by us»; without judgement, «[poetic enthusiasm] would be Madness» (1701, 29). John Langhorne similarly remarked in his *Memoir* of Collins that «the enthusiasm of poetry, like that of religion, has frequently a powerful influence on the conduct of life», since «the gifts of imagination bring the heaviest task upon the vigilance of reason» (1765, i).

For the standards of the time, Collins crossed the border which separated inspiration and unreason, in that his «enthusiasm» was not recognized as limited to the poetic expression. Considered a victim of the excess of fancy and overwhelming passions, he was interned as insane in 1754, and later consigned to his sister's care in Chichester, «where he soon sunk into a state of wretched and deplorable idiotcy [*sic*]» *(Interesting Par-*

[9] Johnson's comment seems to mark a transition between different notions of «enthusiasm»: as Francesca Romana Paci says, enthusiasm was considered a problem at the beginning of the eighteenth century, and, as such, it was much debated. Later, especially with the development of Romanticism, it came to be considered as a sign of genius and true poetic inspiration (1983, 21-22).

[10] On this subject, see also Klein 1994, 166.

ticulars 1821, 204). Incidentally, the poet is reported to have experienced MacDonald's madhouse at Chelsea, one of the private institutions then at the centre of public attention for its negative reputation:

> It is also very notorious, that many other persons, who were perfectly in their senses, have been confined in this [MacDonald's] mad-house, which at present is kept by one who has row a prosecution against him for detaining a young lady decoyed there by her husband. (*Instances of Abuses* 1763, 38-39)

How Collins coped with this environment, however, remains a mystery: the available information regarding the poet's life during and after internment is very scanty. As William Ober notes, our sources are limited to a few memoirs and comments included in literary miscellanies of the period (1970, 207-208). Apparently, Collins «gradually fell into that state of depression of mind which enchains the faculties without destroying them», and his alleged insanity was coupled with an almost complete isolation (Reed in Dodsley, ed., 1782, 352-353). A common aspect of the extant materials regarding Collins' life, in fact, is that his friends and acquaintances met with difficulties in maintaining contact with him, or obtaining information about his condition. In a letter dated 8 March 1754, Samuel Johnson enquired of Joseph Warton: «What do you hear of him [Collins]? are there hopes of his recovery? or is he to pass the remainder of his life in misery and degradation? perhaps with complete consciousness of his calamity» (Johnson, in Dyce 1827, 32). After the poet's death, John Ragsdale wrote that he «never saw him after his sister removed him from M'Donnald's [*sic*] madhouse at Chelsea to Chichester» (1806, 494-495).

Collins' last years under his sister's care are still clouded in obscurity; even more significantly, we have no certain evidence regarding his literary activity in that period. We cannot exclude that the poet continued to write with some regularity: this is what Thomas Warton suggests, when he relates a visit he and his brother paid to Collins in Chichester,

> […] where he lived in the cathedral cloisters, with his sister. The first day he was in high spirits at intervals, but exerted himself so much, that he could not see us the second. Here he shewed us an Ode to Mr. John Home, on his leaving England for Scotland, in the octave stanza, very long, and beginning, "Home, thou return'st from Thames!" I remember there was a beautiful description of the spectre of a man drowned in the night, or in the language of the old Scotch superstitions – seized by the angry spirit of the waters, appearing to his wife with pale blue cheek, &c. Mr. Home has no copy of it. He also shewed us another ode, of two or three four-lined stanzas, called the Bell of Arragon. (Warton, in Drake 1811, 477)

The available drafts of Collins' unpublished poetry were made public well after the poet's death, when some manuscripts and fragments were

discovered among Joseph Warton's papers, now at the Oxford Bodleian Library[11]. The poem known as *An Ode on the Popular Superstitions of the Highlands of Scotland, considered as the Subject of Poetry*, which Thomas Warton mentions in the above quotation, was recovered by Alexander Carlyle in 1784 thanks to the information collected from the available memoirs of the author (*Transactions of the Royal Society of Edinburgh* 1788, 63-75)[12]. The other text quoted by Warton, *The Bell of Arragon*, survives as a small fragment of verse[13]. There is no evidence, however, that these works were written after the emergence of Collins' assumed insanity; they are commonly thought to have been written after the *Odes*, but before the poet's internment (Ryskamp and Wendorf 1979b, 172-175).

It is also possible that, in Chichester, Collins underwent some sort of silencing; the mystery surrounding his last years gave rise to rumours and tales. «The sister of Collins», Mitford reports, «evinced so outrageous an aversion to her brother, because he squandered [...] whatever money he had, that she destroyed, in a paroxysm of resentment, all his papers, and whatever remained of his enthusiasm for poetry» (1827, 39). Were there any truth in this claim, Collins would have been an object of his sister's anger and revenge, as if responsible for his own mental condition.

Various sources regarding Collins' life actually imply that the poet's disease was somehow believed to be self-provoked, and that his late sufferings were a predictable result of years of intemperate behaviour. In 1765, Langhorne emphasized Collins' «unaccountable dissipation» and «indolence», which «triumphed at once over want and shame» (v-vii); in 1808, Samuel Jackson Pratt equally remembered Collins as «remark-

[11] Dep. c. 634-649, d. 586-703, e. 276-305. See Collins 1956.

[12] Collins dedicated his poem to John Home, the Scottish dramatist, who had just returned to his native land after a visit to England. Collins' manuscript was originally titled *Ode to a Friend on His Return*; the new title, now commonly accepted, appeared for the first time in «Transactions of the Royal Society of Edinburgh» (1788). This was not the only change introduced in 1788. Alexander Fraser Tytler says: «I could not help regretting the mutilated form in which [the poem] appeared; and, in talking on that subject to my friend Mr Henry Mackenzie of the Exchequer, (a gentleman well known to the literary world by many ingenious productions) I proposed to him the task of supplying the fifth stanza, and half of the sixth, which were entirely lost» («Transactions of the Royal Society of Edinburgh», 1788, 64). Mackenzie's interventions were signalled in inverted commas and included filling in various other gaps in Collins' lines. For what concerns the manuscript of the poem, Charles Ryskamp and Richard Wendorf note: «The manuscript originally consisted of twelve leaves, one of which (the fourth) is missing. [...] The text is written on both sides of the leaves. The last leaves are blank» (1979b, 165).

[13] The only recovered lines run: «The bell of Arragon, they say, / Spontaneous speaks the fatal day» and «Whatever dark aerial power, / Commission'd, haunts the gloomy tower» (see Dyce 1827, 30).

able for genius and indolence» (236). In 1853, William Moy Thomas illustrated some of the available documents on the poet's life in a *Memoir of Collins*, where he observed that most sources depicted him as «fond of pleasure and eager for excitement» (1858, xix). Thomas added that «the evidences are too many to doubt» of Collins' «indolence» and «dissipation» (xix). These two words recur in *Memoir of Collins* four and five times respectively, either mentioned by the author, or quoted from other biographic accounts. Most contemporary comments on Collins' life and disease suggest, therefore, that mental trouble could have been avoided by regulating his conduct: Collins failed in moderating his impulses and passions, and in exerting the self-restraint which was then considered a vital constituent of reasonable behaviour.

These ideas are also conveyed by Samuel Johnson's remarks about Collins, which constitute a crucial source of information on the author's life. It might be remembered that Johnson associated his own melancholic disposition to sinfulness and, as his *Diaries* testify, constantly took new resolutions to fight his supposed «indolence» and «dissipation» (Johnson in Ingram, ed., 1988, 108-109). It is not surprising, thus, that he adopted the same principles when looking at Collins' experience. In *The Lives of the Most Eminent English Poets*, there is a clear attempt to justify or minimize Collins' moral failings, while at the same time asserting them: «his faults had nothing of malignity or design, but proceeded from some unexpected pressure, or casual temptation» (1783, 314).

Johnson probably perceived a sense of kinship with Collins, as he wrote in a letter to Thomas Warton on 24 December 1754: «I have often been near [Collins'] state, and therefore have it in great commiseration» (Johnson, in Boswell 1799, 320). For five times, Mary Margaret Stewart notes, Johnson referred to his fellow writer as «poor dear Collins» in the letters he sent to the Warton brothers between 1754 and 1756 (1988, 471). Despite his genuine affection for Collins, Johnson identified a sort of aberration in both his friend's conduct and art, and defined the latter as «also obstructed in its progress by deviation in quest of mistaken beauties» (1783, 313). Johnson's portrait of Collins corresponds to the typical image of insanity provoked by excessive fancy and inability to regulate the passions: «indulging some peculiar habit of thought», his «flights of imagination» often caused «harshness and obscurity» (312-313). As regards Collins' distemper, Johnson further states:

> His disorder was not alienation of mind, but general laxity and feebleness, a deficiency rather of his vital than intellectual powers. What he spoke wanted neither judgement nor spirit; but a few minutes exhausted him, so that he was forced to rest upon the couch, till a short cessation restored his powers, and he was again able to talk with his former vigour. (316)

Additional details concerning Collins' condition can be gathered from Gilbert White's testimony, from which we might infer that the poet's internment was probably due to alternating states of deep melancholy and fury:

> [...] I myself saw him under Merton wall, in a very affecting situation, struggling, and conveyed by force, in the arms of two or three men, towards the parish of St. Clement, in which was a house that took in such unhappy objects; and I always understood, that not long after he died in confinement; but when, or where he was buried, I never knew. (1781, 11-12)

The vicar of St. Andrews at Chichester also reported to Thomas Warton that Collins «had been accustomed to rave much, and make great moanings» during his attacks (Warton, in Sigworth 1965, 53). At that time, these symptoms would suggest a melancholy delirium, which, physician John Ball wrote, «differs from a maniacal delirium only in this, that in Melancholy fear and sadness supply the places of boldness and anger» (1760, 38). Various sources also suggest that Collins might have soaked in religious fervour, since he was «a great reader of the Bible» (Warton, in Dyce 1827, 31). However, we have only elusive inferences concerning Collins' alleged disease and ambiguous descriptions of his state.

Despite this lack of information, current scholarship has often focused on Collins' mental trouble, identifying signs of it in the sense of artistic inadequacy which emerges from his works. William Ober deems it «reasonable to assign Collins' feelings of inadequacy as a major cause of his depression» (1970, 213), Paul Youngquist discusses the «anxiety of the poet as creator» (1989, 48), and Roy Porter puts forward that the writer «probably declined into chronic depression precisely because of anxiety that his poetic flow had dried up» (1987c, 274). Most of these observations are related to *Ode on the Poetical Character* (Collins 1979, 24-32), which has been interpreted as a statement of poetic belatedness. In the ode, however, the divine faculty of imagination and its «Cest of amplest Pow'r» (line 19) are denied to most poets, not only to the speaker[14]. Therefore, the admission of failure in seeking to write imaginative verse worthy of Spenser and Milton can also be read as a rhetorical *excusatio* similar to that employed by Finch in *The Spleen*, where the ability to write is denied in the act of writing itself. In stating his inadequacy, in addition, Collins openly positions himself in the literary tradition and qualifies his poetry as a conscious re-reading or revision of the past.

[14] When first mentioned, Collins' poems are followed by indication of the edition I have used and page number; subsequent quotations from the same text are cited by line number.

The connections that Ober, Youngquist and Porter perceived between Collins' insanity and his poetic anxiety may partially derive from some biographical information: the «most unsuccessful» publication of the *Odes* caused great distress to the author, who is said to have burned the unsold copies in a fit of anger (Dyce 1827, 14). Collins' contemporaries emphasized that «the Odes descriptive and allegorical met with few admirers», as happened with the *Eclogues* (Langhorne 1765, vii). «His Persian or Oriental Eclogues, published while at Oxford, had met with little success», Samuel Jackson Pratt notes, «and when his Odes [...] appeared in 1746, they were at first very coldly received» (1808, 236), or, as stated in the *Biographia Britannica*, their success was even «inferior to that of the *Oriental Eclogues*» (eds Kippis *et al*. 1789 [1747], 29).

Collins' scarce fortune among eighteenth- and nineteenth century critics and public was only partially due to the fact that his poems represented a shift from Augustan tastes. The complex, convoluted syntax and abundance of rhetorical figures in the *Odes* contributed to discourage Collins' early readers, who believed that «a cloud of obscurity sometimes rests on his highest conceptions, arising from the fineness of his associations, and the daring sweep of his allusions» (Campbell 1819, 310). In the first half of the twentieth century, Collins' work received renewed attention, although not always in positive terms. Murry asserted that Collins «hovers on the verge of emptiness» (1922, 94), S. Musgrove wrote that the *Odes* «do not seem to be about very much – or, at least, not about anything very interesting» (1943, 215), and Herbert Grierson said that the poems «tail off to vagueness or flatness» (Grierson and Smith 1947, 215). Since Johnson's first comments on the *Odes*, their «abstraction» has been frequently underlined by critics, a tendency that has partially continued until the present[15]. As Gabrielle Starr says, Collins is still «often identified as a failed poet», whose expressive potential is lost in excessive symbolic imagery (2004, 87).

Current criticism has also emphasized the sensation that Collins' production contains too much imitative discourse, and that he only «strive[d] to be original» (Radcliffe 1996, 70); hence, a number of studies have focused on the connections between the *Odes* and works by John Milton, Edmund Spenser, and others[16]. According to another common view, Collins' works are all variations on the same theme, namely artistic creation and inspiration. Because such topics are more extensively treated in *Ode on the Poetical Character*, this poem has long been at the centre of scholarly

[15] For instance, see Brown 1991, 8.

[16] See Woodhouse 1965, 93-113; Finch 1987, 276; Griffin 2002, 123; Shears 2006, 32.

speculation[17]. Starting with Harold Bloom, who opened his examination of the Romantic period with this poem and defined it «a prophecy of the Romanticism that was to come» (1962, 6), Collins' scholarship has heavily relied on the notion of anxiety about literary paternity in interpreting the *Odes*[18]. After all, mid-century poets as a whole are often read in Milton's wake, or seen as in search of a new form of expression that would only be achieved by the next generation of poets[19].

It is probably because of the connections between Collins' aesthetics and Romantic thought that critical attention has focused on his «grandeur of wildness, and [...] extravagance» (Johnson 1783, 312-313), elements which are more clearly anticipatory of later literary developments. Like Akenside, the Wartons and Young, Collins moved away from the «didactic Poetry» and «the fashion of moralizing in verse», and considered «Invention and Imagination» as «chief faculties for a poet» (Warton 1746, 3). However, Collins' attitude towards the emotional excess of «the dang'rous Passions» (*Poetical Character*, line 41) and the rapturing powers of fancy is ambivalent in the *Odes*. In line with contemporary philosophical and scientific discourse, they are represented as fascinating and inspiring but also as potentially detrimental for the poet and his work. In this sense, it is hard to see Collins' poetry as 'wildly extravagant'; I believe he seeks to propose a model of 'rational imagination' that explores the potentials of Fancy while «retiring» it to a «thoughtful Cell» (*The Manners*, line 37).

In my view, this attitude is particularly evident in *The Manners. An Ode* and *The Passion: An Ode for Music*, two poems which are discussed in the following section of the present work. These odes also show that eighteenth-century ideas on the workings of the human mind can account for the loss of the poetic past which Collins often laments in the *Odes*. When «Fancy» was «Young» (line 17), as in *Ode on the Poetical Character*, and its «surprising» and «wonderful effects» (Mihles 1745a, 7) were not known, it was still possible to «feel unmix'd» its flame (line 22), or accept its influence without tension and suspicion. In addition, contemporary «trembling feet» cannot follow the ancients' «guiding steps» (line 71) in the light of a change in epistemological focus: the new perspective questioned the nature of knowledge and suggested that truth, although «in sunny vest array'd» (line 45), is inaccessible to human eyes and to «ev'ry future view» (line 76).

[17] See Woodhouse 1965 and Jung 2000.

[18] See also Balfour 2002, 27-29.

[19] On this topic, see Pagnini 1964, 145-146.

4.2 «*Dim-discover'd Tracts of Mind*»

The eleventh and penultimate text in *Odes*, *The Manners* (Collins 1979, 46-49), is imbued with questions related to vision, perception, and their function in the achievement of knowledge and truth. The fact that most of the poems included in Collins' collection also refer to visual perception and its implications has already been emphasized by Deborah Heller. In her analysis of *Ode to Fear,* she notes that Collins' poems are not «simply about the problem of sight in poetic experience», but rather «explorations of the nature of poetic experience – the experience of imaginative creation – that nonetheless persistently implicate the visual Fancy and its "sceneful" effects» (1993, 110). I think that *The Manners* does not only exemplify the relationship between poetry, vision and fancy, but also reveals the philosophical and scientific influences contributing to Collins' notion of visual imagination.

According to a common reading, the ode hints at a biographical event: it was probably written when Collins decided to abandon his academic life in Oxford and move to London to become a 'literary adventurer'[20]. Critics have also shown that *The Manners* deals with poetic art, in that it discusses a shift from the satire of Swift, Pope and Johnson towards a new lyrical tendency. In particular, *The Manners* has been interpreted in the light of Corbyn Morris' *Essay towards Fixing the True Standards of Wit, Humour, Raillery, Satire and Ridicule* (1744), which re-defines «wit» and «humour» discussing earlier theoretical sources (Paulson 1998, 79-82). My perspective is closely related to these critical stances on *The Manners*: I believe that the ode offers an insight into what Collins perceived as a mid-century revolution in epistemological paradigms; simultaneously, it shows how the emergence of a new mode of knowledge had an impact on both the poet's private life and the artistic tendencies of the period. The following remarks, therefore, focus on the ways in which *The Manners* illustrates a shift in episteme and suggests that, as Foucault says, «le vieux privilege de la connaissance reflexive, de la pensée se pensant elle-même, ne pouvait manquer de disparaître» (Foucault 1966, 337; Sheridan-Smith 1970, 516: «the old privilege of reflexive knowledge, of thought thinking itself, could not but disappear»).

[20] Collins moved to London in 1744. Richard Wendorf and Charles Ryskamp note: «the only real internal evidence in the poem [...] argues for a much later date, and ostensibly for a different origin for the poem [...]. Collins is speaking primarily of his abandoning a kind of philosophical study which need not be specifically connected with his academic studies in the university. The argument of the poem is not necessarily a movement away from books in general, but towards an empirical study of the manners in nature and in the pages of Art's "enchanted School"» (1979b, 149).

It must also be acknowledged, however, that *The Manners* is primarily a poem of multiple meanings or layers, in which different discourses conflate and interact with each other. This plurality cannot be overlooked: for instance, the term «manners» in the title is commonly interpreted by contemporary criticism as indicating the «portraiture of character, disposition and temperament» in literature, for in the ode «the manners are spoken of in the specific context of artistic representation» (Paulson 1998, 79, 150). However, Collins seems to establish ambiguity making deliberate use of a word possessing multiple connotations: the term «manners» assumes a fluctuating meaning in the text, where, as we will see, it can also indicate old habits of thought, or a «customary mode of acting or behaviour» (*OED*). The word «manners» is not the only instance of shifting meaning: a similar case can be made for various other terms in the poem, including «Observance» (line 20) and «Humour» (line 51). In this way, one of the main concepts of the ode, the fact that reality is «ever varying» (line 43), finds expression on all levels of the text.

The Manners produces puzzlement in the reader from its opening lines, where the speaker bids farewell to something that remains partially obscure. The discourse is in medias res and seems to begin as an ongoing personal reflection:

> Farewell, for clearer Ken design'd,
> The dim-discover'd Tracts of Mind:
> Truths which, from Action's Paths retir'd,
> My silent Search in vain requir'd!
> No more my Sail that Deep explores,
> No more I search those magic Shores,
> What Regions part the World of Soul,
> Or whence thy Streams, Opinion, roll:
> If e'er I round such Fairy Field,
> Some Pow'r impart the Spear and Shield
> At which the Wizzard Passions fly,
> By which the Giant Follies die! (lines 1-12)

The speaker claims that, in his search for truth, he has acted like an explorer. He defines the field of his observation in purely spatial, or rather geographical terms, using the terms «paths», «shores», «regions», «world», «stream», and «field». Further exploration is now useless, since the new land has eventually been discovered. The phrase «Tracts of Mind» employs two different meanings of the word «tract», which is both an «extent of territory» and a «treatise», suggesting that the sphere of theoretical thought is one of the subjects considered in these lines[21].

[21] Interestingly, one of the versions of Wordsworth's *Evening Walk* might have been partially inspired by Collins' *The Manners*, as it shares some of its themes and presents

Michael McKeon has noted that, in the eighteenth century, «the epistemology of the travel narrative» relied on the authority of the observer rather than on established sources and traditions, thereby helping lay the foundations of the empirical method (1987, 101). Travel literature contributed to the definition of knowledge and exerted great influence on scientific thought also in the preceding century, as already mentioned here with regard to James Carkesse (§2.1). In particular, Ann Talbot demonstrates the travelogue's central role in Locke's theories on innate ideas: Locke employed travel accounts to demonstrate that social environment influenced the mechanisms of thought more deeply than innate moral rules (2010, 129). The speaker of *The Manners* seems to have in mind Locke's *Essay* when he mentions the «Streams» of «Opinion» in connection with newly discovered perspectives. As Locke states,

> This is apt to be censured, [...] when a man does not readily yield to the determination of approved authors [...]; and it is looked upon as insolence for a man to set up and adhere to his own opinion, against the current stream of antiquity; or to put it in the balance against that of some learned doctor, or otherwise approved writer. (1706, 579)

The «manners» of Collins' title could therefore be the «antiquities» of scholasticism, which long dominated philosophical and scientific thought before then. By considering sensory experience as the chief source of knowledge, Locke's philosophy gave rise to a distrustful attitude towards abstract theory; Collins' lines convey this sort of distrust. As Sandro Jung rightly remarks (2000, 91), *The Manners* expresses the need of re-discovering some aspects of knowledge which lay in the dark and bids farewell to theoretical science in favour of a «clearer Ken» (line 1). Metaphors of light (knowing) and darkness (unknowing) are subsequently reinforced in the poem by recurring references to sight and vision (lines 13, 19, 20, 29, 30, 41, 44, 47).

Given the attention that Collins devotes to sensory impressions and knowledge, the use of travel imagery in the ode is significant on an additional level. Travel reports relied on the narrator's ability to perceive a new environment, but they also exemplified the «power of the imagination to influence all acts of observation and interpretation», as imagination could «fill the gaps and resolve contradictions in empirical knowledge» (Arthur 2010, 83). *The Manners* thus establishes a contrast between di-

similar lexical choices. Here is part of the surviving text of *Evening Walk*: «those to whom the harmonious doors / Of Science have unbarred celestial stores, / To whom a burning energy has given / That other eye which darts thro' earth and heaven, / Roams through all space [...] and [ ] unconfined, / Explores the illimitable tracts of mind». Wordsworth's unpublished text is quoted in Thomas and Ober 1989, 53-54. The square brackets signal a missing word.

rect observation, imagination, and what Locke defines «Belief, Assent, or Opinion, which is the admitting or receiving any Proposition for true, upon Arguments or Proofs [...] without certain Knowledge that is it so» (1706 [1690], 556).

The speaker's disapproval of received opinion, or the manners of thought, is strengthened through lexical and thematic connection with Shaftesbury's treatise *Characteristicks of Men, Manners, Opinions, Times* (1711). Shaftesbury sees beauty and moral goodness as two dimensions of the same concept, and he demonstrates that these ideas are not innate, but proceed from education, practice, and a constant and rigid control of one's passions. After devoting part of his essay to a philosophical-based speculation, Shaftesbury opens what he defines the «Passage from the *Terra Incognita* to the visible World» with these words:

> When we are even past these empty Regions and Shadows of Philosophy; 'twill still perhaps appear an uncomfortable kind of travelling thro' those other *invisible Ideal* Worlds: such as the Study of *Morals*, we see, engages us to visit. Men must acquire a very peculiar and strong Habit of turning their Eye inwards, in order to explore the *interiour Regions* and *Recesses* of the Mind, the *hollow Caverns* of deep *Thought*, the private Seats of *Fancy*, and the *Wastes* and *Wilderness*, as well as the more fruitful and cultivated *Tracts* of this *obscure Climate*. But what can one do? Or how dispense with these *darker* Disquisitions and *Moon-light* Voyages, when we have to deal with a sort of *Moon-blind* Wits, who [...] may be said to renounce *Day-light*, and *estinguish* in a manner, the bright visible outward World, by allowing us to *know* nothing beside what we can *prove*, by strict and formal *Demonstration*? (Cooper, Earl of Shaftesbury 1714, 211)

Shaftesbury expounds the impossibility of discarding 'shadowy' philosophical discourses even when observation might suffice to gain knowledge. In so doing, the imagery he employs is very similar to the one Collins adopts in *The Manners*: both texts rely on spatial and geographical metaphors, and both represent the contrast between empirical and scholastic philosophy in terms of light and darkness. Thematically, Collins seems to share Shaftesbury's belief that the world can be considered as an object of the senses. In addition, like Shaftesbury, the speaker of *The Manners* acknowledges the need to subdue «Passions» and «Follies», from which he defends himself with «Spear and Shield» (lines 10-13). Passions, Shaftesbury explains, are essential for appreciation of beauty, but pose a danger: «as the learned masters in this Science advise», he says, by «ingaging Passions» there is a risk of becoming «so amus'd and extasy'd as to lose our-selves» (Cooper, Earl of Shaftesbury 1714 [1711], 202-203). In *The Manners*, the speaker's attitude towards the passions and fancy is indeed ambiguous, as they often assume negative connotations. In lines 15-16, for instance, fancy is not seen as a creative force, but as one of the elements contributing to Science's ridicule:

Farewell the Porch, whose Roof is seen
Arch'd with th' enlivening Olive's Green:
Where Science, prank'd in tissued Vest,
By Reason, Pride, and Fancy drest,
Comes like a Bride so trim array'd,
To wed with Doubt in Plato's Shade! (lines 13-18)

Here, fancy is not meant as the most revelatory among the «kindred Pow'rs» (line 74), as in *Ode on the Poetical Character*. Understood in a scientific context, fancy becomes what Mandeville defines the «wandering Invention» of some contemporary scholars (Mandeville, in Vittone 2005, 99). Often coupled with «Pride» and empty speculation, the physician says, fancy leads to «loose Conjectures» which neglected «the solid Observation of never-erring Nature» (2005, 99). The «fashion in Philosophizing», Mandeville further comments, was as common as the «wearing of Cloaths» (99), thus reinforcing the idea that the «manners» in Collins' title could refer to widespread scholastic modes of thought.

As is well known, Arthur Johnston has interpreted *The Manners* in the light of a conflict between Platonic idealism and empiricism, adding that «Plato distinguishes between Intellect and Sense-Perception, and for him perfect knowledge is the knowledge of Ideas» (Thomas Gray and William Collins 1970 [1967], 194, note to line 2)[22]. Therefore, Collins' mention of Plato seems to put into question transcendental speculation, as opposed to direct observation and impressions acquired through the organs of perception. These concepts are further developed in the following lines, where the «Youth of the quick uncheated Sight» (line 19) could be an allegory of the new science, namely the Newtonian or physical scientific method:

Youth of the quick uncheated Sight,
Thy walks, *Observance*, more invite!
O Thou, who lov'st that ampler Range,
Where Life's wide Prospects round thee change,
And with her mingling Sons ally'd,
Throw'st the prattling Page aside:
To me in Converse sweet impart
To read in Man the native Heart,
To learn, where Science sure is found,
From Nature as she lives around:
And gazing oft her Mirror true,
By turns each shifting Image view!
Till meddling *Art's* officious Lore,

[22] Johnston's interpretation has had an impact on later analyses of *The Manners*: see, for instance, Paley 1999, 117 and Jung 2000.

> Reverse the Lessons taught before,
> Alluring from a safer Rule
> To dream in her enchanted School;
> Thou Heav'n, whate'er of Great we boast,
> Hast blest this social Science most (lines 19-36)

The ability to read «in Man the native Heart» brings to mind again Shaftesbury's essay, while the fact that through «observance» one can achieve knowledge of both the human heart and the environment is suggestive of David Hume's *A Treatise of Human Nature* (1739). Hume established new foundations for knowledge, basing his speculations not on *a priori* deductions – or Shaftesbury's «strict and formal demonstration» (Cooper, Earl of Shaftesbury 1714 [1711], 175) – but, in the tradition of Locke, on direct observation. Hume's description of the new method finds various correspondences in Collins' farewell to obscure theory in favour of clearer paths:

> Here then is the only expedient, […] to leave the tedious lingering method, which we have hitherto followed, and instead of taking now and then a castle or village on the frontier, to march up directly to the capital or center of these sciences, to human nature itself […]. We must therefore glean up our experiments in this science from a cautious observation of human life, and take them as they appear in the common course of the world, by men's behaviour in company, in affairs, and in their pleasures. (Hume 1739, 5, 10)

To Hume, direct experience is the foundational context of a new epistemological structure; it offers a subject on which to work in view of a science of man, an idea which is also conveyed by Collins' mention of the heaven-blessed «social Science» (line 36). If the poet had in mind Hume's theories of knowledge, the title of his ode can acquire yet another meaning: the «manners» may be, in this case, characters and habits that emerge from the examination of human nature, and «observance» (line 20) can mean both «the action of observing» and «adherence […] to a particular custom» (*OED*).

Just as Hume defines «cautious» the process of scientific observation, Collins' ode apparently warns against the risks of a visual epistemology. The speaker puts into question the human ability to gaze effectively in nature's «Mirror true», which contains «shifting», unstable images (lines 29-30). Vision appears only partially reliable as an instrument of knowledge: the empirical model is, then, praised and destabilized simultaneously, as it can offer new certainties, but also prove deceptive. «Not alike to every mortal eye / Is this great scene unveil'd» (lines 79-80), Mark Akenside wrote in *The Pleasures of Imagination*, referring to the spectacle of nature in its subjective declinations (1781, 28). In the light of the subjectivity of vision, Collins' «manners» may also be understood as different ways to see the world, especially when filtered by fancy's «Glass» (line 44).

The ideological operations at work in *The Manners* can be interpreted, even in this case, in connection with Locke's thought. The philosopher remarks that sight is «the most comprehensive of all our senses» (1706 [1690], 83); yet, he also stresses its unreliability. Human imperfect sensory impressions, Locke says, need the faculty of judgment to be properly re-associated in the consistent picture which we know as reality. It is, therefore, «by a settled habit» that we interpret sensations and perceptions, that is, by comparing them to acquired notions formed by judgment, notions of which we are mostly unaware (83). So, empiricism poses a paradox: understanding can be based on sensorial experience, but some features of perception remain conceptual in nature. According to Collins, the theoretical model of knowledge «prank'd» science (line 15), but even the observational method is not devoid of errors: it is «safer», but not safe (line 33). *The Manners* explores two divergent epistemologies, challenging both in different ways; it shows that the shift towards empiricism brought about a loss of certainty regarding the nature of knowledge itself.

While describing the turn towards new modes of knowledge, *The Manners* simultaneously discusses how this change leads to new forms of aesthetic reflection and to a kind of poetry that «read[s] in Man the native Heart» (line 26). As mentioned above, *The Manner*s has been interpreted as being «primarily about poetics» and narrating «pageants or dramas enacted by personified human emotions as they function in the [...] arts» (Walsh 2013, 116). This discourse particularly emerges in the fourth stanza, where one might note an abrupt shift in tone and focus. Fancy suddenly appears, as David Fairer says, «domesticated in a 'thoughtful Cell' from where she can observe the comic scene of social life, in which Humour and Wit [...] are on stage giving their performances» (2002, 164). When these characters, together with «Satyrs» (or Satire), make their appearance before Fancy, Collins' verses are especially fraught with ambiguities:

> But who is He whom now she views,
> In Robe of wild contending Hues?
> Thou by the Passions nurs'd, I greet
> The comic Sock that binds thy Feet!
> O *Humour*, Thou whose Name is known,
> To *Britain*'s favoured Isle alone:
> Me too amidst thy Band admit,
> There where the young-eyed healthful *Wit*,
> (Whose Jewels in his crisped Hair
> Are plac'd each other's Beams to share,
> Whom no Delights from Thee divide)
> In Laughter loos'd attends thy Side! (lines 47-58)

It can be noted that these lines abound in veiled intertextual relationships. The «wild contending Hues» of Humour remind us of the description of its opposite, foggy Dullness, dressed «in robes of varying hues» (I.69) in Pope's *The Dunciad* (1749 [1728], 19)[23]. Wit's «crisped Hair» seems to echo the «crisped snaky golden locks» (Act III, Scene 2, line 92) which Bassanio deplores when attacking ornament and «outward shows» in Shakespeare's *The Merchant of Venice* (Act III, Scene 2, line 1140). A subtext of deception and illusion ironically subverts the manifest meaning and conventional imagery employed here. Once again, Collins suggests that impressions coming from the senses are unreliable: the scene that Fancy «views» with her «musing Eyes» is confusing and bristling with paradoxes.

The statement that Humour's name is «known, / To Britain's favoured Isle alone» is also rather puzzling, as the subsequent stanza of *The Manners* mentions humorous works belonging to the Greek, Italian, Spanish and French tradition. However, these lines acquire sense if we understand the term «humour» not as the idea of the ludicrous but as «an altered or abnormal form of [physiological] fluids» (*OED*). In this view, we might assume that the speaker is facetiously referring to *The English Malady*, where George Cheyne maintains that mental unbalances are typical of the British Isles, because of the «*Humour of living in great, populous and consequently unhealthy Towns*» (1733, ii). Collins' text, one might note, also contains a semantic set of terms that hint at mental health and illness: the meaning of chumour» as an unbalanced mental condition is reinforced in the poem by the adjective «wild», the reference to «Passions» (of which «humour is the excess», Whalley 1756, xv), and the term «healthful», used to modify «Wit». Also «Laughter», as we have already seen in Anne Finch's work (§3.3), can go together with melancholy or other medical conditions.

The health-illness theme is further developed in the subsequent lines, along with the ideas of deception and illusion. Here, Collins mentions or alludes to some authors and works that are especially representative of humour and wit:

> By old *Miletus* who so long
> Has ceas'd his Love-inwoven Song:
> By all you taught the *Tuscan* Maids,
> In chang'd *Italia*'s modern Shades:
> By Him, whose *Knight's* distinguish'd Name
> Refin'd a Nation's Lust of Fame,

[23] In particular, Pope writes in *The Dunciad* (1749 [1728], 19), «She [Dullness], tinsel'd o'er in robes of varying hues, / With self-applause her wild creation views; / Sees momentary monsters rise and fall, / And with her own fools-colours gilds them all» (Book I, lines 79-82).

Whose Tales ev'n now, with Echos sweet,
Castilia's *Moorish* Hills repeat:
Or Him, whom *Seine*'s blue Nymphs deplore,
In watchet Weeds on *Gallia*'s Shore,
Who drew the sad *Sicilian* Maid,
By Virtues in her Sire betray'd: [...]. (lines 59-70)

The writers indicated hereafter Aristides of Miletus are usually identified with Boccaccio, Cervantes and Lesage (also spelt Le Sage)[24]. Their most famous works can be said to deal with both meanings of the term «humour»; Boccaccio dedicated the *Decameron* to women suffering from love-melancholy, and Cervantes famously pictured the delusions of insane *Don Quixote*, who misinterprets what he sees. Lesage's Gil Blas briefly acts as a physician, and performs his duties of bleeding and purging with so much zeal as to cause his patients' death. Together with the *Milesian Tales*, in addition, all these texts represent melancholic love stories that have to do with excessive and disrupting passions[25].

The Manners thus connects questions of visual perception (and deception) with veiled references to bodily health and mental deviation, a procedure which is very much in line with the contemporary medical discourse. During the first half of the eighteenth century, Locke's theories about sight and sensory impressions were under scrutiny in the medical field, yielding a special interest in 'normal' and 'deviant' ways of knowing external objects[26]. In his *Essay*, Locke put forward various instances in which sensory experience was followed by lacking or deviant reflection, as in the famous «Molyneux's question». William Molyneux posed to Locke a problem concerning blindness from birth, talking about what would happen in case sight was recovered at a certain stage in life. As a response, Locke argued that absence of visual ideas would make it impossible to recognize objects previously distinguished only by touch, underlining that the blind person would lack any «judgement» in correlating different sensory impressions (1706 [1690], 63)[27].

[24] See Johnston's footnotes in Thomas Gray and William Collins 1970 [1967], 198.

[25] Ryskamp and Wendorf note that Blanche, in *Gil Blas*, «was compelled by her father to marry another even though she loved and was loved by the King of Sicily; her jealous husband, mortally wounded by the king, stabbed her as she held him in her arms». The scholars also quote Barbauld's comment, according to whom Lesage's story of Blanche «has more to do with the high passions than with *Manners*» (Ryskamp and Wendorf 1979b, 152).

[26] Disorders of the visual imagination are pivotal to the Battie-Monro dispute in 1758, when discourses on sensory impressions, perception and judgment supplanted humoral theories and Galenic notions.

[27] William Molyneux (1656-1698) was an Irish scientist whose work focused on optics and vision. On 7 July 1688, Molyneux wrote a letter to Locke, and expounded

This line of thought was later followed by various physicians and assumed particular relevance around the mid-eighteenth century. Locke's theories were often re-examined focusing either on the question of vision, or on that of judgement, as is the case with William Cheselden and David Hartley's works. Cheselden examined the case of a blind man who regained sight, implicitly discussing the unreliability of visual sensory impressions: he described his patient as baffled by his new ability to see, «expecting the pictures would feel like the things they represented» and wondering «which was the lying sense, feeling, or seeing?» (1730 [1713], 350). Hartley combined Locke's notions of sight and judgment with the nature of madness, claiming that the images received by the sane and mad were the same, but the insane could not derive correct judgments from them, as their «trains of visible ideas» were deviant or corrupted (1749, 212).

Cheselden and Hartley dealt with association principles in different ways: the former emphasised connections between sensations, the latter between vision and ideas. Both kinds of association are introduced in *The Manners*, where sight only allows «shifting Images» (line 30), Fancy's eyes envision deceitful, «ever varying» characters through a «Glass» (lines 43-44), and the reader cannot derive any univocal 'judgment' from the scene. While relying on the contemporary empirical discourse, *The Manners* also questions it, affirming the instability and haziness of every knowable object. The recurrence of terms like «change», «shifting», and «varying» (lines 22, 30, 43) hints at the fact that a wider framework should be applied in distinguishing what is 'normal' from what is 'deviant'. This is also suggested by reference to the *Milesian Tales*, *Decameron*, *Don Quixote*, and *Gil Blas*, humorous texts which portray different forms of eccentricity but rest as literary and cultural milestones.

The Manners is directly related to *The Passions: An Ode for Music*, the poem which closes the *Odes* (Collins 1979, 49-53). Richard Wendorf and Charles Ryskamp emphasize this continuity: quoting from Dryden's *The Grounds of Criticism in Tragedy*, prefixed to *Troilus and Cressida* (1679), they demonstrate that in the literary field the manners were thought to include the passions (1979b, 155-156). I believe that the connections between the two poems can be further extended, for *The Passions* develops the discourse on contemporary philosophy and science introduced in *The Manners*. According to most eighteenth-century physicians, excessive emotion and imagination could generate bodily changes, as we have seen in the case of monstrous births (§4.1)[28]. In particular, they could

his famous problem concerning sight and blindness; Locke found it «ingenious» and included it in the second edition of his *Essay* (first printed in 1694).

[28] It might be useful to note that eighteenth-century medical treatises often use the word «passion» to indicate what we nowadays term «emotion»; a distinction in this

influence the nerves and the blood, putting at stake both physical and mental health. In order to prevent this condition, doctors advocated the benefits of self-regulation and, as Michael George Hay notes, «authors such as Mead, Bayne, Robinson or Whytt place their faith not in reason but in the authority of convention and the internalisation of conventional norms of behaviour» (1979, 106). Once these norms, or 'manners' were respected, an individual could be safeguarded from unreason.

The Passions, moreover, illustrates the disrupting power of the emotions that «nurs'd» Humour in *The Manners* (line 49). The personifications of Fear, Anger, Despair, Revenge, Jealousy, Melancholy, Cheerfulness, and Joy perform with a musical instrument, taking turns on an imaginary stage[29]. «Madness», wrote Richard Mead, «rises to the greatest heights when the mind is racked with contrary passions at the same time; as wrath and fear, joy and grief: which, by drawing it different ways, at length quite overpower it» (1762, 485). Similarly, in Collins' ode, the disordered and rapid succession of diverse feelings establishes an 'insane' bacchanal which breaks any sense of harmony and prevents Music from expressing herself.

In *The Passions*, the concept of music is often exploited in connection with contemporary scientific views on the mind and brain. In the first place, Collins refers to the long-standing idea that this art can influence human emotions, a notion which received renewed impulse with the eighteenth-century theories of the nerves and nervous sensibility. In the second place, music stands for the «Balance» and «Harmony» of the «Animal Oeconomy», which should be preserved «under a right Regulation» by controlling the «irregular Excursions» of the «Passions of the Mind» (Robinson 1725, 223). It was common, at the time, to encounter musical metaphors in medical explanations of the body: the nerves were often defined in terms of «strings» and «thrills», as Barker-Benfield notes (1992, 21-22). David Hartley talked about «physical vibrations» causing reactions in the brain, and «Hume emphasized the harmonic possibilities of the nervous system», Barker-Benfield further observes, «comparing the affections generated among human creatures to the sounds transmitted by musical instruments» (1992, 22). In *The English Malady*, George Cheyne similarly defined the human body as a «Machin of an infinite Number and Variety of different Channels and Pipes», where the soul acted «like a *Musician* in a

sense started to appear after the mid-eighteenth century (see also Fisher 2002, 6). Collins' *The Passions* presents the same ambiguity.

[29] *The Passions: An Ode for Music* was widely known and extensively quoted throughout the nineteenth century: it is mentioned in Charles Dickens' *Great Expectations* and Thomas Hardy's *Desperate Remedies*, it inspired William Wordsworth's *Personal Talk* and was parodied in Michael Faraday's *An Ode to the Pass*. In recent years, it has received less attention: Dustin Griffin remarks that «the ode on "The Passions" no longer strikes us as one of Collins' better poems» (2002, 128).

finely fram'd and well-tun'd Organ-Case» (1733, 4-5). The nerves, in addition, were «like *Keys*, which, being struck on or touch'd, convey the Sound and Harmony to this sentient Principle, or *Musician* » (5). In *An Essay of Health and Long Life*, Cheyne also specified that through these «Keys» the body and the mind affect each other, and «these *Affections* may be called *Passions*» (1725 [1724], 145)[30].

References to contemporary notions of the mind are intertwined with a reflection on poetry that could be indebted to classical writers. Horace observes in *The Art of Poetry* (*Ars Poetica*): «Format enim natura prius non intus ad omnem / Fortunarum habitum; iuuat, aut impellit ad iram: / […] Post effert animi motus interprete lingua» (1564 [ca. 1470], 8, lines 108-111; Dorsch 1965, 83: «For nature has so formed us that we first feel inwardly any change in our fortunes; it is she that cheers us or rouses us to anger […], and it is only afterwards that she expresses these feelings in us by means of the tongue»). Like a musician, Horace suggests, the poet should modulate his or her emotions according to sound and rhythm; in order to do so, some distance is required. If the poet is a prey to passions, the overall harmony or continuity of effect will be disrupted. Similar ideas appear in Marcus Tullius Cicero's *On the Orator* (*De Oratore*, ca. 1465; Book III, Chapter 50) and Longinus' *Peri hypsous* (1652 [1544], lxxiv). Collins' *The Passions* resonates with these warnings against lack of measure; contrasting and unrestrained emotions produce incoherent sounds rather than music, thereby suggesting that extreme feelings disturb the process of artistic creation. A similar concept surfaces also in *Ode to the Poetical Character*, where passions are shown to be potentially detrimental to writing, and should be «kept aloof, / Far from the sainted growing Woof» (lines 41-42). However, only *The Passions* represents a more general condition of imbalance and dissonance: indeed, the effect of the rhapsodic succession of emotions is repeatedly connected to mental disorder (lines 5, 10, 15).

Scholars have often interpreted *The Passions* as an allegorical text devoted to a theoretical discussion of the poetic subject. As Kevin Barry explains, the ode idealizes the lost art of music to talk about a generalized «cultural nostalgia», which is mainly «about the fate of poetry in an age of one-dimensional reason» (1987, 35-36). In other words, *The Passions* can be read as auspicating the return of primitive forms of artistic expression; however, this line of thought does not fully explain the meaning of the lines. If «young» Greek music (lines 1-2) were a purely positive ideal, its influence over the passions should yield, at least, a pleasurable artistic result. Instead, the poem is dotted by a series of unsuccessful performances, which at times border on the grotesque. Fear is scared by the very first sound he plays (lines 17-20), Anger produces a «rude clash» of «hurried» chords (lines 21-24), Despair's song is

[30] For the effects of music on the body, see also Browne 1729.

«strange» (line 27), Hope's «promis'd pleasure» does not fulfil itself (line 31), Revenge offers a «loud and dread» trumpet «blast» (lines 43-44), and the «Numbers» of other characters are similarly fixed «to nought» (line 53). In short, music is paradoxically absent from this ode.

To return to Kevin Barry's remarks, I believe that also the idea of a cultural past is treated ambiguously in the poem: memories of primordial music in early Greece are followed by the obliviousness of a bacchanal in which music itself is forgotten. In a similar way, Collins' *The Passions* can be seen as establishing a dialectical relationship of remembrance and 'forgetfulness' with the recent poetic tradition, and especially with other works that expressively cope with the power of music on the human mind. For the subject matter of his ode Collins could have drawn inspiration from texts such as John Dryden's *A Song for St. Cecilia's Day* (1687) and *Alexander's Feast* (1697), Alexander Pope's *Ode for Musick: on St. Cecilia's Day* (1708, rewritten in 1730), and George Sewell's *The Force of Musick* (ca. 1710)[31]. In these poems, however, the power of music is soothing because, as in the first version of *Ode for Musick: on St. Cecilia's Day*, it can «make despair and madness please» (Pope 1719 [1708], 11; line 121). The effects that music produces in Collins' *The Passions* are diametrically opposite: all emotions are «fir'd / Fill'd with fury, rapt, inspir'd» (lines 9-10) in an endless divine afflatus[32]. The passions are also described as experiencing a series of corporal responses which were generally associated to enthusiasts: they are «exulting, trembling, raging, fainting» (line 5)[33]. Significantly, the four verbs that Collins yokes together seem to belong to two different spheres: «exulting» and «raging» are typical of furious or manic disorders, whereas «trembling» and «fainting» can be associated to melancholic states. Music arouses excessive and contrasting reactions, which appear irreconcilable throughout the whole poem, and establish a sense of fragmentation and lack of wholeness.

Whereas Collins' discourse about the influence of music on human emotions departs from the recent poetical tradition, it is closely related to Anne Finch's views, as they are presented in *The Spleen*. In the latter text, the

[31] *The Passions* may have influenced Gray's *The Progress of Poesy* (1754) and James Pye's *Ode to Harmony* (1783).

[32] Martha Collins quotes this line of *The Passions* remarking that «sometimes Collins achieves indirection by avoiding verbs altogether, using participles in their place». She adds: «Collins makes similar use of participles elsewhere in the poem, and throughout the first part of *Ode to Liberty*. Most of the participial passages could have been rendered with a more abundant use of verbs, but the poet chooses to avoid the definitiveness of direct statement» (Collins 1975, 370).

[33] Clement Hawes notes that the bodily semiotics of «convulsive» religious fanaticism included «trembling or even fainting in the presence of the Lord», and produced «humming noises, sharp changes in vocal timbre, and various other manifestations of an internal "revolution"» (1996, 93).

speaker mentions music among other remedies to melancholy, and claims that «Harmony no help is had» (line 135) because it provoked abrupt humoral shifts, making her either «too sweetly sad» or «gayly Mad» (lines 136-137). Both writers, then, talk about music as causing a fluctuation from one emotional excess to another, with no possibility of reaching a point of balance. In the light of these remarks, I partially disagree with David Fairer's reading of *The Passions* as a cathartic discharge that re-harmonizes the emotional conflicts present in the preceding odes (2002, 164)[34]. Although *The Passions* concludes with a representation of «Joy», the last personification to enter the stage, no sense of order or harmony is established in the final lines[35]. Joy's «ecstatic trial» (line 80) is confused and confusing, for he changes his instrument while playing. The effects of this performance are disorienting on the audience:

> They would have thought who heard the strain
> They saw, in Tempe's vale, her native maids,
> Amidst the festal sounding shades,
> To some unwearied minstrel dancing […]. (lines 85-88)

In these lines, the sense of puzzlement and uncertainty is evidenced by the use of verb moods («They would have thought […] / They saw»), nouns («shades») and pre-modification («some»): Joy's performance triggers a vision, or rather the impression of a vision. The theme of the unreliability of sight, central to *The Manners*, is re-employed here with reference to the passions, which appear capable of affecting the senses. In the eighteenth century, receiving visions under the spell of strong emotions was typically associated with enthusiasts, who «mistake the stroke or action of their passions, their imaginations, feelings &c. in the place of God's revelation» and believe in «those deceptions», trusting «visions, omens, and second-sighted cheats» (Dove [?] 1750, 40)[36]. When the performances of the passions end, the excesses

[34] Human emotions and feelings can be considered as structuring principles of Collins' poems: as Patricia Meyer Spacks notes, «in many of his odes, [Collins] makes emotion his explicit subject; in others, an implicit one» (2009, 118). In particular, Collins represents excessive and contrasting emotional qualities, juxtaposing, for instance, odes devoted to Pity and Fear.

[35] Here, my interpretation of *The Passions* is in line with Janice Farrar Thaddeus' comments (1965, 71). The scholar also writes: «Apparently disturbed by the concluding lines of *The Passions*, the Earl of Lichfield, Vice Chancellor of the University of Oxford, wrote a different ending for the version set to music in 1750 by Dr. William Hayes, the university's Professor of Music» (71). Significantly, when Hayes put this text into music, he substituted Collins' ending with the Earl of Lichfield's lines. These events are considered in more detail in Heighes 1995, 217-220. To our point, it might be interesting to emphasize that Lichfield's text opened with the *Recitativo accompagnato «But Ah! Madness away»*.

[36] The identity of the author of *Rational Religion Distinguished* remains uncertain; see Bogue and Bennett 1833, 446.

brought about by each character open the way to enthusiasm, whereas music, harmony and tranquillity remain out of the picture. The poem closes with an invocation to music, «Return in all thy simple State!» (line 117), which is also an appeal to find or regain interior balance and peace.

Emotional excess, together with the deceptions and 'cheats' of vision are also treated in Collins' posthumously published poetry, which has received scarce critical attention so far. In particular, these subjects are central to three poems which were supposedly written after the *Odes*, and could represent significant developments in Collins' poetics. The following section is devoted to this partially unexplored area of Collins' production and specifically deals with *When Glorious Ptolomy by Merit rais'd* (84), *An Ode on the Popular Superstitions of the Highlands of Scotland* (56-64), and *No longer ask me Gentle Friends* (79-83).

4.3 «*Luckless Collins' Shade*»

John Baker underlines that caution is needed when considering Collins' poetry in the light of his imputed mental disease. Referring to the information provided by Dustin Griffin on Collins' life (2004, <http://goo.gl/BzLA8J>), Baker notes that the poet's mental trouble is believed to have become evident only in 1750-1751, and no available poem or fragment can be assigned to the period 1751-1759 (2011, 86). In other words, Baker not only discourages from reading signs of mental disease in Collins' writings, but also reminds us that no extant documents were written in the period of the poet's alleged insanity. These warnings are to be kept in mind especially when dealing with Collins' fragmentary unpublished production, which has sometimes been read as belonging to his 'distressed' years (e.g. Farrar Thaddeus 1965, 56-57).

As previously mentioned (§4.1), Collins may have interrupted all literary activity after his first crisis, but it is also possible that his later works are now missing. Richard Wendorf and Charles Ryskamp question the hypothesis that health issues prevented the poet from writing, given that «the evidence clearly points to a disorder of intermittent character» which could have hardly hindered Collins' poetical production (1979a, xxxv). In any case, most of the unpublished writings by Collins that have reached us were probably written between 1744 and 1746, and only three texts were presumably written around 1750. These include the poem now known as *An Ode on the Popular Superstitions of the Highlands of Scotland*, composed in 1749-1750[37], and the fragment beginning *When Glorious Ptolomy by Merit rais'd*,

[37] Charles Ryskamp and Richard Wendorf specify: «The poem has traditionally been dated from late 1749, but Lonsdale has pointed out that three incompletely dated letters from Home to Carlyle indicate that he may still have been in London early in 1750» (1979b, 162).

also known as *Recitative Accompanied*, probably written in 1750. «There is a strong possibility» that also the incomplete elegy *No longer ask me Gentle Friends* was written at the end of the 1740s or in 1750, as the material evidence of the manuscripts suggests (Ryskamp and Wendorf 1979b, 173-174).

As Ryskamp and Wendorf have emphasized, any attempt at establishing a precise chronology for the manuscripts is fraught with doubt. The only certainty we have regarding Collins' unpublished poetry is that it establishes a complex relationship of continuity and discontinuity with the *Odes*, as Sandro Jung has demonstrated with regard to *Ode to Simplicity* and the fragmentary *To Simplicity* (2010). In a similar line of inquiry, I wish to focus on Collins' presumably later compositions, which offer a new perspective on the poet's most recurring topics, including the questions of sight and perception considered in *The Manners* and the dangers of emotional excess treated in both *The Manners* and *The Passions*. It might be useful to stress that I am not devoting particular attention to Collins' alleged later production because I deem it to be anticipatory of his mental imbalance, or to search for symptoms of imminent mental trouble. I rather aim to propose a multifaceted picture of some of Collins' major themes, including in my discussions those texts that may contain further developments of the poet's ideas.

Among Collins' three presumably later poems, *When Glorious Ptolomy by Merit rais'd* is more evidently connected with the *Odes*, since the poet himself linked it to *The Passions* in a letter. In 1750, Collins wrote to William Hayes, who had just put *The Passions* into music, informing him that he could send two additional works on the same subject: «another more perfect Copy of the Ode», a text which was never found, and «one written on a Nobler Subject», «the Music of the Græcian Theatre» (Seward 1798, 384-385). The latter poem has been generally identified with *When Glorious Ptolomy by Merit rais'd*, which now survives as a fragment consisting of only eighteen lines. Because of the incompleteness of the documentation, any remark on *When Glorious Ptolomy by Merit rais'd* is necessarily approximate and very speculative. However, the differences between the available lines and *The Passions* are so striking that I believe they deserve some attention.

The unpublished fragment (Collins 1979, 84) exalts «Glorious Ptolomy» (line 1), who «bad the Dome of Science rise» (line 8)[38]. Reference probably goes to «the first Ptolemy», Ptolemy Soter, who «erected at *Alexandria* a museum or college […] for the support of those who devoted their time to the study of the liberal arts», attracting many Greek scholars to the city (*An Universal History* 1747, 418). The celebration of this event is then described, with Ptolemy sitting «High oer the rest» (line 13):

[38] The poem beginning «When Glorious Ptolomy by Merit rais'd» is published in Charles Ryskamp and Richard Wendorf's edition as *Fragment 11: Recitative Accompanied* (Collins 1979, 84).

His Fav'rite Bards – His Græcian Quire
Who while the Roofs responsive Rung
To many a Fife and many a tinkling Lyre
Amid the Shouting Tribes in sweet succession Sung. (lines 15-18)

The extant lines suggest that singing is performed by the Greek bards in Ptolemy's presence, a pattern which is clearly imitative of Dryden's *Alexander Feast*. Differently from the *Odes*, no personification appears in the fragment, and no mention is made of rapture or excessive passions; science and knowledge are explicitly alluded to and exalted. The bards are set in contrast with the «Shouting Tribes» and bring about harmony in a chaotic background: capable of producing «sweet» and, we might assume, soothing music, they appear as principles of order[39].

An image of bards playing an instrument also appears in *An Ode on the Popular Superstitions* (Collins 1979, 56-64), although its context and implications are rather different from *When Glorious Ptolomy by Merit rais'd*[40]. Reference goes, in the first case, to ancient Scottish poetry and its inspiring influence, which John Home is expected to enjoy after having returned to his native land:

Old Runic bards shall seem to rise around,
With uncouth Lyres, in many-colour'd vest,
Their Matted Hair with boughs fantastic crown'd […]. (lines 41-43)

The bards' aspect calls to mind the guise in which Humour and Wit enter the stage before Fancy in *The Manners*: the former wears a «Robe of wild contending Hues», the latter's «crisped Hair» is adorned with «Beams» (lines 48-56; see §4.2). *An Ode on the Popular Superstitions* rereads the artificial and illusory character of Humour and Wit's appearance by placing accent on the natural, primitive simplicity and authenticity of rural life. The bards' image is devoid of any artifice or craft: their hair is «Matted», wild, and garlanded with «boughs» instead of gems. Simi-

[39] In his comment on the unpublished fragment *To Simplicity* (ca 1746) and *Ode to Simplicity*, Sandro Jung remarks: «The sweetness of [Orpheus'] music has a soothing effect on his audience and serves as a remedy not only for melancholy but for aggression, violence, and an imbalance of the passions that may be understood in terms of a disorder or contamination of the spirit. Orphean song, in that regard, restores morality and natural innocence. It is thus a medium of Nature to use art to reanimate originary unfallenness. Simplicity – as Collins notes in the *Ode on the Popular Superstitions of the Highlands of Scotland* (1749) – can convey a message that […] cure[s] the "divine excess" of enthusiasm […]» (2010, 423). I believe that most of Jung's observations can be extended to *When Glorious Ptolomy by Merit rais'd*.

[40] For an investigation of the political dimension of *An Ode on the Popular Superstitions*, see White 2000, 29-60.

larly to *The Passions*, *An Ode on the Popular Superstitions* expresses nostalgia for a lost and primitive past, as revealed by the comparison between London's classical Naiads and the ancient pagan spirits that dominate Scotland (lines 1, 17). The «primal innocence» (line 167) of the rural land allows for remaining «to nature true», which might sometimes imply departing «From sober truth» (lines 188-189) and indulging in irrational thoughts and beliefs.

The lexical relationship between the «Wizzard Passions» in *The Manners* (line 11) and «the Gifted Wizzard Seer» in *An Ode on the Popular Superstitions* (line 54) establishes a further link between the two poems. After having considered the 'cheatings' of the eyes in the *Odes*, with the figure of the «Seer» Collins shifts his attention to second sight, frequently deemed to be a form of self-deception of the senses proceeding from melancholy and superstition. The poet's contemporary Martin Martin extensively treated this phenomenon, with particular reference to the western areas of Scotland, and defined it as follows[41]:

> The *Second-sight* is a singular Faculty of Seeing an otherwise invisible Object, without any previous Means us'd by the Person that sees it for that end; the Vision makes such a lively impression upon the Seers, that they neither see nor think of any thing else, except the Vision, as long as it continues: and then they appear pensive or jovial, according to the Object which was represented to them. (1716 [1695], 300)

Whereas Martin supported the existence of second sight, Collins' lines seem to attribute the phenomenon to a 'false idea' caused by fancy and seclusion: the Seer lives in isolation «in Sky's lone isle», «framing hideous spells» (lines 53-54). He is one of those «whose Sight such dreary dreams engross», who «With their own Visions oft astonish'd droop», and «When o'er the watry strath or quaggy Moss / [...] see the gliding Ghosts unbodied troop» (lines 57-60). *An Ode on the Popular Superstitions* not only re-states and reinforces the idea that unrestrained passions and fancy can be detrimental to the mind, but also suggests that it is easier to fall prey to these excesses when departing from society and its customs. This idea clearly emerges in the figure of the Seer, who inhabits «the Wintry cave» or «Ust's dark forrests» (lines 55-56), but it also surfaces in the image of the «Wandrers», cheated by visual illusion towards dangerous paths:

> What tho far off from some dark dell espied
> His glimm'ring Mazes cheer th' excursive sight

[41] Martin's work is also mentioned in Ryskamp and Wendorf 1979b, 168. I would like to add that similar themes are treated by John Beaumont (1705, 82-174).

Yet turn ye Wandrers, turn your steps aside
Nor chuse the Guidance of that faithless light!
For watchfull lurking mid th' unrustling Reed
At those sad hours the wily Monster lies
And listens oft to hear the passing Steed
And frequent round him rolls his sullen Eyes
If Chance his Savage wrath may some weak wretch surprise. (lines 95-103)

Unfortunately, given the incompleteness of the poem, the context of this section is not clear: lines 87-94 are missing, together with the whole preceding stanza, and we have no antecedent for «Him» or «that faithless light». The extant text only describes an approaching danger, a «Monster» capable of attracting (weak) people by 'cheering' their eyes. The wanderers' sight is «excursive» or, in other words, «apt to diverge from a definite course; prone to stray, erratic; digressive» (*OED*). Abandoning common ways of seeing, the wanderers believe a deviating perception and risk their lives.

An Ode on the Popular Superstitions repeatedly hints at the dangers of solipsism, revealing a new social dimension in Collins' production[42]. Leaving one's social connections, familiar lands – and by allegorical extension, accepted ways – can lead to the loss of the self, as Shaftesbury warned in *Characteristicks of Men, Manners, Opinions, Times* (1714 [1711], 202-203). This is the case with the «luckless Swain» (line 104): he abandons «his Flocks and smoaking Hamlet» to reach, «bewilder'd», a «dank dark Fen», and is drowned by a «Furious», «whelming Flood», with no hope of escape (line 104-120). Both the «Fiend» and the «Monster», who attack the swain and the wanderers respectively, are commonly identified with the «Kaelpie» (line 137), or Kelpie, a malign Scottish spirit of the waters which was believed to drown travellers. Collins' Kaelpie seems to assault all those who perceive or act differently, deviating from the 'norm', and annihilates them under a sudden flow of waters. Yet, the Kelpie fails in removing the swain from the world of the living, because the man's «mournfull Sprite» (line 127) goes back to earth and visits his widow. Trapped between existence and non-existence, the swain inhabits a different dimension, while his dead body still fights with the waters, «weltring on the Osier'd Shore» (line 136). The swain's story might allegorically allude to the dangers of exploring the most obscure aspects of the mind, a path which «forbid[s] All return» (line 111), can provoke a partial loss of one's identity and self, or exclude from the social order within which one resides.

[42] In the same line of thought, it can be noted that the opening lines of *An Ode on the Popular Superstitions* emphasize the significance of the speaker's «social name» (line 10), and much information included in the poem is presented as deriving from folkloric, shared beliefs and ideas (e.g. lines 20-21).

The luckless swain and his ghost can be connected with the mention of «luckless Collins' Shade» (line 72) in *No longer ask me Gentle Friends* (Collins 1979, 79-83), another poem which celebrates the rural environment[43]. This elegy concludes by stating:

> Whate'er within her Native Meads
> The Tunefull Thirsis sung
> Less to my Love shall He be Dear
> Altho He earliest paid
> Full many a soft and tender tear
> To luckless Collins' Shade! (lines 67-72)

Janice Farrar Thaddeus, one of the few scholars to comment on this poem, interprets the closing lines as a phenomenon of «split personality» and an «oddly schizophrenic vision»; she further notes that the poem «contains a disturbing confusion of identity, particularly because Collins is both dead and alive» (1965, 63-64). Apparently, Thaddeus assumes no separation between the poet and speaker and no clear split between the subject of enunciation and the subject of utterance, which, in my opinion, characterize *No longer ask me Gentle Friends*[44]. The speaker adopts the author as the topic of his discourse, in a play on the disjunction between the lyric persona and the writer. Such a play is complicated by the fact that the authorial self is fictionalized in the poem as a character who is seemingly dead, for other poetic figures are said to weep for his «Shade» (line 72). In a sense, then, Thaddeus is right in perceiving a disturbing sense of schizophrenia, because this unusual communicational situation comprises three entities: the speaker, the author, and the author as character, or signifier. *No longer ask me Gentle Friends* can be considered as an experimental text, which opens the way to new frontiers of poetic dialogism.

Paradox and disjunction are not limited to the last stanza of the poem. The whole text is pervaded by confusing allusions and sudden shifts of subject or perspective. The opening lines seem to devote attention to the social scene (also emphasized in *An Ode on the Popular Superstitions*) by referring to a circle of acquaintances:

[43] In Ryskamp and Wendorf's edition, the poem beginning *No longer ask me Gentle Friends* is published under the title «Fragment 10» (Collins 1979, 79-83).

[44] The concepts of «subject of enunciation» and «subject of utterance» are employed here in the sense indicated by Julia Kristeva in *Le Mot, le dialogue et le roman* (1969, 143-173), translated by Thomas Gora, Alice Jardine, and Leon Roudiez as *Word, Dialogue, and Novel* (1980, 64-91).

No longer ask me Gentle Friends
Why heaves my constant Sigh?
Or why my Eye for ever bends
To yon fair Eastern Sky
Why view the Clouds that onward roll?
Ah who can Fate command
While here I sit, my wandring Soul
Is in a distant land. (lines 1-8)

While the «Gentle Friends» show concern for the speaker's distress and nostalgia, his mind goes to a «distant land» in the East. The play on disjunction which characterizes the closing of the poem is here thematically anticipated: the speaker is physically in one place, whereas his soul is far away, in the lands where he longs to return. He is referring, as the subsequent lines suggest, to the southern areas of England, commonly identified with Chichester or Trotton, Collins and Otway's birthplaces respectively (lines 43-45)[45]. The 'schizophrenic' sensation mentioned by Thaddeus is heightened by the fact that the speaker of the poem shares a number of features with the author, including, probably, the same «Native dells» (line 45).

The lyric persona indulges, then, in memories of his past, to explain the reasons of his distress; the «wandring» of his soul is reflected by that of his thoughts. The second and third stanzas narrate the arrival of «Delia», a mysterious female figure that the speaker seems to have first met in his youth (line 20). Delia has often been associated with women encountered by Collins during his lifetime[46], but I believe that she can be considered as a fictional character, which represents the world of natural simplicity and chastely virtuous rural life, in the tradition of Samuel Daniel's poetry. The idea that Delia's figure can have a symbolic function of is substantiated later in the poem by the fact that the speaker introduces a number of other female characters. He mentions «a Maid» (line 49), the melancholic «Greenwood Nymph» who dwells «in her Bow'r» (lines 53-54), then a Muse (line 57) and «Laura» (line 60), perhaps another identity for «Delia». The reference of most pronouns and demonstrative adjectives is ambiguous or too vague, as in lines 57 and 62, making it impossible to establish clear relationships between these figures: Farrar Thaddeus rightly stresses that «one cannot be sure who is speaking, who is being spoken about, which nouns govern the pronouns» in the text (1965, 63).

[45] See Ryskamp and Wendorf 1979b, 187.

[46] «Delia» has been repeatedly identified with Elizabeth Goddard, with whom the poet was said to be in love. See, for instance, Ryskamp and Wendorf 1979b, 187 and Carver 1967, 74.

The complex and intricate interplay of the female personae's identity suggests that a dense and hidden web of intertextual connections informs the poem; even more importantly, it makes us think of the constantly «shifting Image[s]»mentioned in *The Manners* (line 30), emphasizing that not only sensory objects are susceptible of constant change and transformation, but also personal identities. One might note that «Collins», the character mentioned in the last line of *No longer ask me Gentle Friends*, undergoes the most substantial of these transformations, being reduced to a shade and probably deprived of his life *tout court*. The «ever varying» nature of the female characters, in addition, reveals a sense of playfulness underlying *No longer ask me Gentle Friends*. To some extent, this poem seems to anticipate Samuel Taylor Coleridge's poem *Names* (2004 [1997], 677-678), where the speaker asks his beloved to choose «what [he] should call her» among a list of traditional female figures: «Lalage, Neaera, Chloris, / Sappho, Lesbia or Doris / Arethusa or Lucrece» (lines 2, 4-6).

The subtle intertextual web underlying *No longer ask me Gentle Friends* can open the way to a tentative interpretation of the closing image, «luckless Collin's Shade» (line 72). In the fifth stanza, the speaker visits Otway's birthplace in order to encounter Delia again, and in the sixth stanza he says:

> I shew'd her there the Songs of One
> Who done to Death by Pride
> Tho' Virtue's Friend, and Fancy's Son
> In Love unpitied died
> I hop'd when to that Shepherd's Truth
> Her Pity should attend
> She would not leave another Youth
> To meet his luckless end. (lines 33-40)

Even in this case, Collins' lines have been interpreted with reference to biographical events and historical figures. For instance, it has been suggested that this shepherd may be James Hammond, author of *Love Elegies* (1743)[47]. I think that, as is the case with Delia, the «luckless» shepherd could be a purely fictional character, which is closely connected to the final description of «Collins» as a «luckless» shade and, incidentally, reminds us of the «luckless Swain» in *An Ode on the Popular Superstitions* (line 104). In particular, I believe that these lines contain a reference to the mythological figure of Daphnis, often identified with the inventor of pastoral poetry.

[47] On this topic, see Ryskamp and Wendorf 1979b, 188.

Daphnis' tragic death has been reported in numerous and varying accounts, but Collins' lines seemingly refer to a tale in particular, which has reached us in two versions:

> Welcker […] held that Daphnis was enthralled by a Nymph […] but jilted her; [she] pursued him and Aphrodite aided her by trying to revive his love; Daphnis however boasted that he would never yield to love and in anger and revenge Aphrodite made him the victim of a hopeless passion for a maiden, from which he languished. K. F. Hermann produced a modified account whereby Daphnis, having plight his troth to a Nais and agreed not to have intercourse with any other woman, excited the anger of Aphrodite by his self-control: she inspired a hopeless passion for a strange maiden […], from which he languished. (Ogilvie 1962, 106)

No longer ask me Gentle Friends seems to echo Daphnis' story as narrated in these tales: the shepherd is «done to Death by Pride», and was «Virtue's Friend, and Fancy's Son» (lines 33-34). However, it remains unclear whether the «Pride» mentioned here refers to Daphnis' conduct, or to the indifference of the maiden whom he passionately loved. Some eighteenth-century re-readings of this theme suggest the latter hypothesis is more plausible, as a woman is said to have «scorn'd his Love, and fled his wishing Arms. […] / She sacrific'd the Shepherd to her Pride» (Froud 1700, 2).

We might suppose that Theocritus' *Thyrsis* was in Collins' mind while composing *No longer ask me Gentle Friends*: in his first idyll, the Greek bucolic poet describes Thyrsis while singing a lament for Daphnis' death. Such a connection, in fact, can account for the otherwise puzzling appearance of «Tunefull Thirsis» in lines 68-71. In the light of this further link, the poem reveals a complex interweaving of themes, characters and symbols, which might be worthy of a brief recapitulation: Daphnis is evoked in the poem as the figure of a luckless shepherd who met his death for love. Equally luckless is «Collins», whom we may assume to be also (mysteriously) dead. Thyrsis, who traditionally lamented Daphnis' fate, is said to shed tears on «Collin's Shade». Hence, «Collins» and the «Shepherd» could both refer to the same character, a figure which is deeply related to the mythical Daphnis.

If «Collins» and the shepherd are the same person, this character, like Daphnis, succumbed to unrequited, consuming and incontrollable love after having tried to moderate his passions. According to this interpretation, *No longer ask me Gentle Friends* sheds new light on the dangers of excessive emotions, and suggests that any attempt at restraining their flow is destined to end in failure. Daphnis' story shows that feelings can be only tempered to a limited extent: human passions are not completely under the control of our intellect and will. This reminds us of Aquinas' *Summa Theologiae* (1267-1274), where passions, fear in particular, are said to be capable of overwhelming our resistance (1978, 1415-1416).

Collins presents this new discourse on human emotions in a context of a constantly mutable reality. Shifting identities, fragmented discourses and disjunction of form dominate this poem, making it not only the most original and innovative text in Collins' production, but also an ideal point of departure to look at similar procedures at work in Christopher Smart's *Jubilate Agno*, the poem of eccentricity *par excellence*.

5

MICRO- AND MACRO-VISION IN CHRISTOPHER SMART'S *JUBILATE AGNO*

5.1 «*For silly fellow! silly fellow! is against me*»

The disjunction and fragmentation which characterize Collins' *No longer ask me Gentle Friends* are commonly considered as central features of Christopher Smart's *Jubilate Agno*. This poem was written between 1758 and 1763, while the author was interned in a private madhouse at Bethnal Green. It has been described in terms of «disjunctive 'flightiness'» (Hawes 1996, 173), «fragmentary, posthumous extravaganza» (Balfour 2002, 35), «a deluge of images» (Moss 1981, 119), «not […] a work of art any more than a shattered stained-glass window is» (Frye 1947, 176), characterized by «chaotic associations […] and other signs of psychic confusion and despair» (Feder 1980, 194).

Harold Bloom further connects Collins and Smart's poetry claiming that, differently from some of their contemporaries, both writers «attain a transfiguration of the matter of common perception» (1962, 8). This procedure, which is at work in indirect and often obscure ways in Collins' *oeuvre*, becomes manifest in *Jubilate Agno*: as we will see, Smart gives a literal dimension to contemporary ideas about imagination, according to which:

> we can, by our Imagination, vary the Shape or Figure of a Thing and infinite number of Ways; transpose its Parts; and change its Situation and Distance, with respect to other Things; and make different Applications of Agents to Patients, from any we have ever seen or observed, or that perhaps are any where to be found. (*Two Dissertations Concerning Sense* 1728, 72)

Before entering into detailed analysis of *Jubilate Agno* and its transfiguring procedures, some preliminary observations on the atypical form and contents of the poem are needed. As is well known, *Jubilate Agno* is a highly experimental text, which consists of a formulaic collection of lines without rhyme, all beginning with the words «Let» and «For»[1].

[1] The only exceptions are the first two lines: «Rejoice in God, O ye Tongues; give the glory to the Lord, and the Lamb. / Nations, and languages, and every Creature, in

I. Natali, «*Remov'd from human eyes*»: *Madness and Poetry 1676-1774*, ISBN (online) 978-88-6453-319-3
ISSN (online) 2420-8361,

The poem treats different subjects in an almost encyclopaedic way and, among others, tackles questions of astronomy, gravity, magnetism, electricity, and light. Smart also lists almost all existing sea creatures, from the «Whale» (B124) to the «Holothuria» (B249), as well as most other animals, while humans are enumerated by nationality or geographical area. It is only recently that *Jubilate Agno* has been recognized as a 'fragmentary totality', an idea which lends itself to explication as what Philippe Lacoue-Labarthe and Jean-Luc Nancy call the «la logique du hérisson» («logic of the hedgehog»):

> La totalité fragmentaire, conformément à ce qu'il faudrait plutôt se risquer à nommer la logique du hérisson, ne peut être située en aucun point: elle est simultanément dans le tout et dans chaque partie. Chaque fragment vaut pour lui-même et pour ce dont il se détache. La totalité, c'est le fragment lui-même dans son individualité achevée. C'est donc identiquement la totalité plurielle des fragments, qui ne compose pas un tout (sous le mode, disons, mathématique), mais qui réplique le tout, le fragmentaire lui-même, en chaque fragment. (Labarthe and Nancy 1978, 64)
>
> Fragmentary totality, in keeping with what should be called the logic of the hedgehog, cannot be situated in any single point: it is simultaneously in the whole and in each part. Each fragment stands for itself and for that from which it is detached. Totality is the fragment itself in its completed individuality. It is thus identically the plural totality of fragments, which does not make up a whole (in, say, a mathematical mode) but replicated the whole, the fragmentary itself, in each fragment. (Barnard and Lester 1988, 44)

I believe that the concept applied by Lacoue-Labarthe and Nancy to the Romantic notion of «fragment» can also capture the multiplicity inherent in each of Smart's seemingly unconnected, fragmentary lines and images. Every living creature and every natural phenomenon cited in *Jubilate Agno* encloses a totality or a multiplicity, while also remaining self-sufficient and, to some extent, isolated. Smart, in other words, constructs a complex and organic structure that constantly reflects itself in a prismatic way, creating articulated correspondences between micro- and macrocosm; he dissects language letter by letter, and shows that every constitutive element of creation («word», B220) joins together in the whole architecture of forms («work», B220).

In addition to being an instance of «fragmentary totality», *Jubilate Agno* is also a poem of opposites and paradoxes. A revealing example in this re-

which is the breath of Life» (A1-2). It might be helpful to repeat that here Smart's text is cited parenthetically with indication of section (A, B, C, D) and line numbers, following Karina Williamson's edition (1980).

spect concerns its form: the repetitive «Let» and «For» lines re-propose the antiphonal structure of Hebrew psalms, so that most current criticism has considered the poem as primarily destined for oral delivery[2]. However, one might note that part of the text is conceived in strictly visual terms, and some of its lines acquire sense only if *seen* on the written page. Smart, in fact, observes that the letter «X» consists «of two check G» (B534): this statement can be understood by noting that the «X» is drawn on the manuscript by attaching two hooked semicircles[3].Other aspects of *Jubilate Agno* which will be addressed in the following sections of this chapter are similarly open to multiple readings and interpretations. For instance, the poem has been defined as both religious and heretical (Side 1954, 316-319), as a piece of private writing and a public text (Hawes 1996, 173, 189), as a «truly scientific» work characterized by a «deep regard for logic and a minute knowledge of facts» (Greene 1953, 332) and a «*fundamentally* unscientific» view (Williamson 1979, 411, original emphasis). In short, *Jubilate Agno* has brought about diverging scholarly views – and, remarkably, in most cases both sides of each view find support in the text.

My third point on *Jubilate Agno* is closely connected to the second. Smart's poem resists classification within literary conventions and, as Harriet Guest says, it «is […] unlike anything else written in the eighteenth century» (1989, 123). The argument might be raised that *Jubilate Agno* contains too many different kinds of eighteenth-century writing simultaneously: indeed, it has been classified as «the Augustan nightmare come to life» (Bertelsen 1992, 377), pre-romantic (Weinbrot 1995, 185), «not […] romantic [and] essentially neo-classical» (Cook 1968), and the work of «a romantic spirit fretting to decay in a neo-classic milieu» (Greene 1953, 329). Smart appropriates and re-defines elements from heterogeneous origin, in a wide notion of culture which goes beyond literary tradition. For this reason, most scholars have eluded questions of eighteenth-century literary placement by focusing on some specific sources of inspiration for *Jubilate Agno*, namely, the poetic diction of Horace, the Horatian concept of «curiosa felicitas», religious psalmography, and the rhetorical patterns of Hebrew poetry[4].

English psalmody underwent no major modifications for centuries, until William III authorized *A New Version of the Psalms of David* by Na-

[2] On this issue, see Bertelsen 1992, 366; Biele 2010, 93; Marks 2014, 24.

[3] See MS Eng 719 (Houghton Library, Harvard University), Fragment B, sequence 17. The photographic reproduction of Smart's manuscript is available at the Harvard University Library website, *Harvard University Library Page Delivery Service*, <http://pds.lib.harvard.edu/pds/view/18807694> (01/2016).

[4] See, for instance Sherbo 1957, 233-241; Walker 1980, 449-459; Mounsey 2001, 210; Meyer Spacks 2009, 181.

hum Tate and Nicholas Brady (1696). The new publication stirred up an increasing interest in proposing new versions of the psalters, as testified by Isaac Watts' *Short Essay on the Improvement of Psalmody* (1707). The new impulse consisted of paraphrasing and renewing old ways of praising God, which yielded results such as Watts' *Psalms of David* (1719)[5]. In the context of this heightened attention to psalmody, Robert Lowth held his *De sacra poesi Hebraeorum praelectiones academicae* (1753; *Lectures on the Sacred Poetry of the Hebrews*, 1787), which have long been recognized as one of the main influences on *Jubilate Agno*[6]. Lowth highlighted that biblical poetry consisted of «versicles or parallelisms corresponding to each other» (Lowth, in Bauman and Briggs 2003, 114), and scholars have assumed that Smart modelled his «Let» and «For» lines after the notion of binarism of Hebrew poetry.

From these remarks, it also follows that *Jubilate Agno* is pervaded by parallelism, repetition and, we might add, cataloguing. These techniques, of course, were not new to eighteenth-century poetry[7]: cataloguing, for instance, characterizes Swift's *The Lady's Dressing Room* (1732) and was widely employed by James Thomson. In 1728, the latter enumerated the wonders of nature in *The Seasons*, «Spring» (Thomson 1793 [1728], 10), where the «living herbs» are said to be so many that it is «beyond the power / Of botanist to number up their tribes» (lines 222-223). Thomson's *To the memory of Sir Isaac Newton* (1986, 6-14), published in 1727, is linked to *Jubilate Agno* both in form and content, for it joins «Nature's general symphony» (line 11) in praising a list of Newton's discoveries, ranging from the laws of motion to astronomy and optics. Smart's poem, in other words, adopts some familiar, if not conventional techniques, but brings them to the excess: the lists are too longwinded, too repetitive, or too large for mainstream literary standards of decorum and taste. *Jubilate Agno* accumulates words and notions, to reflect the fact that «the names and number of animals are as the name and number of the stars» (B42).

Because of this outpouring of language, the 'excessive' *Jubilate Agno* has commonly been read as a symptom of mental disorder[8]. Apparently, it was identified as a mad poem since its very production: «unpublished

[5] For further information regarding English psalmody in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, see Gillingham 2008, 158-159 and Marsh 2010, 410-411.

[6] The idea was first proposed by William Force Stead in Smart 1939, 297. William H. Bond shows that Smart had a personal relationship with Lowth in Bond 1954, 20. Later studies on the connections between Smart and Lowth include Hawes 1996, 208; Branch 2006, 161; Powell 2013, 114; Hawkins 2014, 103.

[7] For a discussion of eighteenth-century 'catalogues', see Doody 1985, 28-29. This topic is also treated *passim* in Wall 2006 and Meyer Spacks 2009.

[8] For further discussion of this scholarly tendency, see Keymer 1995, 97 and Stern 2014, 34.

for some 170 years», Clement Hawes says, it was «privately preserved as a 'medical curiosity', a case study in 'poetic mania', rather than as a poem» (1996, 175). *Jubilate Agno* was first published in 1939 by William F. Stead, under the meaningful title *Rejoice in the Lamb: A Song from Bedlam*. According to the available sources, the manuscript of the poem, now preserved at the Houghton Library, Harvard University, was acquired from Colonel W.G. Carwardine Probert, grandson of Reverend Thomas Carwardine, who in turn had received it from his friend William Hayley (Williamson 1980a, xxi-xxii; Wilson 1939, 299). For a curious coincidence, both Thomas Carwardine and William Hayley were friends of William Cowper, and it seems that they found Smart's manuscript useful to understand Cowper's mental trouble and help relieve him from his sufferings (Paley 1983, 47; Anderson 1974, 70).

The extant manuscript of *Jubilate Agno* consists of thirty-two pages, including ten single leaves and three pairs of conjunct leaves. Each side of the available pages contains a densely written series of «Let» or «For» lines: Smart never alternates the two formulas and, as the catchwords in the corner of each folio suggest, his text was organized as to maintain a distinction between the «Let» and «For» sections[9]. The sense of fragmentation often perceived in Smart's work can be partially due to the incompleteness of the available documentation. On the one hand, probably Smart never finished his ambitious poem; on the other, we might have only a small part of what Smart wrote of it. By analysing the extant materials, W.H. Bond argues that the «Let section was originally written on a series of eleven double folios, or forty-four pages, of which four and one half double folios or eighteen pages survive» (1954, 18).

Bond's study has been groundbreaking for an additional reason: the scholar has been the first to recognize a pattern in the «Let» and «For» lines, identifying some correspondences between the two sections. Although separated in the manuscripts, some of the available «Let» and «For» verses are closely related, and they agree page for page and line for line:

> Let Zurishaddai with the Polish Cock rejoice—The Lord restore peace to Europe.
> *For I meditate the peace of Europe amongst family bickerings and domestic jars.* (B7)

[9] All information on Smart's manuscripts is based on the digital archive of images in *Harvard University Library Page Delivery Service*, <http://pds.lib.harvard.edu/pds/view/18807694> (01/2015). The sheets containing the 1739 available lines of *Jubilate Agno* in MS 719 are of two kinds, the «Let» (MMSS 719.1-4, 9-12, 21-22, 25-32) and the «For» sections (MMSS 719.5-8, 13-20, 23-24).

In the light of this discovery, Smart's *Jubilate Agno* has been variously re-edited. Whereas William F. Stead had proposed the same arrangement found in the manuscripts printing each of its pages under a Roman numeral, W.H. Bond divided the text into fragment A, B1, B2, C and D, publishing the «Let» and «For» lines on facing pages. The antiphonal structure of the text is made more visible by Karina Williamson, who divides the text in four fragments (A, B, C, D); in sections B and C, she includes the corresponding pairs of «Let» and «For» lines on the same page. As in the example quoted above, Williamson employs italic types to distinguish visually the two kinds of lines[10].

Significantly, Smart's work has been presented with increasing editorial interventions over the years. We might assume that the feeling of 'confusion' that *Jubilate Agno* conveys to its readers was so pervasive as to require re-interpretation and re-organization of the original manuscripts; Bond and Williamson's editions emphasize that the poem possesses a logical form, and invite the readers to fully appreciate it. In so doing, it could be argued that they respect the original text only in part: Smart's manuscript always presents the «Let» and «For» verses on separate pages. However, giving sense to this 'mad poem' has long appeared a scholarly priority. Allegations of insanity have concerned, in fact, not only the contents and form of *Jubilate Agno*, but also the way it was composed and structured. In this sense, it can suffice to think of some unreliable anecdotes that are still circulating, according to which Smart would have «scratched» his poem «on the wall of a madhouse [...] during a lucid interval» (e.g. Blaydes 1966, 25)[11]. One might see in the history of *Jubilate Agno* a tacit assumption that Smart's madness prevented him from organizing his text, a task which was to be taken up by his critics.

For what concerns Smart's internment, William Ober (1970) offers us relevant information, relying on the hospital records of the period[12]. The poet was first confined in St. Luke's public hospital from May 6, 1757 to May 11, 1758; about one year later, he entered George Potter's private madhouse in Bethnal Green, where he remained until 1763. Smart seems to have experienced two 'moral' institutional managements, first under Dr William Battie, one of the founders of St. Luke, who openly criticized

[10] In the present study, the italics adopted in Williamson's edition are maintained only in block quotations.

[11] Sophia B. Blaydes quotes from page 248 of «The Athenaeum», 3095, dated 19 February 1887. Later, these speculations on the composition of *Jubilate Agno* were shown to be groundless; however, some scholars still mention them as partially reliable (see Biele 2010, 95).

[12] All subsequent information on Smart's life is based on Ober 1970 and Mounsey 2001.

blood-letting and other corporal practices adopted in Bethlem, and then under Potter, whose humane supervision has been often emphasized (Sherbo 1967, 130). Ober adds that the interval between Smart's discharge from the public hospital to his re-hospitalization in Bethnal Green «was largely occupied by petitions from his friends to have him admitted to the Incurable Ward at St. Luke's» (1970, 253). Evidently, the poet's condition caused great concern in those around him; it seems that the reasons for this preoccupation had to do with an unsuitable social conduct, but we may exclude that Smart could be perceived as an actual danger to public safety. Johnson's remarks suggest that the poet only made a frequent show of his religious zeal:

> Madness frequently discovers itself merely by unnecessary deviation from the usual modes of the world. My poor friend Smart shewed the disturbance of his mind, by falling upon his knees, and saying his prayers in the street, or in any other unusual place. […] I did not think he ought to be shut up. His infirmities were not noxious to society. He insisted on people praying with him; and I'd as life pray with Kit Smart as any one else. Another charge was, that he did not love clean linen; and I have no passion for it. (Johnson, in Boswell 1799, 459)

Lori Branch examines various testimonies of Smart's alleged insanity, including the above quoted passage. In the same line of thought with Clement Hawes, she emphasizes that Smart's habit of praying freely in the streets had political implications at the time: it «evoked seventeenth-century enthusiasm» and called to his contemporaries' minds the cases of Methodist conversion and religious fanaticism (2006, 159)[13]. As Branch further explains, at that time «Methodism could be equated with madness, and spontaneous prayer in public was not the sort of sentiment that appealed to the culture of sensibility» (2006, 159).

A comparison between Smart's and Carkesse's situation can offer some insights into the changes that the conception of madness underwent in about eighty years' time. Carkesse was probably confined for his 'furious' and antisocial inclinations, which seem to have included stealing, damaging properties and ripping his own clothes (see §2.1). Smart's contemporaries deemed his conduct as equally disreputable, but there is no evidence of aggressive behaviour: apart from the fact that he publicly exposed his delusions, «no man's wits could be more regular than those of Smart» (Thrale Piozzi 1794, 4). Hester Thrale Piozzi's comments about her friend's confinement are illuminating:

[13] On this topic, see also Devlin 1961, 81.

> While Kit Smart thought it his Duty to pray in Secret, no living Creature knew how mad he was; but soon as the Idea struck him that every Time he thought of praying, Resistance against y[t] divine Impulse (as he conceived it) was a Crime; he knelt down in the Streets, & Assembly rooms, and wherever he was when the Thought cross[d] his Mind – and this indecorous Conduct obliged his Friends to place him in a Confinement whence many mad as he remain excluded, only because their Delusion is not known. (1951 [1942], 728)

Thrale Piozzi reveals a new awareness that judging an individual's state of mind depended on his or her social appearance rather than on actual symptoms of disease. Of course, the idea that a person's public face was central to being defined sane was not a mid-eighteenth century invention: we have seen it at work in James Carkesse and Anne Finch. As early as 1651, moreover, Hobbes stated that even «the most sober men» who experienced temporary mental imbalance because of alcohol «would be unwilling the vanity and extravagance of their thoughts […] should be publicly seen» (2003, 62). Yet, from the 1750s onwards, new attention was devoted to social rules and conventions, and to what it could imply to break them.

According to David Hume, social norms were arbitrary in origin, but later they transformed themselves into a spontaneous and natural sense of justice which drew human beings toward the public good. Every individual was believed to pursue «a sense of common interest; which sense each man feels in his own breast, […] and which carries him, in concurrence with other, into a general plan or system of actions, which tends to public utility» (1768 [1739], 389). In this perspective, Smart had not undergone an internalization of the appropriate public behaviour, and he hindered the standard social functioning. In the light of Hume's remarks, we can also assume that those who contravened the social norm were lacking an 'inborn' procedure of adaptation; therefore, they could be considered as deviant in nature, or possessing a birth defect. This brings us back to the question of monstrous births (see §4.1), and the sense of destabilization of order they generated. Significantly, *Jubilate Agno* establishes a connection between monstrosity and insanity:

> *For I have seen the White Raven and Thomas Hall of Willingham and am my self a greater curiosity than both.* (B25)

Here, the speaker compares himself to two creatures that were considered 'monsters' at the time. Thomas Hall was a «Prodigy of Virility» who was «but three Years and two Months old» and already «four Foot high, his Limbs near as large and strong as a Man's, and his Voice deeper than that of most Men» (Mihles 1745b, 468). The source of the «White Raven» is more uncertain, but I believe that reference might go to Rob-

ert Boyle's work. When listing the extravagancies of creation, the scientist wrote: «I have seen a perfectly white raven, both in bill and feathers», and then added that the raven was the only bird in his nest to show this peculiarity (Boyle 1725, 45-46). Both Thomas Hall and the raven, thus, shared a common feature: they had a birth 'defect', which made them 'curiosities' for their anomalous features[14]. We may assume that another such defect characterizes the speaker, who, we are later told, is in a «house» for the «LUNATICK» (B123). The concept of madness that emerges from these considerations is still essentially 'organic', but not as corporal and physical in nature as in the preceding decades.

Returning to Thrale Piozzi's remarks, it can be noted that she draws a line between a private sphere, where mental vagaries would remain covert, and a public one, where threatening established 'manners' and conventions could not be admitted. In her discourse, moreover, the private realm seemingly coincides with secrecy, or being out of sight; as Lawrence E. Klein notes, «what people in the eighteenth century most often meant by 'public' was sociable as opposed to solitary (which was 'private')» (1995, 104-105)[15]. The idea that certain thoughts should be kept hidden or 'private' acquires a new prominence after the mid-eighteenth century, and is captured well in Sterne's *Tristram Shandy* ([1983 [1759-1766]): «so long as the man rides his HOBBY-HORSE peaceably along the King's highway, and neither compels you or me to get up behind him, – pray sir, what have either you or I to do with it?» (1983, 5)[16]. Smart's indiscretions, which included waking up his friends at night to have them join him into prayer, undoubtedly meant that he was compelling others to ride his hobbyhorse behind him[17].

The conflict between a private and public dimension concerned not only Smart's life, but also his work. *Jubilate Agno*, Hawes says, «defamiliarizes the boundaries between private and public» by «constant and abrupt

[14] For a historical study of teratological imagery in relation to otherness, diversity, and transgression, see Marchetti 2004.

[15] Kline adds that binary oppositions do not adequately explain the complexities of 'private' and 'public' spheres at the time. Today's view of 'private' as 'domestic' is partly the result of the nineteenth-century ideas of domesticity.

[16] For questions of madness in Sterne's novel, see Gozzi (1991), 37-38.

[17] I have analysed elsewhere (2016) Smart's first documented 'public act' of insanity – and his last before incarceration: *Hymn to the Supreme Being*, a poem published in 1756. Smart's contemporaries not only dismissed the literary quality of *Hymn*, but also read it as a first sign of mental trouble. Even more importantly, *Hymn* sets the tone for Smart's later production, as it anticipates some of the main tendencies of *Jubilate Agno*: it includes, for instance, the ideas of a personal relationship with God, sinlessness and exaltation of the self. In other words, both *Hymn* and *Jubilate Agno* textually enact some chief elements of contemporary clinical descriptions of mania.

"translation"» between the two spheres (1996, 173). In the following section, I wish to draw attention to what I have already defined as one of the paradoxes of *Jubilate Agno*, that is, the coexistence of a private and public dimension in its lines. I will try to show that Smart's focus is often on a communal sphere, as he seemed to believe that «the Bible knows nothing about solitary religion» (Wesley, in G.R. Cragg 1968, 65).

5.2 «*For Eternity is like a grain of mustard*»

Jubilate Agno has been defined in connection with confessional poetry or autobiographical writing, and its «true scandal», says Hawes, consists in subverting the «public dimension by "translating" acts of liturgical rejoicing into [...] the "private" author's existence» (1996, 176)[18]. This view has been articulated with particular regard to a portion of the «For» lines of the poem, which seemingly contain direct references to the author's life, or deal with his condition in the madhouse. Most of the 'journal-like' lines are included in MS Eng 719 sequences 5, 7 and 8, and start with the formula «For I». From a quantitative perspective, the parts which have been interpreted as being more strictly 'autobiographic' include roughly 170 lines of *Jubilate Agno*, which is 16% of the extant «For» lines and around 10% of the whole available text. I believe that the 'autobiographical' sections are open to various interpretations; as I will try to demonstrate, *Jubilate Agno* is 'confessional' in mode, but probably in a different way than commonly assumed.

Before undertaking the massive project of *Jubilate Agno*, Smart frequently 'played' with identities and fictional personas. In his written production, for instance, he assumed the character of Mrs. Mary Midnight, an imaginary elderly woman who even engaged in a correspondence with Smart himself, revealing the poet's «bizarre and colourful theatricality» (Wild 2008, 2). In other contexts of his life, too, Smart confirmed a tendency to enjoy acting a plurality of roles, to the point of extravagancy. The latter aspect was emphasized by Thomas Gray in a letter written in 1747:

> [...] And as to Smart, he must necessarily be abîmé, in a very short time. [...] he is amusing himself with a Comedy of his own writing, which he makes all the boys of his acquaintance act, and intends to borrow the Zodiack room, and have it performed publickly. Our friend Lawman, the mad attorney, is his copyist; and truly the author himself is to the full mad as he. [...] He acts five parts himself, and is only sorry, he can't do all the rest. (1816 [1747], 180-181)

[18] On this topic, see also Hawes 2013, 87-104; Miller 1999, 99-118; Hartman 1974, 435.

In my view, this context is pivotal to analysing *Jubilate Agno*, where this changing of roles not only comes into play, but also assumes a metaphysical dimension. I believe that the way in which we read some references to the self in the poem should be shifted from a literal to a figurative perspective, as is the case with some lines which are commonly believed to describe Smart's life in the madhouse:

For they pass by me in their tour, and the good Samaritan is not yet come. (B63)

Arthur Sherbo (1967, 134), Geoffrey Grigson (1961, 18) and Marie Mulvey-Roberts (2014 [1986], 12) are among the scholars who have interpreted this line in the light of Smart's annoyance with some indifferent spectators of his internment. According to these views, the «tour» is that of the visitors who came to enjoy the 'madhouse show', and Smart would be talking about the same phenomenon that James Carkesse describes in *Lucida Intervalla* (see §2.1 and 2.3). An allusion to actual circumstances taking place in Bethnal Green cannot be completely excluded here, but I think it is rather unlikely. Roy Porter underlines that private madhouses, Potter's institution included, «presupposed a high level of discretion, not to say secrecy» before 1774; the keepers wished to «avoid publicity» and «did not admit visitors» (1992b, 284). In public hospitals such as Bethlem, Andrews notes, «patients were exhibited at the behest of charity», thus to the purpose of collecting money (Andrews *et al*. 1997, 64). No such interest motivated private madhouses, where opening the doors to the public would be detrimental for business. Any reference to Smart's previous confinement in St. Luke's Hospital is also very questionable: William Battie, Smart's physician there, claimed that «the impertinent curiosity of those, who think it pastime to converse with Madmen and to play upon their passions, ought strictly to be forbidden» (1758, 68-69). All things considered, then, this line of *Jubilate Agno* may well contain no allusion to concrete aspects of Smart's life in the madhouse: in my opinion, it refers to the poet's internment only by analogy. Rather than with the biographical author, the speaker can be aligned with a character of Jesus' parables, namely, the man who was stripped of all of his belongings in the Good Samaritan story: the by-passers ignore him, and he is waiting for his rescuer.

Whenever Smart's autobiographical self might seem to emerge more clearly, the lines become highly metaphorical. *Jubilate Agno* encloses a wide range of enunciatory positions, which enter a complex relationship with the actual author; the poem lacks a clearly defined 'I', making any biographical reading highly problematic. In other words, I am suggesting that Smart often 'plays' with different identities in his poem, similarly to James Carkesse. The speaker adopts the voice of various biblical figures whose predicament can bear similarities to his condition as a confined

'madman'. In particular, he wears the mask of those who are stripped of their property, humiliated and delegitimized in the Bible – for instance, he repeats almost literally Job's words in 6:15, «my brethren have dealt deceitfully as a brook, and as the stream of brooks they pass away»:

> *For my brethren have dealt deceitfully as a brook, and as the stream of brooks that pass away.* (B74)

Job was deprived of all his possessions to demonstrate his loyalty to God, and was later rewarded for his faith. At least two other lines of *Jubilate Agno* reinforce the relationship between the speaker and Job by echoing the biblical text: they concern the 'strength of the loins' (B80, *Job* 40:16) and the image of a harpooned whale (B124, *Job* 41:26). A similar mechanism links the speaker with St. Peter, the apostle who used to be 'a fisherman' and then turned into «the fisher of men» (B110, *Matthew* 4:19), and whose life is exemplary of how spiritual honour is achieved through humiliation. The St. Peter theme, which concerns three additional lines of *Jubilate Agno* (B131, 138, 142) is interwoven with the pagan myth of the Fisher King, alluded to through the «King's Fisher» in the text (B30). References to the legendary and injured Fisher King introduce further ideas of incapacitation, including lack of strength and, possibly, emasculation. As I have already mentioned when discussing Anne Finch's poetry (§3.1), in *Jubilate Agno* the speaker is often represented as deprived of his virility, although temporarily: physical strength has not abandoned him (B80), and is awaiting full recovery (C119-129).

The subject of enunciation is further linked with the merchant of pearls in the gospel (B30, *Matthew* 13:45-46), thus reinforcing the idea that one's goods or strength can be momentarily dispensed with in view of greater future achievements (this is also suggested by the references to Job and St. Peter). In the same vein, he adopts the words of Abraham, who was promised a new land and «felicity» «at the latter end» (B16). Since «the life of the Lord is in Humiliation» (A51), obtaining a future reward entails suffering, fight and hard work:

> *For the Lord is my* ROCK *and I am the bearer of his* CROSS. (B94)
> *For I pray God to turn the council of Ahitophel into foolishness.* (B101)
> *For I am the Lord's builder and free and accepted* MASON *in* CHRIST JESUS. (B109)

In the above quoted lines, the speaker is related first to «Simon of Cyrene» (see also B162), who carried Jesus' burden, then to David, the warrior and psalmist who prayed God to «turn the counsel of Ahithophel into foolishness» (2 *Samuel* 15:31), and finally to King Solomon, the builder of the Temple of Jerusalem who also claimed that «all is van-

ity» (B287, *Ecclesiastes* 2:11). The story of these biblical characters can be seen as bearing analogies to Smart's condition in the madhouse, but the terms of such analogies are not entirely clear or straightforward. Biblical persons, moreover, are not the only references in the text: for instance, the poetic I must endure «twelve HARDSHIPS» (B139) like Hercules. As is the case with the Fisher King, pagan and Christian elements coexist: they are inextricable in the history of humanity, a history in which Smart sees a continuity of motifs and tropes[19].

In the so-called confessional verses, the speaker defines himself and his predicament in relation to various key figures of the Bible, or belonging to other ancient traditions; therefore, he possesses universal features characterized by these archetypes. The process, however, is one of analogy and not of identification; just as *Jubilate Agno* repeats but also renews psalmody and biblical tradition, its speaker often re-enacts archetypal figures while simultaneously departing from them:

> *For I am come home again, but there is nobody to kill the calf or to play the musick.* (B15)
> *For I am safe, as to my head, from the female dancer and her admirers.* (B140)
> *For I bless God that I am not in a dungeon, but am allowed the light of the Sun.* (B147)

The first quotation draws evidently from the parable of the prodigal son (*Luke* 15:11-32). In Smart's criticism, this line represents another example of how the figurative framework of the poem has often been read in literal terms: Karina Williamson puts forward that «it would appear from this verse that Smart was allowed a temporary release from the asylum» (Williamson, in Smart 1980, 14). Yet, it is not clear why Smart would perceive his return as a 'coming home', or why he would associate such an event with the themes of repentance and forgiveness. Here, the poetic I defines himself both in analogy and in contrast to the prodigal son, expressing a sense of frustration for having not received an expected but unspecified reward. Likewise, in the other «For» lines cited above the subject of utterance places himself in opposition to John the Baptist and the prophet Jeremiah, who was «cast [...] into the dungeon of Malchiah» (*Jeremiah* 38:6). By giving details about the terms of disagreement between two different situations, these lines also allude to an underlying similarity, which makes the comparison possible in the first place.

Smart's recasting of the biblical (and legendary) past does not necessarily imply that he is seeking to restore an original or primordial framework:

[19] Francesca Romana Paci emphasizes that the Cambridge School had much influence on Smart's tendency towards connecting pagan and biblical elements. The scholar adds that the hermetic, magic, cabalistic, theosophic and masonic elements of Smart's culture were all mediated by the Cambridge School (Paci 1983, 14-17). Incidentally, Paci's *Jubilate Agno* is the first and only translation of Smart's poem into Italian.

he is creating a new context, which stands in a metaphorical relation to the world of everyday life. The condition of the interned madman is akin to that of Job, St. Peter, Solomon, and many others; it has archetypal dimensions, mythological proportions, and humanity has been familiar with it since the very beginning of its history. Smart does not consider madness as a medical disease, as Carkesse or Finch do, and he is certainly not interested in its corporal aspects, or in treatments and doctoring. He looks at the effects and consequences of being imputed as insane. In them, he recognizes a general existential situation which has been represented and has repeated itself since the origins of humankind. Imputed madness and internment, moreover, are not individual conditions: private experience is lost in a shared, collective tradition. Rather than presenting his own state, Smart offers an emblem of it, where individual consciousness is the core of eternity, and man is a microcosm in a macrocosm.

In *Jubilate Agno*, the microcosm/macrocosm pattern is at work on various levels. For the case in point, it can be stressed that similar mechanisms for establishing analogy characterize both the micro- and the macrostructure of the poem. The figurative connection between the speaker and biblical or legendary figures reminds us, for instance, of the relationships linking patriarchs, priests and leaders of Israel with animals and plants in the «Let» lines:

> Let Othniel praise God with the Rhinoceros, who put on his armour for the reward of beauty in the Lord. (A28)

With Othniel, the first biblical judge, Israel fought a successful war; so, figuratively, he can be thought of as a rhino, a powerful animal wearing a 'cuirass'. In this play of symbols, allusions and cross-references, each individual is part of a timeless whole, which embraces all the creation and all times. Nothing has meaning on its own: the self must surrender to a totality which encapsulates him.

The microcosm/macrocosm correspondences entailing the speaker in *Jubilate Agno* can be further widened by noting the recurring motifs that characterize the «Let» sections, especially those concerning the conjunct prayers of biblical figures and animals. In these lines, most of the animal descriptions focus on attack or defence mechanisms:

> Let Joshua praise God with an [*sic*] Unicorn – the swiftness of the Lord, and the strength of the Lord, and the spear of the Lord mighty in battle. (A26)
> Let Jotham praise with the Urchin, who took up his parable and provided himself for the adversary to kick against the pricks. (A32)
> Let Samuel, the Minister from a child, without ceasing praise with the Porcupine, which is the creature of defence and stands upon his arms continually. (A44)

The 'warfare' subject is pervasive in the «Let» sequences, and it concerns both fragment A (22, 35, 36, 50, 74, 93, 101) and fragment B (4, 9, 17, 24, 27, 46, 114, 115, 125, 154, 160, 198, 210, 245, 249, 257, 258, 290); hence, *Jubilate Agno* centres on themes of danger, defence and battling. Besides the need to «parry the adversary» (A22), the other features which characterize the natural realm are isolation and confinement:

> Let Meshullam bless with the Dragon, who maketh his den in desolation and rejoiceth amongst the ruins. (A86)
> Let Pedaiah bless with the Humble-Bee, who loves himself in solitude and makes his honey alone. (A97)

For some of the «Let» lines dealing with warfare, isolation and confinement, a corresponding «For» line is available. Read in combination, the two lines reveal an analogy between the condition of the animal and that of the speaker. «It is the logical culmination of the primal quest for identity», Paul McGlynn says,«the universe imitates man» (1979, 364) – or, in our case, man imitates the universe. As a result, the text conveys an image of the subject of utterance as being secluded, «more unguarded than others» (B124), and constantly in need of heightened vigilance and protection:

> Let Elizur rejoice with the Partridge, who is a prisoner of state and is proud of his keepers.
> *For I am not without authority in my jeopardy, which I derive inevitably from the glory of the name of the Lord.* (B1)
> Let Bukki rejoice with the Buzzard, who is clever, with the reputation of a silly fellow.
> *For silly fellow! silly fellow! is against me and belongeth neither to me nor my family.* (B60)

Undoubtedly, Clement Hawes is right in defining *Jubilate Agno* «self-referential» in form (1996, 176); I would add that the poem is replete with hyperbolic self-referentiality in contents. In *Jubilate Agno*, the 'collective dimension' of the self is brought to an extreme: the speaker's predicament is shared not only by various key figures in the history of humanity, but also by most creatures in the natural world. The condition brought about by confinement allows for partaking in the whole, and in the natural mechanisms that regulate all creation. To borrow Maria Del Sapio's remarks on early modern scientific 'sight', in *Jubilate Agno* the human gaze affirms its right to observe both heaven and earth, both surface and depth (2011, 43)[20].

[20] In the original: «Lo sguardo afferma ora il diritto di osservare le stelle e i corpi terreni, l'alto e il basso, l'infinitamente grande e l'infinitamente piccolo; ma anche la ne-

Smart's metaphysical preoccupations with micro- and macrocosm are not devoid of scientific and philosophic overtones. In Robert Hooke's *Micrographia* (1665), «microscopic views of minute structures elicited analogies from macro-objects to micro-objects», so the scientist illustrated «cheese mold that looked to him like "microscopical Mushroms" and a gnat's antennae that seemed like "the horns of an Oxe"» (Copenhaver 2003, 539-540). For what concerns human beings, Thomas Browne observed that we «can call our selves a Microcosm», and invited his contemporaries to «behold and contemplate the World in its Epitome or contracted essence» (1642, 89, 115). In particular, Smart's philosophy seems to be akin to the so-called movement of Physico-theology; one of its major exponents, William Derham, wrote: «as to Man, we have […] such a Microcosm, such an Abridgment of the Creator's Art in him, as is alone sufficient to demonstrate the Being and Attributes of God» (1714 [1713], 264).

Even more remarkably, Smart's discourse on the interaction between part and whole is often related to specific questions that were being debated in the contemporary scientific world. In order to illustrate this interplay of ideas, I would like to focus on the lines concerning the «Toad» (here numbered in square brackets for quick and easy reference):

> [1] Let Tola bless with the Toad, which is the good creature of God, tho' his virtue is in the secret, and his mention is not made. (A29)
> [2] *For a Toad can dwell in the centre of a stone, because – there are stones whose constituent life is of those creatures.* (B412)
> [3] *For a Toad hath by means of his eye the most beautiful prospects of any other animal to make him amends for his distance from his Creator in Glory.* (B413)
> [4] *For a toad enjoys a finer prospect than another creature to compensate his lack. Tho' toad I am the object of man's hate. Yet better am I than a reprobate.* (*who has the worst of prospects*). (B580)
> [5] *For there are stones, whose constituent particles are little toads.* (B581)

Different questions converge and interact in Smart's discourse regarding the «Toad». As happens with most other elements of the creation, the toad shows affinities with the speaker, who compares himself with this animal in quotation [4]. The self is therefore related to a repulsive exterior image, in the same vein with line B25, where the speaker says to share a 'monstrosity' with the «White Raven and Thomas Hall of Willingham» (see §5.1). According to extract [1], however, the toad is unpleasant to the sight but

cessità di osservare le cose in superficie e in profondità, sì da possederne l'immagine e il volume» (Del Sapio Garbero 2011, 43; The human gaze affirms its right to observe stars and celestial bodies, looking upwards and downwards at the infinitely small and the infinitely big, but it also understands the need to observe both surface and depth, in order to get the image and volume of things).

hides a virtue. Shakespeare's *As You Like It* includes a similar reference to the toad's secret qualities: though «ugly and venomous», it «wears [...] a precious jewel in his head» (Act II, Scene 1, lines 560-561). As George Steevens explained in 1793, it was commonly believed that the head of the toad contained a 'magic' stone which functioned as an antidote to poison (in Shakespeare 1793, 254). In this 'toadstone', one could see «verie often the verie forme of a tode, with despotted and coloured feete» (Maplet 1567, <http://goo.gl/RjXlUq>), so that the image of the whole animal was reflected in one of its parts.

A stone hidden in the toad's head can make us think of the «stone of folly», namely the sixteenth-century theory that «folly, stupidity, and madness were due to stones in the head» (Gross 2009, 120), which led most physician to 'cure' their insane patients by skull trepanning. A connection between toadstones and stones of folly must have occurred also to various seventeenth-century writers, for the toadstone is linked with the spleen in John Jones' *Adrasta* (1635) and ironically attributed to «most physicans' heads» in John Fletcher's *Monsieur Thomas* (1639). It might not be excluded that the affinities between the speaker of *Jubilate Agno* and the toad include the presence of 'stones' in the head.

Lines [2] and [5] shift focus to a different belief of the time: various seventeenth- and eighteenth-century sources report stories of toads living inside blocks of stone:

> At Statfold, in Offlow Hundred, when the Steeple was repaired, the top Stone being thrown from the Pinnacle into the Church Yard, broke in two, and as they here positively affirm, discovered a live Toad in the Center of it, which died upon being exposed to the Air. (*The Geography of England* 1744, 162)[21]

Interestingly, in his lines Smart considers both the stone included in the toad and the toad included in the stone. This system of Chinese boxes, in my opinion, represents well the relationship between the part and the whole in *Jubilate Agno*: each microcosm is part of a macrocosm, and simultaneously encloses that macrocosm in itself. At the same time, quotations [2] and [5] allude to an issue which was heatedly debated in eighteenth-century scientific tracts: the «Matter of Fact» that «live Toads» could be found «in the Midst of Stones» had to do with the question of spontaneous generation, or the hypothesis that inanimate substance is capable of producing life. The Royal Society fellow John Ray, for instance, refuted the idea that toads could be «generated in the solid Stone», offering a number of alternative explanations of the phenomenon (1714, 323-324).

[21] Similar events are related also in Plot 1686, 247 and Bradley 1721, 120.

Together with toads, worms had emerged as objects of scientific discussion since 1669, when both Jan Swammerdam's *Historia insectorum generalis* (A General History of Insects) and Marcello Malpighi's *Dissertatio epistolica de bombyce* (Epistolary Dissertation on the Silkworm) were published. Contemporary speculation centred on whether, to put it in Smart's words, «the worm hath a part in our frame» (B37), since these animals were often believed to generate spontaneously in both inanimate substances and human bodies. Moreover, worms seemed capable of regenerating into two new and distinct individuals when cut in half, a fact that puzzled the scientific world. The Royal Society's *Philosophical Transactions* for the years 1732-1744 include a letter written on 14 March 1742 by Charles Bonnet, a Genevan natural philosopher, who wondered:

> Are these Worms only mere Machines, or are they like more perfect Animals, a Sort of Compound, the Springs of whose Motions are actuated by a kind of Soul? And, if they have within themselves such a Principle, how can this Principle afterwards appear in every distinct Piece? Shall we grant, that there are in these Worms as many such Souls as there are Pieces of the same capable of becoming complete Worms? (1747 [1742], 50)

As Janelle A. Schwartz emphasizes, questions of generation and regeneration «disrupted eighteenth-century ideas on the supposed boundaries separating plant from animal, animate from inanimate, life from nonlife» (2012, 190), and posed questions that, Virginia Dawson says, had «unsettling metaphysical implications» (1987, 17). *Jubilate Agno* embraces those metaphysical complications by offering a clear perspective on the issue: «For the Soul is divisible and a portion of the Spirit may be cut off from one and applied to another» (B388). The notion of 'quantitative' part is rejected in favour of the idea of the whole, an idea which calls to mind Aristotle's discourse on the soul in Book I of *De Anima* (*Περὶ Ψυχῆς*).

Smart's view on (re-)generation is only a small part of a wide and complex scientific discourse, which is often articulated in its metaphysical implications in *Jubilate Agno*. In the following section, I wish to focus especially on Smart's views on contemporary science, demonstrating how *Jubilate Agno* indirectly deals with mental medicine and with the definition of insanity.

5.3 «*For I am inquisitive in the Lord*»

> *For Newton nevertheless is more of error than of the truth, but I am of the* WORD *of* GOD. (B195)
> [...] *Newton is ignorant for if a man consult not the* WORD *how should he understand the* WORK*?* (B220)
> *For Newton's notion of colours is* αλογος *unphilosophical.* (B648)

Because of these remarks, *Jubilate Agno* has been seen as opposing Newtonianism, empirical science, or even the scientific system as a whole[22]. Therefore, scholarly attention has often focused on a more overtly philosophical plane, pointing out connections between Smart's poem and the conceptions of George Berkeley, Gottfried Wilhelm von Leibniz, and other thinkers who shared the belief that materialism removed God as First Cause. Karina Williamson has offered an innovative perspective on Smart's anti-Newtonian stance, suggesting that its roots are to be found in John Hutchinson's theories rather than in Berkeley's influence. In particular, she argues that Hutchinson and his followers «clearly answered the need for a philosophy which reconciled science and revelation, and restored belief in the divine origin and nature of creation» (1980b, 131). Francesca Romana Paci puts forward a more multifaceted view on this topic by considering a wide and detailed range of influences, most of which revolve around the Cambridge School and its adherents (1983, 18-20).

The question of Smart's attitude towards science is particularly environed with difficulties and doubts, since the poet's position does not always appear to be stable in the text. To put it in Noel Chevalier's words, «Smart's thinking was anything but systematic» and comprised «a jumbled miscellany of ideas, half-constructed notions, intuitions, and flashes of insight» (2013, 130). The only certainty we can have is that *Jubilate Agno* does not consistently declare against Newton's theories or, at least, it does not consider them in a methodical way. Most of Smart's 'scientific' lines are matter-of-fact statements about principles of physics, and deal with topics which were widely discussed in contemporary essays:

> *For* MOTION *is as the quantity of life direct, and that which hath not motion, is resistance.* (B161)
> *For Elasticity is the temper of matter to recover its place with vehemence.* (B164)
> *For the Skrew, Axle and Wheel, Pulleys, the Lever and Inclined Plane are known in the Schools.* (B181)

The almost didactic tone that we may perceive in these statements can be traced back to Smart's preoccupation with John Newbery's books for children, an aspect which Noel Chevalier has already analysed in detail (2013, 130). The smack of didacticism is coupled with another and even more relevant tendency: in *Jubilate Agno*, scientific phenomena are commonly related either to the workings of God or to the spiritual world at large. Karina Williamson notes that «*Matter, Motion, Resistance, Centripetal and Centrifugal forces* are the first five principles of Newton's *Principia*»,

[22] See, for instance, Greene 1953, Williamson 1979, and Powell 2014.

hence Smart mentions these concepts to «restate scientific explanation in spiritual and animistic terms» (Williamson, in Smart 1980, 38):

> *For Resistance is not of* God, *but he – hath built his works upon it.* (B162)
> *For the Centripetal and Centrifugal forces are* God SUSTAINING *and* DIRECTING. (B163)
> *For the* PERPETUAL MOTION *is in all the works of Almighty* God. (B186)

The shift from a purely material to a spiritual plane characterizes most 'scientific' observations included in *Jubilate Agno*, but the purport of such a shift is probably less obvious than commonly assumed. I believe that in these lines Smart is not restating physical principles in order to attribute them to God's intervention («Resistance is not of God»); he seems to be establishing analogies between physics and metaphysics, or between two different kinds of forces that are complementary and similar to each other. Smart's procedure, therefore, could be one of juxtaposition rather than substitution: the laws of nature are pictured as following rules that reflect and imitate God's direct activity and providential care, but they are not necessarily presented as dependent on his will. It can also be noted that the way these correspondences are established bears remarkable similarity to the procedures of analogy that connect the self with biblical or legendary figures, or with the elements from the natural world.

Before writing *Jubilate Agno*, Smart had already used Newton's principles to establish parallels with phenomena of a different nature, although in a much more humorous tone. Under the *nom de plume* Mary Midnight, he facetiously demonstrated that the laws of gravitation «mathematically proved by the incomparable Sir Isaac Newton» accounted for the «Necessity of a Man's keeping his Money in his Pocket», the latter being «the Centre of Friendship» capable of attracting people's consideration (1753, 28-29). If a similar mechanism of analogy were at play in *Jubilate Agno*, Smart would not be questioning or rereading the scientific discourse, but exploring the connections between physics and the spiritual or religious dimension.

According to this interpretation, Smart's attitude and the scientific discourse of his time are neither irreconcilable, nor distant. It can be noted, for instance, that a number of eighteenth-century physicians coupled or even intertwined the mechanist conception of a material universe with spiritual concerns. For instance, George Cheyne spoke about God's power of attraction on the human soul comparing it with modern gravitational theories, and Francis Lee mentioned Boyle's law of gases in connection with the Genesis (Gibbons 2000, 42). In other words, for the canons of the time Smart's stance can hardly be defined as anti-scientific, or even as anti-mechanistic. Exemplary in this sense is the case of the Swiss scientist Nicolas Fatio de Duiller (1664-1753), whose work has been analysed by Michael Heyd. Fatio became involved with the enthusiastic zeal of the French Prophets in the beginning of the eighteenth century, and proposed a reading of Newton's

theories which could «account for, and prove, the constant intervention of God in the world» (Heyd 1995, 257). Yet, Heyd says referring to Fatio and Newton's thought:

> [...] historians rightly stress that there was no necessary contradiction between the two orientations at that period. They place Fatio within Newton's circle and explain the links between his scientific and prophetic tendencies by referring to the conceptions of Providence and millenarianism prevalent in that circle. (1995, 255)

Although the general terms of Smart's 'anti-scientific' position may need reconsideration, there is little doubt that *Jubilate Agno* contains some direct attacks towards Newton and his work. As is well known, the theories exposed in *Opticks* (1704) appear to be at the centre of Smart's disagreement: for instance, the poet proposes an alternative classification of colours, as opposed to the inventory, or spectrum, provided in *Opticks*. Smart's criteria, in this case, are admittedly «spiritual» (B649); colours have different degrees of 'purity', according to their distance from «WHITE», «the first and the best» (B650).

Even more importantly than providing a new classification of colours, Smart underlines their variety, and their ability to transform themselves into one another. Thus, Smart says, «there are many intermediate colours» (B651); «GREEN» comes in «ten thousand distinct sorts» (B654), «purple works off to BROWN which is of ten thousand acceptable shades» (B659), and «Red» is of «sundry sorts till it deepens to BLACK» (B657). Newton seems to have forgotten not only the spiritual symbolism of colours, but also (and especially) their mutable nature to the human eye. Contrarily to *Opticks*, *Jubilate Agno* shows that colours are not fixed and immutable: they constantly change and often coexist, and their borders are uncertain, or even overlapping. Smart's observations closely resemble the concerns of Philippe de La Hire, a mathematician who considered how our perception of colours can be influenced by different mediums and contexts: «Le rouge pourpré & foncé ne paroît vif & éclatant, que lorsqu'il est exposé à une grande lumiere [*sic*]», and, in the shadow, «il nous paroît fort brun, & tirant sur le noir» (la Hire 1769 [1711], 171; trans. unknown 1742, 133: «the deep purple red only appears bright and shining when it is exposed to a strong light», [and, in the shadow,] «it appears to us very dark, and approaching to black»).

Harold Bloom defines the poetic procedure that entails constantly transforming the contemplated object as «transfiguration of the matter of common perception», and specifies that the authors who adopt this technique «proceed to dissolve the objects into one another» (1962, 8)[23]. Among

[23] On this topic, see also Bloom 1986, 165-184.

these authors, Bloom mentions Collins and Smart, with particular reference to *Ode on the Poetical Character* and *Jubilate Agno*. Bloom's statement can be supplemented by noting additional points of contact between Smart and Collins' discourse, which emerge especially in relation with our previous comments on Collins' *The Manners* (see §4.2). Firstly, Smart and Collins emphasize the subjectivity of vision, and suggest that the scientific world underestimates the «ten thousand acceptable shades» (B659) in which reality becomes mutable to our eyes. Secondly, both poets question the reliability of empirical science and its actual 'clarity'; any model of knowledge wrestles with doubt and relativity. In fact, the idea that knowledge is unattainable pervades *Jubilate Agno* on various levels. Language itself is seen as being devoid of precision and objectivity: «days» should be called «by better names» (C81), while «the right names of flowers are yet in heaven», so that «God» is asked to «make gard'ners better nomenclators» (B519).

We may suppose that Newton's alleged 'ignorance' claimed in *Jubilate Agno* does not merely consist in adopting a «mathematical rather than scriptural» approach (Walsh 2013, 129), but also in lacking the necessary instruments to attain knowledge. Such instruments have not been available to humankind since the fall, as Smart suggested in his early Seatonian prize poem *On the Omniscience of the Supreme Being* (1752):

> [Philomela's] science is the science of her God.
> Not the magnetic index to the North
> E'er ascertains her course, nor buoy, nor beacon.
> She heav'n-taught voyager, that sails in air,
> Courts nor coy West nor East, but instant knows
> What Newton, or not sought, or sought in vain.
> Illustrious name, irrefragable proof
> Of man's vast genius, and the soaring soul!
> Yet what wert thou to him, who knew his works,
> Before creation form'd them, long before
> He measur'd in the hollow of his hand
> Th' exulting ocean [...]. (1987 [1752], lines 86-97)

To some extent, therefore, Newton's errors can be thought of as inevitable to present humanity, which underwent an irreparable loss of knowledge of God's creation, as well as of Adam's divine language. At the same time, in Smart's eyes the scientist is unaware of the relativity and uncertainty of his findings, which are presented as absolute truths.

It is in this vein that Smart's disagreement with *Opticks* moves from the notion of colours to that of sight and perception. Newton's theories treated the body as a machine; discussing sight and the nerves, the scientist showed how human organs are passive receptacles of sensation. The «Rays of Light», he wrote, «falling upon the bottom of the Eye excite Vi-

brations», and these vibrations are in turn «propagated along the solid Fibres of the optick Nerves into the Brain» so to «cause the Sense of seeing» (Newton 1718 [1704], 319). Smart seems to underline that this mechanist approach does not account for the interaction of the body and the mind; in particular, it does not explain the active part played by human perception, which can hardly be seen as a passive elaboration of sensations. Newton's notions, in other words, do not consider or explain the complexity of sensory impressions in real life:

> *For the phenomenon of the horizontal moon is the truth – she appears bigger in the horizon because she actually is so.* (B426)

Smart's remark on the «horizontal moon» almost anticipates Goethe's famous motto «optical illusion in optical truth» (Goethe, in Zajonc 1995, 194): it suggests that the inner and the outer world interact and participate with one another. Reality shapes our impressions, but our perception in turn actively shapes reality. In this line of reasoning, Smart's disagreement widens from Newton's to Locke's theories; the latter's «doctrine concerning innate ideas» is «folly» (B396) because it assumed that sensation is passive, and equally passive is the «Perception of the Agreement and Disagreement of any two Ideas», which is involuntarily received (Locke 1706 [1609], 568)[24]. By confuting Newton and Locke, Smart also questions contemporary tracts which maintained that «in all sensations at least the objects are agents and ourselves the patients», and that «the mind can neither excite nor avoid nor change [a body] in any manner», remaining «purely passive to take whatever happens to it from external objects» (Tucker 1768, 6).

For Smart, sensation, perception and representation are not mere 'copies', or passive imitations of objective reality, but active and subjective forces. This principle entails corollaries that glide from science to the arts. «Painting», Smart says, «is a species of idolatry, tho' not so gross as statuary» (B671). As imitations of appearances, painting and sculpting cannot convey reality in the way direct sensation does under natural conditions. Visual art can produce a sort of indirect impression on the senses, and elude direct interpretation by an active subject. Subjectivity, for Smart, is comprised in the outer world, and is capable of shaping it; sensations are equivalent to an exchange with the material identity of reality. Accordingly, every creative process involves 'modelling':

> *For my talent is to give an Impression upon words by punching, that when the reader casts his eye upon 'em, he takes up the image from the mould which I have made.* (B404)

[24] On active and passive powers in Locke, see LoLordo 2012, 31-35, 110.

The idea of «Impression» also occurs in Smart's preface to his translation of Horace. Here, Smart identified among the Latin poet's qualities «Impression […], a talent or gift of Almighty God, by which a Genius is impowered to throw an emphasis upon a word or sentence […]» (1767, xii). The 'technique' of impression, according to Smart, has a twofold effect: first, it adds new shades of meaning to a single word or phrase; second, it modifies and de-familiarises the entire context. Therefore, «Impression» is not merely the distinctiveness of a word or phrase, but rather the interplay of that part of speech with its context to shed new light on the complete thought (and on language as a whole). Language is the symbolic identity of reality, and its constitutive elements reflect its dynamics; thus, using language for Smart is transforming or transfiguring, but not 'copying'. On a different level, the figurative re-reading of the biblical history in *Jubilate Agno* best represents this procedure: as we have seen, the speaker's predicament does not literally re-enact the past, but rather repeats it with variation. Incidentally, Smart's notion of modelling language again challenges Locke's thought, who maintained that «the use […] of Words, is to be sensible Marks of Ideas; and the Ideas they stand for, are their proper and immediate signification» (1706, 347).

In the light of the previous remarks, we might conclude that Smart refutes the existence of a mirroring principle connecting sensation and reality (or words and ideas). He seems to emphasize the arbitrariness of any connection between the senses, perception, and reality, denying that an external world of objects exists independently from man. Interpretation is at the core of the relationship between humans and the outer world, because things are defined by the relationship with the individual:

> *For I is identity* […]. (B521)
> *For I is the organ of vision*. (B546)

Line B546 can appear as a mere lively play on words. Yet, once read in combination with B521, it establishes a synecdochic relationship between the part («eye») and the whole («I»), suggesting that vision defines and is defined by the self, and the truth of the senses is not absolute. Sight is a subjective instrument of knowledge; just as there is not only one way of seeing correctly, there are not established ways to understand correctly[25].

As I have suggested earlier, *Jubilate Agno* does cope neither with the notion of madness as a disorder, nor with doctors and doctoring. Although Smart does not overtly deal with mental medicine in his work, his ideas regarding sight and perception are closely related to contemporary the-

[25] Smart often employs the metaphor of physical sight as an image of understanding. This metaphor is deeply embedded in Occidental culture; together with hearing, Loretta Innocenti remarks, sight has long enjoyed a privileged position as an instrument of perception and knowledge (2003, 11).

ories on madness, and obliquely question its basic assumptions. In the eighteenth century, the system of receptivity of the senses described by Newton and Locke, together with its connection to human thought, was foundational for the emerging theories of the nervous system and for the speculation concerning mental norm and deviance. The 'mirroring' principle that Smart contests was among the main criteria used to define the functioning of thought, as John Richardson indicated in 1755:

> […] *Thinking* may not unaptly be defined a Mimicking, or acting over again, every Kind of Sensation, performed by the same Organs, (in the more interior Parts of their Construction) but the impulse being different, and exerted in a different Manner, from that exhibited by real Objects. (1755, 6)

For Smart, thinking is not an imitative process, or a «mimicking» of the mechanisms of sensation; he defines an «IDEA» as «the mental vision of an object» (B395), and not as a fictitious representation of the object of sense[26]. Imagination and actual perception show no difference; reality is not the object outside perception, but the impression of the object in the human mind. Conversely, eighteenth-century science believed that 'normal' sensation, perception and thought should repeat faithfully the original object: any deviation from such 'imitative' pattern could be recognized as a sign of insanity. William Battie, Smart's physician in St. Luke Hospital, wrote in his groundbreaking essay:

> […] that man and that man alone is properly mad, who is fully and unalterably persuaded of the Existence or of the appearance of any thing, which either does not exist or does not actually appear to him, and who behaves according to such erroneous persuasion. […] Madness, or false perception, [is] a præternatural state or disorder of Sensation Madness, or false perception […]. (1758, 6)

In Battie's view, madness is primarily a malfunctioning of sensation and perception. To devise his definition of insanity, probably the physician relied on Herman Boerhaave's models of illusion or 'primary imagination', exposed in connection with an explanation of mental deviance. Significantly, Boerhaave and Battie propose the same example to demonstrate that illusions can be deceptive: when we press an eye with a finger,

[26] In eighteenth-century scientific discourse, only what is perceived through the senses is real; other images are «Fictions of the mind» (Berkeley 1734 [1710], 64). John Locke expresses similar concepts in *An Essay concerning Humane Understanding* (1706 [1690], 264) and Hume defines the belief in the existence of the mind as «fiction» (see Loeb 2010, 322). On Smart's perception of 'reality', see also Easton 1999, 161-163.

we see fiery sparks, «ac quidem [...] ab ipso igne extra me existente oblata est» (Boerhaave 1751 [1739], 223; [Translator Unknown] 1745, 258: «as if [they] arose from fire existing without and placed before the eyes»)[27]. Boerhaave further explains that particularly vivid illusions cause a «fortissima persuasio», lead the individual to act accordingly, and thus open the way to madness (Boerhaave 1751 [1739], 224; [Translator Unknown] 1745, 259: «strong persuasion»). In this process, Akihito Suzuki emphasizes, the human mind is again considered as playing a passive role, and it functions abnormally because of a powerful external stimulus (1992, 258).

It is worth emphasizing that Boerhaave and Battie inaugurated a novel stance on mental disorder, marking a definitive shift from humoral (or metabolic) towards neuronal theories, and abandoning the traditional classification of mental affections into madness, melancholy and frenzy. In this regard, Battie distinguished between «original» and «consequential» insanity, which found their causes in internal disorders or external pressures «of the medullary substance» contained in the nerves (1758, 43-44). Smart's view questions Battie's theories at their root and on different levels. In the first place, Smart denies the passive role of the human mind in sensation and perception; in the second place, he sheds doubts on the validity of a distinction between categories such as 'internal' and 'external', showing that patterns of influence are never unidirectional, but rather reciprocal. The boundaries of the 'self' become so porous in *Jubilate Agno* as to make it impossible to offer any definition of madness, or of 'normal' thought. Such a definition was, instead, central to Battie's *Treatise*, as Richard Stern underlines; the scholar notes that, while Battie tried to identify insanity and draw its boundaries in order to cure it effectively, «the idea of confinement as a means to treat illness is afforded no reality by Smart» (2014, 23). In other words, Smart rejects the idea of any 'intellectual' disorder, suggesting that the mind can be only affected by moral deviations.

Issues regarding sense and perception are not the only instance of Smart's veiled argument against contemporary mental science. The lists and catalogues included in the 'taxonomic' «Let» sections of *Jubilate Agno* have the function of casting doubt on contemporary scientific models, including those concerning insanity. Smart's listing procedures, in fact, raise questions regarding not only the criteria for selection, but also the epistemological methods adopted; in order to illustrate them, I would like to focus on the lines concerning animals.

As a premise, it is worth stressing that the «Let» sections of *Jubilate Agno* contain an unconventional recasting of Noah's ark, in which an Adam-like

[27] The same example is mentioned in Battie 1758, 42: «the eye that is violently struck immediately sees flames flash before it».

speaker names God's creation while expressly claiming to be deprived of a divine language (e.g. C40). This naming procedure as a whole bears only tenuous references to the Genesis; in *Jubilate Agno*, for one thing, animals are mentioned in connection with human beings, with whom they share attitudes, characteristics and conditions. In Derrida's terms, we might argue that *Jubilate Agno* denies the position of human supremacy typical of logocentrism, which presupposes that the animal is «privé de logos, privé du pouvoir-avoir le logos» (Derrida 2006, 48; Wills 2008: «deprived of the logos, deprived of the can-have-the-logos»). In addition, Smart's poem somehow re-reads the biblical procedure that, according to Derrida, anticipated the expulsion from Eden; by eliminating the awareness of man's distinction from animals, Smart's Adam-like lists do not produce difference. Difference is avoided also within the animal realm, since the catalogues included in the «Let» lines do not seem to follow any hierarchical scale of creation; there are neither correspondences with the arrangement of living beings proposed in the Bible, nor with extant scientific taxonomies[28]. Therefore, Smart challenges contemporary preoccupations with schemes and ordering of knowledge, and the fact that «the natural world was reduced into classifications based on analysis and, increasingly, on observation» (McKitterick 2006, 603).

The questions of both animal difference and cataloguing are intimately related to the eighteenth-century medical discourse concerning insanity. Contemporary classifications did not concern *naturalia* alone: physicians often indicated the characteristics of madness through categorizations of the insane, or «human animals», to use Edward Moore's words (Fitz-Adam [pseud. Moore] 1757, 200-201). Richard Blackmore talked about the different types of mentally disturbed people as «the numerous subordinate Classes of these ambiguous Animals» (1725b, 265). The physician's presupposition was that the insane should be categorized within or in connection with the animal realm, for their absence of «sense and ingenuity» (274); with this in mind, he examined the «Set[s] of these capricious Animals», clarifying their distinctive features (266). Smart's lists undermine this kind of discourse, subverting it with a mechanism that reminds us of the fourth book of Jonathan Swift's *Gulliver's Travels* (1726)[29]. Yet, while Swift

[28] Smart repeatedly refers to Pliny the Elder's *Naturalis historia* (*Natural History*) as the main source for his lines (e.g. B620, D16, etc.). However, it seems that Smart's main source might have been more recent, as he mentions the «rackoon» (A87): this term was introduced in the seventeenth century, during the early colonization of North America, and the animal was first classified by Linnaeus (1758, «*ursus lotor*»). For the history of the term «raccoon», see Romaine 2001, 164.

[29] It may be useful to emphasize that the idea of madness as a reversal of all hierarchies and classifications has been tackled not only by Foucault (2006a) but also by Mikhail Bakhtin (1984) and Cesare Segre (1990).

represents an ironic inversion between the human and the animal, Smart suggests an analogy, if not an identification, between the two categories.

Smart shows that animality is an innate part of our nature, and not necessarily as a marker of savagery. Animals represent the origins, the infancy of humankind; with humans, they keep participating in the same natural and divine laws. In order to define and fix their identity, Smart suggests, our species rejects animality and denies evident analogies and commonalities with the natural world. Similarly, in order to define rationality, the human culture elaborates procedures of distinction, categorization and exclusion; and, as Clement Hawes aptly remarks, «the real achievement of *Jubilate Agno* lies in its struggle to neutralize the conflict between inclusive and exclusive space» (1996, 210-211), between an inside and an outside of thought, self, nature, history, and culture.

6

A 'MORAL EYE' IN WILLIAM COWPER'S EARLY POETRY

6.1 «*My continual misery*»

William Cowper can be seen as a liminal figure between two centuries, as Meyer Spacks suggests; he was able to «foretell developments of the Romantic period in the early nineteenth century», while also «[recapitulating] literary patterns of the century now nearing its end» (2009, 251). As for the relationships between literature and the history of medicine, Cowper's role is similar: his works represent a turning point, and combine traditional and new perspectives on the human mind, its functioning and health.

In line with the chronological boundaries of this study, the years 1676-1774, the present chapter is limited to Cowper's early poetry. In particular, I wish to focus on the verse written after Cowper's first and second 'nervous' attacks (1763 and 1773) and the poems that cope directly with his experience of insanity: *Hatred and vengeance*, also known as *Lines Written during a Period of Insanity* (first dated 1763, but later re-assigned to 1774), *Heu! Quam remotus vescor [ab] omnibus* (*Far from my natal roof I sigh*, as translated by Alfred Gough), or *Lines Written during the Author's Second Period of Insanity* (1774), and *The Shrubbery: Written in a Time of Affliction* (presumably dated either 1773 or 1779-1780)[1]. I will also consider *Olney Hymns*, authored in collaboration with John Newton; around 1770 Cowper wrote sixty-six poems for this collection, which kept him «in a *constant fever*», «heated his brain, Sunk his Spirits and brought on that dreadful depression» and «rendered him Miserable during the Space of 7 years» (Hesketh in Baird and Ryskamp 1980b, xvi, original emphasis)[2]. Together with Cowper's verse, I will also analyse the author's *Memoir*, a spiritual autobiography which contains a fictional re-reading of the expe-

[1] For information about the dates of composition of Cowper's early poetry, see Baird and Ryskamp 1980a, 462-564.

[2] These remarks are included in Lady Hesketh's letter to William Hayley, dated 30 August 1801.

I. Natali, *«Remov'd from human eyes»: Madness and Poetry 1676-1774*, ISBN (online) 978-88-6453-319-3
ISSN (online) 2420-8361, CC BY-NC-ND 3.0 IT, 2016 Firenze University Press

rience of mental disorder. This text was first published in 1816, but presumably written between 1766 and 1767.

Much critical focus has concerned Cowper's 'major' poems, especially *The Task* (1785). This work has often been read in the light of the author's religious fervour within the Evangelical movement, and interpreted with particular attention to the enclosed spaces, or the rural settings that it portrays[3]. Most scholars agree in emphasizing the lack of unity of its lines, which can be the sign, Joseph Musser says, of «[Cowper's] psychological inability to find in his personality the integration he needs for sanity» (1979, 506)[4]. Mental health and «religious agony» have also been central themes to the interpretation of *The Castaway* (1803), presumably the last poem that Cowper wrote in 1799, shortly before his death[5]. Cowper's hymns and 'minor' writings have received less attention, but they are generally recognized as important elements in the tradition of enthusiasm in the latter half of the eighteenth century[6].

Among the 'mad' poets considered in this study, Cowper stands out as a remarkable exception: he was the only one to enjoy great literary success during his lifetime. Despite the stigmatizing experience of the madhouse, he attracted a wide audience of contemporaries, whereas the fortunes of Carkesse, Finch, Collins and Smart vacillated. As already mentioned, we know very little about James Carkesse, whose *Lucida Intervalla* probably reached a niche of readers; Finch became briefly well known for *The Spleen*, but her works were recovered and re-evaluated only in the twentieth century. The cold reception of Collins' poetry has long been assumed to have triggered his mental trouble; by contrast, Smart's 'madness' and institutionalization caused his literary decline. The winner of several Seatonian Prizes, Smart experienced an enormous fall, which was epitomized in September 1763 by the «Monthly Review» through a quotation from Milton's *Samson Agonistes*: «By how much from the top of wondrous glory / To lowest pitch of abject fortune art thou fall'n» («Monthly Review»,

[3] In particular, Dustin Griffin proposes an interesting reading of *The Task* as a new georgic (1990, 865-879), W. Gerald Marshall analyses the contrast between country and city life in connection with Cowper's Christian faith (1987), and Deborah Heller stresses the presence of biographical elements in *The Task* (1995). It has also been noticed that Cowper re-read the *topos* of *vita agrestis* and authors such as Propertius, Tibullus, Vergil and Horace.

[4] Questions of mental trouble are suggested also in Menely's eco-critical analysis (2012).

[5] See, for instance, Brunström 2004, 128.

[6] With Cowper, says Maria Stella, the hymn tradition pictures enthusiasm as a prelogic state of perception of the canticle of the creatures and nature («nell'ottica di questa tradizione l'entusiasmo è uno stato prelogico di percezione del cantico delle creature della natura», 1998, 207).

29, in Mounsey 2001, 258). Cowper enjoyed a moderate success with his first publications; then, he was acclaimed by both critics and readers for *The Task*. Until his death in 1800, he was one of the most famous and celebrated living poets in England. In other words, at least in the eighteenth century, he was never denied a legitimate position as a writer, or a place in the canon of English literature.

It has been suggested that Cowper's themes of domesticity, sensibility, and religious virtue well appealed to the middle-class public in the last two decades of the eighteenth century (Hess 2005, 129-130). One might add that something had changed in the common perception of mental disease, so that the «humiliating stereotypes of mad people», to use Hilary Clark's words (2008, 57), did not affect Cowper's social figure and literary career. To some extent, Cowper's mental trouble could have partially accounted for his success in a period which saw a temporary fascination for strong passions and nervous sensations. When such fascination disappeared, Cowper's readership underwent rapid changes: less than two decades after the poet's death, a very different feeling developed towards his person and works. Focus shifted on Cowper's supposed weakness and «effeminacy», which, Hazlitt wrote in 1818, «shrinks from and repels common and hearty sympathy» (1870 [1818], 121). Conjointly, new attention was devoted to his supposed melancholic condition, which came to be associated with other kinds of deviance from the norm. In particular, rumours spread concerning some alleged «defect» concerning his sexual sphere. Charles C.F. Greville reported in 1834:

> There is one curious fact […] which accounts for much of Cowper's morbid state of mind and fits of depression, as well as for the circumstances of his running away from his place in the House of Lords. He was a Hermaphrodite. It relates to some defect in his physical conformation; somebody found out his secret, and probably threatened its exposure. (1927 [1834], 135)[7]

This gendered view on Cowper is noteworthy on different levels. On the one hand, it turns the writer into a 'material' embodiment of the Romantic model of «poetical effeminacy»[8] and reinforces a connection between femininity and madness that was undermined in the mid-eighteenth century (§4.1). On the other, through the idea of a physical defect,

[7] On Greville's text, see also Ryskamp 1959, 135.

[8] The idea of Romantic «poetic effeminacy» has been discussed especially in connection with Keats. An in-depth analysis of Keats' 'femininity' is provided in Cox 1996, 11-15 and 81-106. A recent collection of essays edited by Lilla Maria Crisafulli and Cecilia Pietropoli considers in detail the dialectic between masculine and feminine poetics during the Romantic period (2002); in this collection, see in particular Bandiera's essay on William Cowper (2002).

it points to an organic origin for Cowper's behavioural issues; it postulates not only a rational explanation for nervous weakness, but also the existence of a bodily, or birth 'mark' associated to it, as in most traditional views on madness (§4.1; 5.1). The study of conflicting nineteenth-century receptions of Cowper has provided good grounds for discussing gendered standards and prejudices in the history of England[9]. Even more significantly for the topic at hand, the nineteenth-century change in Cowper's reception proves to be connected with a shift in the conception of (male) nervousness. As Heather R. Beatty explains, «the heightened threat of military invasion by the French [...] prompted popular fears of 'soft soldiers', and a consequent portrayal of nervous males as effeminate weaklings» (2012, 143). In the medical field, a similar turning point towards a negative view on nervous affections can be identified as early as 1808, with Thomas Trotter's *View of the Nervous Temperament*. Here, Trotter recognized the «depravity» of the city as one of the main causes of nervous trouble and defined its sufferers as subject to «religious melancholy, and enthusiasm; jealousy, avarice, insatiable revenge, boundless ambition [...], and some species of pride» (1808, 87).

«Lo, and behold, the nerves have vanished!» announced «The London Magazine» in 1825, referring to the previous decades as to the period «when nerves were the fashion» and «every body had the nerves and nervous disorders; and took nervous medicines» (*On Fashions in Physic* 1825, 178). Indeed, in the last two decades of the eighteenth century, medical attention concentrated on the nervous system, and a set of new terms became available to define mental disorder. 'Nerves' were nothing new: they had played a role in the definition of insanity since Willis and Sydenham, and came to be considered as the primary seat of the illness with Boerhaave and George Ernst Stahl[10]. After Cheyne and Whytt connected nervous affections with civility, or a positive sign of refinement and virtue, the way was paved to the establishment of a 'fashionable disease'[11]. The predominance of new notions, however, does not imply that traditional views on madness were abandoned. As James Adair suggested

[9] On this topic, see Elfenbein 1999, 63-89 and Keith 2005.

[10] On this topic, see Rocca 2007.

[11] See, in particular, Cheyne 1733 and Whytt 1765. Robert Whytt's work emphasizes the broad definition of 'nerve disease' and its understanding at the time. The physician wrote: «All diseases may, in some sense, be called affections of the nervous system [...]. However, those disorders may peculiarly deserve the name of NERVOUS, which, on account of an unusual delicacy, or unnatural state of the nerves, are produced by causes, which, in people of a sound constitution, would either have no such effects, or at least in a much less degree» (Whytt 1765, 93-94). Whytt's theories implied, among other things, «reimagining the nature of the human as fundamentally neurological» (Bassiri 2013, 428). On this topic see also Fisher-Homberger 1983, 47.

in 1786, in some cases the former notions of hysterical and hypochondriac illness were merely renamed:

> Upwards of thirty years ago, a treatise on nervous diseases was published by [...] Dr. Whytt, professor of physick, at Edinburgh. Before the publication of this book, people of fashion had not the least idea that they had nerves; but a fashionable apothecary of my acquaintance, having cast his eye over the book, and having been often puzzled by the enquiries of his patients concerning the nature and causes of their complaints, derived from thence a hint, by which he readily cut the gordian knot – «*Madam, you are nervous!*» The solution was quite satisfactory, the term became fashionable, and spleen, vapours, and hyp [hypochondria], were forgotten. (Adair 1786, 14, original emphasis)

Heather Beatty emphasizes how the new orientation influenced the literary production of the time, from Richardson's *Sir Charles Grandison* (1754) onwards (2012, 22-24). The 1760s and 1770s are particularly rich in novels and characters related to nervous disorders, of which Henry Mackenzie's *Man of Feeling* (1771) is probably the most representative example. In the same period, one might also mention Frances Sheridan's *Memoirs of Miss Sidney Bidulph* (1761), Oliver Goldsmith's *Vicar of Wakefield* (1762), Henry Brooke's *The Fool of Quality* (1770) and Tobias Smollett's *Expedition of Humphry Clinker* (1771)[12]. Debilitated heroes and heroines were a result of the new fascination for nervous weakness, and, at the same time, they contributed to consolidate the new interest in 'nerves'. As for poetry, the revaluation of verse writing that we have seen at play during William Collins' lifetime further developed into a positive attitude towards madness, or rather, towards two ideas related to it: melancholy and sublimity. Max Byrd comments on this respect:

> [...] we can see how the new age came to create literature deliberately out of the irrational parts of the human self that the Augustans had regarded as anarchic and insane, for melancholy and sublimity are two openly irrational experiences that transform men (temporarily) into good likenesses of madmen. (1974, 116)

Fashionable forms of madness, that is, temporary states of debilitation or lesser distempers were increasingly becoming literary subjects. However, not much had changed in the conception of 'actual' insanity. In 1781, Alexander Thomson still connected acute «nervous disorders» with an «irregular motion of the animal spirits», malfunctioning of the

[12] See also Benedetta Bini's essay on the novel of sentiment in Franca Ruggieri's collection focusing on the Age of Johnson (1998) and Gemma Persico's study of Mackenzie (1996).

digestive tract, or «menstrual irregularities», as was the case with hypochondria and hysteria decades earlier (1781, 27, 9).

The management of mental hospitals was a vivid example of this dialectical tension between tradition and innovation. Jonathan Andrews stresses that Cheyne, Blackmore and Mandeville had already eroded «the brutal, unfeeling image of the mad», by relating «emotive accounts of the distressed patients» and treating insanity as an illness that deserved sympathy (1991, 65)[13]. Yet, it was with the controversy between William Battie, founder of St. Luke, and John Monro, First Physician at Bethlem, that the seeds of new concepts of mental therapy were sown. Battie opposed bodily treatments and the presence of visitors in mental hospitals; Monro partially agreed with his fellow physician at least on these points, and added:

> Great art should be made use of [by the physician] in breaking all ill habits. [...] [Patients] should be accustomed to obey, and though talked to kindly, it should still be with authority. They should be used with the greatest tenderness and affection, nor, were it possible to prevent it, should their attendants ever be suffered to behave otherwise to them. (1758, 38)

Battie and Monro anticipated some aspects of the so-called 'moral' treatment of the insane. Though this kind of management was officially introduced in England by William Tuke in 1792, various scholars agree in identifying the first offshoots of the phenomenon in the previous decades[14].

Adam Smith's *The Theory of Moral Sentiments* (1777[1759]) can help understand the changes that Britain underwent in the second half of the eighteenth century. In this treatise, Smith advocates a less 'rigid' notion of virtue, which is modulated according to three main variables: imagination, vision and perception – incidentally, the same three elements that lie at the core of mid eighteenth-century notions of madness. The essay's opening section casts new light on earlier assumptions concerning imagination:

> Though our brother is upon the rack, as long as we ourselves are at our ease, our senses will never inform us of what he suffers. They never did and never can carry us our own person, and it is by the imagination only that we can form any conception of what are his sensations [...]. By the imagination we place ourselves in [the other's] situation, we conceive ourselves enduring all the same torments, we enter as it were into his body, and become in some measure him. (1777 [1759], 2)

[13] However, the medical theories that prevailed at the end of the seventeenth century were not completely abandoned in the eighteenth: as Andrews emphasizes, William Pargeter (1760-1810) believed in the old notion that 'maniacs' were insensible to cold and pain (Andrews 1991, 65; see also Pargeter 1792).

[14] See, for instance, Wear 1992, 9-10; Yardley 1997, 210; Pickren and Rutherford 2010.

To some extent, the intersubjective orientation of Smith's discourse rereads the traditional belief that heated imagination – religious enthusiasm included – could spread like a contagious disease. He substitutes the idea of 'infection' with those of sympathy and communion, although he still maintains that too heightened passions cannot be understood or shared, and should be reduced «to harmony and concord with the emotions of [other people]» (1777 [1759], 24). According to Smith, who «uses the vocabulary of perception in a moral context» (Griswold 1999, 192), reflection and imagination are essential to acquire a moral vision. His «spectator» is an interpreting and judging subject who assesses the situation through the means of emotion. His or her gaze is directed not only to other people:

> We suppose ourselves the spectators of our own behaviour, and endeavour to imagine what effect it would, in this light, produce upon us. This is the only looking-glass by which we can, in some measure, with the eyes of others other people, scrutinize the propriety of our own conduct. (Smith 1777 [1759], 183)

Jack Barbalet notes that the looking-glass image is crucial in Smith's philosophy, for it shows that only an external gaze can distinguish between «beauty or deformity» of the other's mind (2007, 91). In essence, Smith's essay anticipates two of the main preoccupations that would orient the medical field at the turn of the century: sympathy for the patient and the doctor's gaze on him or her. In this sense, *The Theory of Moral Sentiments* copes with issues similar to those involved in the management of mental inmates. Smith was a precursor in the philosophical field, just as William Battie and John Monro were in the medical one: as early as 1758, they advocated a 'sympathetic' treatment of the insane, consisting of constant re-education of the patient to self-control and monitoring of his or her behaviour. To put it in Faubert's terms, the insane were progressively pushed «to internalize the expectations of his doctor, an education that was the equivalent of a new and constant awareness of the gaze in the patient», to the point that the individual became «existentially defined by the gaze of the moral manager» (2003, 37).

A new attention towards the public eye in the definition of madness is already evident in the case of Christopher Smart's commitment to mental institutions; the same attention becomes one of the main motifs of Cowper's early works, and especially of his *Memoir*. The latter text repeatedly shows the narrator's awareness that sanity has much to do with controlling one's public demeanour, and avoiding behaviours that are incompatible with rational social conduct.

6.2 «*Et fluctuosum ceu mare volvitur*»

A brief premise about *Memoir* is necessary. This autobiography employs puritan and evangelical conversion patterns, describing life before, dur-

ing and after conversion. Donatella Pallotti remarks that the conversion narrative is the result of «biographical reconstruction» among other factors, and implies «processes that are never innocent from an ideological and psychological point of view» (2012, 77). Indeed, Cowper's text presents individual experience as filtered through social, religious and cultural tensions which have often attracted scholarly interest[15]. Here, I will focus on the medical discourse of *Memoir,* which is especially pertinent to the main subject of this study.

Barrett John Mandel (1970) and George MacLennan (1992) have already analysed the form and structure of *Memoir* in this perspective, underlining that religious and medical explanations of mental disturbance coexist and intertwine in it. As Katharine Hodgkin explains, in conversion narratives «[the] spiritual framework of sin and punishment, repentance and redemption, is not incompatible with the medical idea of madness, but it inflects it in particular ways» (2007, 5). Therefore, it is essential to bear in mind that *Memoir* is included in the context of devotional literature, and that its main purpose is to underline the impact of the narrator's conversion in his life. At the same time, the religious and spiritual framework should not prevent use of the text to investigate Cowper's views on mental imbalance. Such a procedure does not de-contextualise Cowper's autobiography, because the author himself partially bends and revisits the established forms of the conversion genre.

Donatella Pallotti notes that the «so called 'morphology of conversion'» in seventeenth-century accounts comprised «detailed stages of sin, false confidence, doubt, conviction, faith, temptation and assurance», which helped structure the narrative and provided an interpretative grid to explain the main events described (2012, 76). This pattern is completely absent in Cowper's text, which consists of two main 'movements': a first phase towards mental disorder and sin, a second one (supposedly) away from them. Other major elements of the conversion narrative are either missing or de-structured in *Memoir*: to borrow Donatella Pallotti's words, there is no clear «difference of identity between a past, sinful 'I' and a present, godly 'I'» (2012, 77). *Memoir* conventionally presents mental trouble as a punishment from God, but the text ends without showing signs of transformation in the narrator, who merely chooses to live in retirement. Actually, Mandel writes, «the converted narrator seems to retain many 'mad' characteristics of the pre-conversion self», and Cowper focuses on the experience of madness «to the point that it seems to subsume the conversion experience itself, as if the conversion were a product of the mental instability» (1970, 434, 437). Therefore, in concert with Mandel, we can recognize madness as a subplot that lies behind the religious scenario of

[15] See, for instance, Nussbaum 1987 and Davies 2013 [2011].

Memoir: this subplot progressively turns into the dominant discourse, with the effect that the narrator seems to trace a history of derangement, rather than one of salvation.

Before moving into a more detailed discussion of *Memoir*, it may be useful to consider briefly the main biographical events that it relates, or rather revisits, by focusing on the circumstances that led to Cowper's alleged madness and internment. The poet suffered his first documented mental 'breakdown' in 1763, when he was nominated to the office of Clerk of the House of Lords. Cowper claims that the prospect of a preliminary oral examination terrified him to the point that he repeatedly attempted suicide. Consequently, he was committed to Dr Nathaniel Cotton's Collegium Insanorum in St. Alban's. This private structure, says Andrew Wear:

> [...] housed no more than half a dozen lunatics. Rates were correspondingly higher. Cotton, for example, charged up to five guineas a week per client – a sum which was the equivalent of a year's wages of a maidservant. (1992, 286)

The Collegium Insanorum was clearly meant for wealthy people, and Dr Cotton had a reputation for being of «cheerful, benignant manners» (Hayley 1812, 98; Moyle 2013, 74). However, in *Memoir*, Cowper's narrator mentions having spent some periods «in bondage» (1816, 83), and adds some obscure comment:

> It will be proper to draw a veil over the secrets of my prison-house: let it suffice to say, that the low state of body and mind, to which I was reduced, was perfectly well calculated to humble the natural vain-glory and pride of my heart. (1816, 71)

It is not clear whether the «low state of body and mind» discussed in these lines is connected with the protagonist's interior sufferings or with the treatments in the «prison-house». Moreover, use of the passive voice in «was [...] calculated» prevents the reader from understanding whether such calculation was made by medical practitioners or by the divine providence. In either case, the 'humbling' approach is accepted by the speaker as an effective solution to his problem, or rather, as a just punishment for his guilt. The kind of therapy described here reminds us of Thomas Willis' treatments, which included threats and bonds, because the physician believed that «the Corporeal Soul being in some measure depressed and restrained, is compell'd to remit its pride and fierceness» (Willis in Hunter and Macalpine, eds, 1963, 192). The 'old' methods, namely seventeenth- and early eighteenth-century understanding and treatment of madness, find an echo also in other parts of Cowper's spiritual autobiography, suggesting that the narrator considers them still valid. It might suffice to note that *Memoir* discusses insanity as the «metaphor of folly, error, or malice that it was for Pope and his contemporaries», and «the

emblem of a dunce [or] the just punishment of a villain» of Augustan times (Byrd 1974, 96)[16].

Simultaneously, Cowper's spiritual autobiography sheds light on more recent conceptions of mental trouble. In particular, it demonstrates the relevance that the idea of 'external gazes' on the insane had acquired via Battie and Monro's medical theories, as well as Adam Smith's philosophical discussion. In *Memoir*, the narrator is very aware of judging eyes surrounding him at all stages of his conversion process (or disease course). Such awareness emerges from the opening of the text, when the young protagonist is said to be concerned about appearances: already affected by melancholy, he feels a sudden relief to his «vexation of spirit» during a stay in Southampton, but avoids weeping in public (Cowper 1816, 28). This close attention to other people's gazes and opinions becomes increasingly evident as the story progresses, since the narrator repeatedly states that he «could not bear» the «eyes of men» (62). He stresses his fear of any «public exhibition», and defines the oral examination he was expected to sit for at the House of Lords «mortal poison» and «horror» (36). The most 'horrifying' aspect of the dreaded interview is the idea of being judged by others: the protagonist developed a «nervous fever», because he felt that «a finger raised against [him] was more than [he] could stand against» (37).

The same fear of judgment surfaces in numerous other occasions, especially when the protagonist explains how he kept controlling his public face and hiding his troubled feelings. For instance, he claims to have indulged in «fit[s] of passion» only «when alone in [his] chambers» (40) and, after deciding to buy some laudanum to attempt suicide, he says: «[the apothecary] seemed to observe me narrowly; but, if he did, I managed my voice and countenance, so as to deceive him» (44). The distress provoked by potential spectators is described as exponentially increasing as the nervous crisis worsens: it becomes both a symptom and a consequence of the disease. At a certain stage, the protagonist comes to believe that his inconsistencies are «evident to others as well as to [him]self» (31) and appreciates solitude as the only means to achieve «full liberty to attend to [his] spiritual state» (59). Any attempt to keep the nervous condition secret proves fruitless, since the narrator's brother «instantly observed the change» and decides to intern him in St. Alban's (71). Significantly, the protagonist's concern with people's eyes does not disappear during

[16] Hilary Clark underlines that the fictional self in Cowper's spiritual autobiography presents himself «as an actor in God's drama», in keeping with Burton's (or Democritus Junior's) «antic or personate actor» in *The Anatomy of Melancholy* (Clark 2008, 58). At the same time, it might be worth underlining that throughout the text Cowper describes the protagonist's mental trouble in terms of «nerves» (*passim*).

or after the recovery process: he talks about the improvement achieved thanks to his «watchful» physician, and specifies that the release from the madhouse happened under the «watchfulness» of a servant (71, 79, 83).

The motifs of gaze and judgement in *Memoir* are connected not only with philosophical and medical questions, but also with social ones. Following Adam Smith, most late eighteenth-century thinkers emphasized the need to restrain one's passions in a way which would be suitable for society. In 1776, Joshua Reynolds maintained that «in all cases, […] we must regulate our affections of every kind by that of others», as the «well-disciplined mind acknowledges this authority, and submits its own opinion to the public voice» (1780 [1779], 150). Affections that were not regulated to the authoritative public discourse could become a cause of social disorder: the physician John Aikin identified madness as a threat to social life in *Thoughts on Hospitals*, where he interpreted inappropriate behaviour in the light of Hume's idea of internalized social norms (see §1.2 and 5.1). To Aikin, madness consisted mainly in failing to discipline the self, thereby breaking the boundaries of civil life.

Patients' self-discipline was becoming a major concern in mental hospitals as well. «Moral management», Faubert writes, «recommended strict self-regulation on the part of the patient» and simultaneously «exemplified the notion of the omnipotent, omniscient, and subjecting medical gaze» (2003, 39). This double question emerges clearly in *Memoir*, which copes with both the idea of an 'omnipotent' external gaze and the subject's inability to regulate the self. Throughout the spiritual autobiography, the protagonist seems unable to manage his self even in the most common daily activities. Therefore, he repeatedly states his need of a paternalistic authority to guide and control him, an authority that the text identifies alternatively with God and the physician. During his crisis, the narrator says he lacks «direction», which he later finds under Dr Cotton's «fatherly protection» (Cowper 1816, 37, 92); a similar phrase, «fatherly care», is employed with reference to God's intervention in the convert's life (84). Once released from the madhouse, the protagonist says that he misses again a «guide to direct» him, but finds it first in his brother, who «attended» him, then in the Saviour, who provided for him (84-85). This attitude may appear as a return to childhood on the patient's part, a phenomenon that was discussed by physicians Thomas Reid, Karl Moritz and Alexander Crichton towards the turn of the century[17].

As a further connection with contemporary medical discourse, the narrator of *Memoir* describes at least one instance of 'wrong association of ideas', which, as we have seen, was considered as a major problem in

[17] On this topic, see Faas 1991 [1998], 59 and Faubert 2009, xxi.

mental health after the 1730s[18]. Shortly before the examination at the House of Lords, the narrator concedes that his mind was «disordered» and «given up to a strong delusion» (45-46). Significantly, the symptoms of that delusion are presented as pseudo-Lockean experiences of madness, consisting of altered perceptions and interpretive frameworks. The protagonist «thought the people [in the street] laughed at [him], and held [him] in contempt» (62), believed «that the voice of [his] conscience was loud enough for every one to hear» (62), and became certain that a newspaper which he was reading at a coffeehouse contained a satire on him (45). Probably, the coffeehouse episode represents the apex in a series of signs that the protagonist's interpretive capacities were being progressively affected by anxiety and nervous disorders. In the earliest phases of the malady, for instance, the narrator says he could only «read without perception» and «was not in a condition to receive instruction, much less to elicit it out of manuscripts» (37).

According to Holly Faith Nelson and Laura Ralph, Cowper himself was believed to «engage in distorted reading practices» by his friends (2009, <http://goo.gl/j9mL8F>). By quoting William Pargeter's notes in *Observations on Maniacal Disorders* (1792), the scholars underline how this idea was consistent with eighteenth-century medical studies on perception and mental illness. I would like to add that further connections can be found in earlier medical works: in 1768, William Smith, practitioner in London, described the various stages of mental disease in much the same terms as *Memoir*. The physician wrote that in «melancholy madness» the nerves «are relaxed, sometimes so greatly as hardly to be able to raise a perception in the soul at all»; when nerve disorders degenerate in actual lunacy, instead, «they are greatly too elastic», provoke misperceptions, and «the ideas of the soul [become] bold, and daring» (299).

Even more importantly, the lexical choices adopted to describe the peak of mental trouble in Cowper's *Memoir* evoke Battie's «deluded imagination» in *A Treatise on Madness* (1758, 5). According to Battie, madness laid chiefly in erroneous perception; his antagonist, Monro, observed that «vitiated» judgement of that perception was instead at the core of insanity (1758, 4). The terms of the conflict between the two physicians, Suzuki notes, «had a common basis of the then widely accepted medical idea that delirium was a disorder of both imagination and judgment», mediated by the nerves (1992, 247). The fact that Battie's medical ideas influenced *Memoir* is supported by various expressions Cowper employs to talk about altered mental states. The «tremulous vibration» the narrator felt «in the fibres» of his brain (1816, 65) recalls the «spasmodic

[18] For more about wrong associations of ideas and insanity in the eighteenth century, see McGovern 1985, 10-12.

impulse» of the nervous fibres discussed in Battie's treatise (Battie 1758, 66). Moreover, the «frequent flashing, like that of fire» that the protagonist of Memoir sees «before [his] eyes» (Cowper 1816, 45) can be related to Battie's example of false sensation, according to which an «eye that is violently struck immediately sees flames flash before it» (1758, 42)[19].

Including specific reference to medical theories was not at odds with the spiritual context of *Memoir*. Actually, in the late eighteenth century Battie's theories were frequently quoted in religious and philosophical discussions, especially in debates on false perception and miracles. One of the most authoritative voices in such debates was William Paley, who cited Battie in *View of the Evidences of Christianity* (1794):

> It is not necessary to admit as a miracle what can be resolved into a false perception. Of this nature was the demon of Socrates; the visions of St. Anthony, and of many others; [...] All these may be accounted for by a momentary insanity; for the characteristic symptom of human madness is the rising up in the mind of images not distinguishable by the patient from impressions upon the senses. (1824 [1794], 190)

In the same vein with this new tendency, Cowper's spiritual autobiography presents a double discourse, which is devoted to religion and mental health simultaneously. This procedure is not limited to *Memoir*: it also concerns Cowper's early poems, especially *Olney Hymns*. The texts that the poet wrote for this collection are so representative of his ability to combine religious issues and questions related to mental states that, Patricia Meyer Spacks says, «their strength derives almost entirely from the quality of their psychological insight» (Meyer Spacks 1986, 207).

Apparently, Cowper wrote his hymns in a period of relatively stable health. After his release from the madhouse, he led a retired life in the countryside, and eventually moved to Buckinghamshire, where he attended the parish of Olney. There, reverend John Newton (1725-1807) «persuaded Cowper, always fearful of public appearances, to take part in large prayer meetings and religious discussions» and urged him «to compose hymns for their joint collection» (Baird and Ryskamp 1980b, xvi). The volume *Olney Hymns*, published in 1779, includes 348 hymns, 66 of which are certainly attributable to Cowper[20]. It seems that the author composed these poems between 1770 and 1772, before another «relapse into insanity in 1773» (xvii). Similarly to *Memoir*, Cowper's contributions to *Olney Hymns* address two major questions: the theme of a public

[19] See also Monro's objections regarding Battie's example of false sensation in Monro 1758, 21.

[20] At first, Newton's hymn *Breathe from the Gentle South, O Lord* was mistakenly attributed to William Cowper. See Baird and Ryskamp 1980a, 483.

code of conduct as opposed to a private one, and the idea of a judging eye which oversees the speakers' actions.

In Hymn 22, *Prayer for a Blessing* (Cowper 1980, 162), the devotee distinguishes between the «public prayer[s]» and «secret tear[s]» (lines 17-19) that are addressed to God in repentance for some unspecified «crimes» (line 15)[21]. Hymn 48, *The Hidden Life* (187-188), focuses even more explicitly on the existence of «secrets» that are not to be «exposed to open air» (lines 10-12); however, the speaker feels he can proclaim his Christianity «with boldness» (line 13), without concern if other people «frown» and «blame» (lines 17, 19). The renewed faith in God is a means of bringing rest to a «lab'ring spirit» (line 5), and there is no sign of deviation in it. When the speaker claims to «draw the likeness true, / And not as fancy paints» (lines 21-22), he seems to defend against possible allegiances of religious enthusiasm, which was traditionally connected with delusive imagination. Being his converse with God a sign of sanity, and not of mental disease, it can be voiced so that «thousands hear» (line 14).

The opinions of the speaker's «former friends» (line 17) are not the only concern in *Olney Hymns*. Cowper's texts are especially rich in references to the judging eyes of both God and other people. For one thing, nouns and verbs linked with sight and vision recur almost obsessively in some poems, as is the case with the two opening stanzas of Hymn 20, *Old-Testament Gospel*[22]. In various texts, believers must constantly «watch», or «watch and pray», imperatives that presumably invite them to examine both their own selves and the external world[23]; in addition, all creation is or must be «watchful», including the birds in the sky[24]. By contrast, the speaker is often pictured as a «poor blind creature», «[b]lind to the merits» of Christ, or «with a single eye»[25]; being hardly capable of active sight, in most hymns he appears a passive object of external gazes. His occasional moments of vision are presented as epiphanic revelations, as in Hymn 30, *The Light and Glory of the Word* (170), where «truth» is brought «to sight» and «light»

[21] When first mentioned, Cowper's poems are followed by indication of the edition I have used and page number; subsequent quotations from the same text are cited by line number.

[22] See Hymn 20, *Old-Testament Gospel*, lines 1-10: «Israel in ancient days, / Not only had a view /Of Sinai in a blaze, […] / The types and figures were a glass / In which they saw the Saviour's face. / The paschal sacrifice, / Seen with enlightned eyes […]» (Cowper 1980, 159).

[23] See Hymn 21, *Sardis*, line 9 (Cowper 1980, 161) and Hymn 60, *A Living and a Dead Faith*, line 7 (199).

[24] See, for instance, Hymn 16, *The Sower*, line 15 (Cowper 1980, 155) and Hymn 24, *Prayer for Children*, line 19 (164).

[25] See Hymn 45, *Submission*, line 19 (Cowper 1980, 185), Hymn 65, *Praise for Faith*, line 13 (204) and Hymn 46, *Behold I Make all Things New*, line 2 (185).

can be reached by following «precepts» (lines 2-4). In order to regain sight, believers must «bend the will» to both «rule» and «reason» (lines 5-6), as suggested in Hymn 19, *Contentment* (158).

Blindness is, of course, a common metaphor for sinfulness and vice; however, Cowper's «distemper'd eye» seems to suggest a wider frame of reference (Cowper 1980, 204; Hymn 65, *Praise for Faith*, line 11). In 1718, Andrew Snape famously defined madness as «a third Sort of Blindness», equivalent to sin and ignorance, which «divests the rational Soul of all its noble and distinguishing Endowments» (1718, 15)[26]. Deprived of the light of God, the speaker of the *Hymns* is also denied the light of reason and discernment, an idea which is very much in line with Monro's theories, as Scull suggests (1989, 87). Therefore, Cowper's lines associate the traditional belief that blindness and madness are «often explained as a punishment for some evil perpetrated in the past» (Barash 2001, 36)[27] with more recent perspectives in the religious and the medical field. It might be noted that both conditions, in different capacities, were marked by privatization, if not isolation, of the individual from the public realm.

Unable to see or judge on his part, the speaker of Cowper's poems is often «fed with judgements» (line 19) and marked by utter exclusion, as in the irregular Sapphic lines of «Hatred and vengeance, my eternal portion» (Cowper 1980, 209-210). Cowper's use of this poetic form deserves some attention: the original Sapphic metrical features were considered unsuitable for the English language, because their adaptation resulted in «disagreeable» and «invariable monotony», although they also produced «a deep solemn sound» (*Observations on Sapphic Verse* 1784, 306). No other form could be more appropriate for a text that puts forward the speaker's damnation with Dantesque imagery, convoluted syntax and prevalence of rhotic and fricative sounds. *Hatred and vengeance* is also dominated by passive verb forms and participial phrases: the speaker is «Damn'd below Judas», «more abhorr'd than he was» (line 5) and «Fall'n, and if vanquish'd» (line 15); his lot is «Encompass'd with a thousand dangers» (line 13), as he is «Buried above ground» (line 20). Even Christ is defined as «Twice betray'd» (line 7), since the speaker replicated Judas' fault. The poetic I performs almost no active role and is primarily a recipient of external actions: Jesus deems him «the profanest» (line 8), «Man disavows, and Deity disowns» him (line 9). His only activity is expressed by a gerund form, «trembling with a thousand

[26] It is worth mentioning that the Bible associates blindness and madness as two curses of disobedience (*Deuteronomy* 28: 28).

[27] Moshe Barash identifies and discusses a traditional connection between madness and visual impairment, explaining it in religious and medical terms (2001, 35-37). On this topic, see also Felman 2003, 35-36.

terrors» (line 16), probably a reference to *Job* 18:11. A similar propensity to employ the passive voice characterizes also *Memoir*, where the protagonist is often the object of actions performed by an «invisible hand» (Cowper 1816, 49).

Use of past participles and gerunds, in addition, can be considered as a point of contact with the works of William Collins, who «achieve[d] indirection by avoiding verbs altogether, using participles in their place» (Collins M. 1975, 370). Probably, Cowper perceived a commonality with Collins, because after reading Johnson's *Lives* (1779-1781), he is reported to have declared:

> In all that number [of writers] I observe but one man – a poet of no great fame – of whom I did not know that he existed till I found him there, whose mind seems to have had the slightest tincture of religion; and he was hardly in his senses. His name was Collins. [...] But from the lives of all the rest there is but one inference to be drawn – that poets are a worthless, wicked set of people. (Cowper, in Dyce 1827, 33-34)

Collins and Cowper adopt some similar techniques to achieve impersonality, and they both deal with the powers of reason and fancy[28]; however, between their works there is a major difference in tone. Unlike Collins' *Odes*, Cowper's *Hatred and vengeance* is filled with rage and violence, as is suggested by «the vindictive rod of angry Justice» (line 17). The intense lines establish a climax («Damned», «more abhorred», «the last delinquent», lines 5-7) in which the speaker, however passively, makes a grandiose claim of himself. According to Conrad Brunström, «the extremism of the poem derives from its perverse arrogance as the narrator struggles to wrest from Judas the title of "most damned"», in an almost «proto-romantic fascination with Satan as a tragic individualist» (2004, 161). In other words, while lamenting his «eternal portion» (line 1), Cowper's speaker assumes the role of a solipsist rebel, split in the attitude toward his own self: he repudiates the figure of Judas and simultaneously identifies with it, then resolves the conflict by denying his own existence *tout court* («Buried above ground», line 20)[29].

[28] Francesco Binni observes that the tone of Cowper's poetry «si alza progressivamente al di sopra della sensazione [...] per accogliere l'attività del giudizio o del "common sense" contro le "airy reveries", gli "empty dreams" della "fancy": scelta personale-intima che sarà conseguentemente anche scelta estetica [...] con la proposizione di un "judgment" del sentimento e insieme della ragione» (1999; rises progressively beyond sensation [...] and embraces judgment or "common sense", against fancy's "airy reveries", or "empty dreams"; this personal and intimate choice will become an aesthetic choice [...] which leads [Cowper] to propose a "judgment" in both reason and sentiment).

[29] In *Olney Hymns*, too, a poetic 'I' announces his own death: «My former hopes are dead, / My terror now begins; / I feel, alas! that I am dead / In trespasses and sins». Hymn 32, *The Shining Light*, lines 1-4 (Cowper 1980, 173).

Hatred and vengeance opens the way to discussing a tension which characterizes much of Cowper's early production; to use Lillian Feder's terms, the speakers are often «at once hostile and worshipful» towards deity (1980, 179). *Olney Hymns* contains various instances of such opposition, and reveals a resistance to divine (and human) laws of conduct, while endorsing the need of conforming to them. It is to this aspect of Cowper's production, as well as to its implications, that I will devote the next section.

6.3 «*Thy rebellious worm is still*»

The first three stanzas of Hymn 12, *Ephraim Repenting* (Cowper 1980, 151), express sorrow for having taken the wrong path. The lines closely follow the biblical passage which inspired them (*Jeremiah* 31:18-20), but emphasis is placed on the speaker's sinful nature and his attitude before God's punishment[30]:

My God! till I received thy stroke,
    How like a beast was I!
So unaccustomed to the yoke,
    So backward to comply.

With grief my just reproach I bear,
    Shame fills me at the thought;
How frequent my rebellions were!
    What wickedness I wrought!

Thy merciful restraint I scorned
    And left the pleasant road;
Yet turn me, and I shall be turned,
    Thou art the Lord my God. (lines 1-12)

Past sins are here recalled with apparent pride: the speaker's rebellions were numerous, his evil deeds outstanding, and he was so bold as to scorn God's rule. Wickedness gave the speaker a stature: the sensation we derive from these lines is one of courage, and opposition to om-

[30] The biblical passage on which the poem is based runs: «I have surely heard Ephraim bemoaning himself thus; Thou hast chastised me, and I was chastised, as a bullock unaccustomed to the yoke: turn thou me, and I shall be turned; for thou art the Lord my God. Surely after that I was turned, I repented; and after that I was instructed, I smote upon my thigh: I was ashamed, yea, even confounded, because I did bear the reproach of my youth. Is Ephraim my dear son? is he a pleasant child? for since I spake against him, I do earnestly remember him still: therefore my bowels are troubled for him; I will surely have mercy upon him, saith the Lord» (*Jeremiah* 31:18-20).

nipotent tyranny. Overall, this attitude is not very different from that of the solipsist rebel in *Hatred and vengeance*. However, the latter text copes with damnation only; *Ephraim Repenting* illustrates a moment of inner transformation and, as in most *Hymns*, uses Christian imagery to represent interior turmoil. Remarkably, the change of direction towards «the pleasant road» (line 10) is not described in a positive light. The poetic persona seemed capable of excelling at «wickedness» (line 8), whereas now he is brought to conformity and submission. Moreover, he lost his freedom and, although he claims that he used to be «like a beast» (line 2) before God's intervention, it seems that his bestiality is much more evident after conversion. Madeleine Marshall and Janet Todd recognize a «brutal image» in the opening of the poem, since «the singer is a cart-horse that must be whipped to stay on the path» (1982, 141). Perhaps, mention of the «yoke» (line 3) can make us think of an ox, rather than a horse; reduced to a tame animal, the speaker can thus be «turned» at God's will (line 11) and loses his individuality.

Most poetic personae in Cowper's contributions to *Olney Hymns* appear removed from society and nature because of their 'crimes', or they are presented as fragile, ill, and hardly human[31]. The price they pay for normalization and re-admission to the community is loss of the self and inclusion in a 'herd', where they become anonymous members of a whole[32]. In order to follow both God and man's laws, the 'subhuman' sinner needs to sacrifice a part of his self, in a procedure which equally makes him less of a human being. Therefore, in *Olney Hymns* animal imagery is often employed to represent both the speaker's sinful state and his later conversion; beasts are a conventional symbol for the devil, or appear connected with a tortured sense of submission, in the form of docile cattle under God's «yoke» of obedience[33]. None of these two images bears positive connotations: in either case, there is no sense of identification or communion with nature on the speaker's part.

Differently from Christopher Smart's *Jubilate Agno*, Cowper's production as a whole depicts a troubled relationship between self and other, where harmony and fusion are generally absent. Like Smart, Cowper often copes with micro- and macro-perspectives of reality and is interested

[31] See, for instance, Hymn 3, *Jehovah-Rophi, I am the Lord that Healeth Thee*, line 3 (Cowper 1980, 141); Hymn 5, «Jehovah-Shalem, The Lord Send Peace», line 17 (144); Hymn 9, *The Contrite Heart*, line 8 (148); Hymn 32, *The Shining Light*, lines 2-3 (172).

[32] The experience of conversion, Donatella Pallotti says, «involves self-denial, even self-dissolution, in order to take place» (2012, 79).

[33] See, for instance, Hymn 12, *Ephraim Repenting*, line 3 (Cowper 1980, 151) and Hymn 50, *True Pleasures*, line 23 (190).

in «all forms / Terrestrial in the vast and the minute» (Cowper 1995, 231; *The Task*, Book V, lines 810-811); however, even «minute» forms of life, such as the «worm», can pose a threat to the individual. For Smart, the worm «hath a part in our frame» (B37), and in *Jubilate Agno* it often stands for continuity and regeneration. Cowper's imagery, instead, adheres more strictly to Christian tropes, and his «worm» is either a symbol of the «undying worm» of biblical and Miltonian reference[34], or an emblem of corruption, as the all-consuming, «voracious» creature that keeps «eating through and through» in *The Task* (Cowper 1995, 59; Book I, line 27). After all, Cowper's *The Progress of Error* emphasizes that scientists like Leeuwenhoek, the father of microbiology, should recognize that human beings are not able to embrace dimensions other than their own (1980, 276; line 487). Science offers new knowledge of the infinitely small and big, and «Brings the planets home into the eye / Of observation» (Cowper 1995, 168; *The Task*, Book III, lines 229-230); yet, this opportunity does not purport access to, or fusion with the universe. As stated in *Charity*, whoever ties to fill «the space between the stars and us», «carve a fly, or spit a flea» is nothing but «a solemn trifler» (Cowper 1980, 346; lines 352, 354-355). To some extent, one could imagine Cowper counting Christopher Smart among the «Enthusiasts, drunk with an unreal joy» mentioned in *The Progress of Error*, who cannot recognize how earthbound human knowledge is (264; line 76). «[M]an, the moth / is not afraid [...] / To span omnipotence», but his quest remains frustrated (Cowper 1995, 283; *The Task*, VI.211-212.).

Cowper's poetic personae generally maintain some distance from the natural world because they feel they have no control on it, and they cannot «call the swift / And perilous lightnings from the angry clouds» (1995; *The Task*, Book III, lines 212-215). Bill Hutchings argues that the search for stability is a main preoccupation in Cowper's poetry, which focuses constantly on «the relationship between control and disruption» (1983, 44-45). This remark is particularly applicable to the early verse, where natural forces and beasts are common representations of disorder and chaos that exert a sense of fascination and repulsion simultaneously.

[34] As is well known, the «undying worm» is mentioned in Milton 2006 [1667], 6, 739. The «worm» is mentioned in six poems of *Olney Hymns*. In Hymn 41, *Peace after a Storm*, the speaker is a «rebellious worm» who must subdue his «disobedient will» in «self-abhorrence» (lines 20, 18 and 24); in Hymn 62, *The Narrow Way*, God is said to fight the «sordid worms» and their idols (lines 17 and 20). The worm indicates the debased state of the reprobate who «basely cleav'd to earth» before conversion In Hymn 22, *Mourning and Longing*, line 25, Hymn 52 *Lively Hope, and Gracious Fear* (lines 2 and 5), and Hymn 64 *Not of Works* (line 7). The worm is «feeble», and signals weakness and mortality in Hymn 5, *Jehovah-Shalem, The Lord Send Peace* (line 17) (Cowper 1980, 144, 180-181, 191-192, 201 and 203).

For instance, animals and wild life exemplify a rejected idea of unconventionality or lack of restraint in *Heu! Quam remotus vescor [ab] omnibus* (Cowper 1980, 210-211), written shortly after the author's second nervous attack in 1774. The Latin poem focuses on the themes of solitude and isolation, and its final lines closely resemble *Hatred and vengeance*: the speaker is swallowed by Hell's mouth, while suffering a thousand fears. Far from his friends and native home, the poetic persona laments having abandoned a mysterious figure in particular:

Heu! Quam remotus vescor omnibus
    Quibus fruebar sub lare patrio,
Quam nescius jucunda quondam
    Arva, domum, socios, reliqui!

Et praetor omnes te mihi flebilem,
    Te chariorem luce vel artubus,
Te vinculo nostram jugali
    Deserui tremulam sub ense.

Sed nec ferocem me genuit pater,
    Nec vagientem nutriit ubere
Leaena drumoso sub antro,
    Fata sed hoc voluere nostra.

Et, fluctuosum ceu mare volvitur,
    Dum commovebar mille timoribus,
Coactus in fauces Averni
    Totus atro perii sub amne. (Cowper 1980, 210-211)

The available poetical English version of these lines translates them rather freely as:

Far from my natal roof I sigh,
    Of all its joys, alas! bereft,
Since long ago, so thoughtlessly,
    Sweet fields and home and friends I left;

And thee forsook, for whom mine eyes
    Weep sore, more loved than limb or life,
And linked to me by closest ties,
    A victim trembling 'neath the knife.

Yet no fierce monster was I born,
    No lioness e'er nourished me,
In some rude cave o'erhung with thorn;
    No! – this is Destiny's decree.
My soul by countless terrors riven,
    And like the stormy ocean tossed,

Into Avernus' jaws was driven,
In its black stream for ever lost. (Gough 1892, 219-220)[35]

In lines 9-11, the speaker draws a clear distinction between himself and beasts. He seems to use animal imagery to assert that he is able to sympathize with other human beings, even if his past behaviour suggests insensibility or cruelty (lines 4-8). Actually, various lines of interpretation can be taken in interpreting the relationship between self and nature in *Heu! Quam remotus*. The poem can be read as an experience of alienation from civil society and an 'exile' into wilderness, or else, we may hypothesize that the protagonist is removed from home *because* of his supposed 'bestiality'. Whatever the case is, the speaker resolutely denies any connection or commonality with wild life (lines 9-11). Twice displaced, the poetic persona is an element of disorder, a 'un-man' separated from both human beings and nature. Order is soon re-established when he disappears, engulfed by an abyss.

Heu! Quam remotus undoubtedly copes with issues of control on various levels. As in *Memoir,* the poetic I appears constantly driven by external forces, and unable to decide on his own destiny. First, he is almost compelled to leave his home (line 4) and abandon someone he loves (line 5-8); then, he is acted upon by waves of fear (lines 13-16). To some extent, the speaker suggests that he is aware of the rules of social and Christian acceptability, but cannot fully conform to them; this prevents him from participating in communal life. Something more powerful than his will leads him astray, perhaps even depriving him of volition and judgment, as is the case with beasts. It is tempting to see in Cowper's lines an underlying reference to mental trouble, and the difficulties involved in negotiating a «place for himself between the demands of Evangelical values, Augustan values, and his own personality» (Jordan 2003, 207). In wide terms, the poem creates a symbolic play out of the relation between wild life and human nature, sin and righteousness, insanity and reason.

[35] Thomas Wright says that the poetical translation was «kindly written for [him] by a friend, Mr. Alfred Gough, with the assistance of Professor Hales [of King's College]» (1892, 219-220). John D. Baird and Charles Ryskamp propose the following free translation in prose: «Alas, how remote I live from all whose company I used to enjoy under the paternal roof; how I am forgotten, I who have quitted that once joyful region, that home, those companions. And above all, you are a cause of lamentation to me, you, dearer than light or limbs, you who are mine in the nuptial bond – I forsook you, left you shivering under the stroke. But my father did not beget me to be unfeeling, nor did a lioness in a cave filled with thorn bushes rear me at her breast to be footloose; but this my fate willed. And, just as the waves of the sea are moved, while I was vexed by a thousand fears, I was compelled into the jaws of Avernus, I perished completely in the black river» (1980a, 490).

Madness and sinfulness are often connected in Cowper's work: both conditions bring about lack of conformity, and single out the individual from the collective, or the herd. In this vein, Conrad Brunström has emphasized the poet's fierce, «resolute individualism» and tendency to reject «common sense» (2004, 118, 95); «if [Cowper] praises the ordinary», William Free says, «he does so […] to assert the integrity of his personal vision» (1970, 110). In fact, the early poems show an implicit urge to distinguish one's self from the «bustling crowd», even if this purports isolation[36]. Cowper's poetic personae reject commonality and conformity just as much as they condemn transgression from the norm, thus revealing a split, or conflicting ego identification. Though in different ways, both *Ephraim Repenting* and *Heu! Quam remotus* suggest that the speaker's natural propensity and inclinations are not in accordance with religious or social constructs; so, he should forego his own self in order to meet the demands of the world. From this follow interior turmoil and contradictory tensions, feelings that pervade most of *Olney Hymns* and find expression in both the content and form of the poems. For instance, in Hymn 44, *Prayer for Patience* (Cowper 1980, 184), the speaker affirms his experiential particularity by denying it, and underlines his unicity and non-conformity:

> I yet should have no right to say,
> My great distress is mine alone.
>
> Let me not angrily declare
> No pain was ever sharp like mine […]. (lines 19-22)

In Cowper's world of disjunctions, «Discordant atoms meet, ferment and fight» (1980, 312; *Expostulation*, line 297). Not even peaceful natural scenery can offer comfort, as is the case with *The Shrubbery: Written in a Time of Affliction* (425-426). The poem is set in a natural landscape, typical of the retirement theme; yet, seclusion does not soothe negative emotions or bring happiness, as in the conventional treatment of this subject. The first two stanzas of *The Shrubbery* are filled with contrasts between the sensations that the scene is supposed to raise in the human heart and the actual effect it has on the speaker:

> Oh happy shades! to me unblest,
> Friendly to peace, but not to me,
> How ill the scene that offers rest,
> And heart that cannot rest, agree!

[36] See *Olney Hymns*, Hymn 17, *The House of Prayer*, line 16 (Cowper 1980, 156).

This glassy stream, that spreading pine,
    Those alders quiv'ring to the breeze,
Might sooth a soul less hurt than mine,
    And please, if any thing could please. (lines 1-8)

The prevalence of fricative consonants phonetically suggests the sounds of the stream and the breeze, giving a sensation of tranquillity and, simultaneously, of a landscape in motion. The same effect is achieved by the gerundives «spreading» and «quiv'ring» (lines 5-6), which picture nature as moving in front of the observer's eyes. The scene, therefore, is ambivalent: it is said to be peaceful and offer rest, but it appears as restless as the speaker's heart. Natural order reveals an essential disorder and inherent contradictions: it cannot offer consolation because it is as fragile and vulnerable as its spectator, as the adjective «glassy» implies (line 5)[37]. In marked contrast with the action of the first two stanzas, in the third quatrain the speaker's «care» is «fixed» and unmovable (line 9):

But fixt unalterable care
    Foregoes not what she feels within,
Shows the same sadness ev'ry where,
    And slights the season and the scene. (lines 9-12)

Melancholic states were believed to be accompanied, as Blackmore wrote, by «a continued and uninterrupted Flux or Train of Thoughts fixed upon one sad Object» (1725b, 155); similarly, Cheyne maintained that the nervous system could be «waste[d] and destroy[ed]» by «fixing [a] set of Ideas on the Imagination» (1725 [1724], 156). Cowper seems to rely on widespread eighteenth-century theories about mental trouble to suggest that his poetic I presents the typical symptoms of melancholy. In contrast with Anne Finch's poems, however, in *The Shrubbery* this condition is not fought or rejected. The poetic persona seems to resign to its symptoms, or even to cultivate the disease:

The saint or moralist should tread
    This moss-grown alley, musing, slow;
They seek, like me, the secret shade,
    But not, like me, to nourish woe! (lines 17-20)

[37] Discussing the political implications of Cowper's perception of landscape, Tim Fulford notes: «unable to base a vision of shared moral or social order in the fields he surveyed, [Cowper] refigured the landscape poet's authority as an anxious marginality and vulnerability» (1996, 38). This observation seems to transcend the political field and power relations and finds wide application in Cowper's poetry.

The sheltered natural environment is a refuge to indulge in morbid thoughts, and secrecy is needed because this practice contravenes contemporary principles of both Christian and social good. Mental trouble does not merely 'take possession' of one's mind, but is rather welcomed or sought. A similar idea recurs in *Memoir*, where the narrator explains that, before the much-feared examination, he «began to look upon madness as the only chance remaining», and «wished for it earnestly, and looked forward to it with impatient expectation» (Cowper 1816, 41). Thus, Cowper's fictional attitude towards mental trouble highlights a sense of propensity to wilful self-deception, in line with mid-eighteenth century theories: «le fou [...] n'est pas tellement victime d'une illusion, d'une hallucination de ses sens, ou d'un mouvement de son esprit. Il n'est pas *abusé*, il *se trompe*» (Foucault 1972b, 259, original emphasis; Murphy 2006, 240, «the madman is not so much the victim of an illusion, of a hallucination of the senses or a movement of his mind. He is not *misled*, he is *making a mistake*»). Both Cowper's spiritual autobiography and his poetry capture the most recent developments of mental medicine, including the first seeds of the so-called 'moral' treatment of the insane. This is apparent in *The Progress of Error* (1980, 278), where the speaker says that «Habits are soon assum'd, but when we strive / To strip them off, 'tis being flay'd alive» (lines 582-583). Here, focus is on the dangers of sin, but also on one of the physicians' main concerns starting with the end of the eighteenth century. As Cox explains, mad-doctors were expected to «correct erroneous ideas» by «destroy[ing] the links of morbid association and break[ing] the force and effects of vicious mental habits» in their patients (1806 [1804], 64-65)[38]. With regard to *Olney Hymns*, *The Contrite Heart* (1980, 144) suggests that Cowper might have been familiar with Battie's notion of «Anxiety» as «Insensibility or Sensation not sufficiently excited by real objects» (1758, 33) when the sinner describes his spiritual numbness:

> I hear, but seem to hear in vain,
> Insensible as steel;
> If aught is felt, 'tis only pain,
> To find I cannot feel. (lines 5-8)

In Cowper's production, references to mid eighteenth-century medical theories are coupled with frequent allusions to earlier medical thought. Like *Memoir*, *Olney Hymns* creates fictional selves that seek deliverance from both insanity and sin through abasement and submission, renouncing to «self-will, / Self-righteousness and pride» (Cowper 1980, 142;

[38] See also eds Hunter and Macalpine 1963, 596.

Hymn 4, *Jehovah-Nissi, The Lord My Banner*, lines 25-26). Madeleine Marshall and Janet Todd note that various hymns «no doubt betray the poet's disturbed psyche and the unfortunate suitability of certain Calvinist ideas to it» (1982, 143). As already mentioned, the idea of self-abasement fits not only Evangelical Christianity and Cowper's personal idiosyncrasies, but also Thomas Willis' seventeenth-century approach to mental disturbance.

In my opinion, Cowper referred to both old and new theories about insanity to reveal some hidden inconsistencies included in the history of medicine. At a time when Battie and Monro insisted that insanity should not be «looked upon as incurable» (Battie 1758, 93)[39], Cowper seems to remind his contemporaries that a link between melancholy and personality traits had been established since Hippocrates and Galen's doctrine of the human temperaments. In fact, Cowper's works suggest that recovering from mental disorder purports foregoing distinctive aspects of the self; accordingly, melancholic perceptions and affections constitute a mode of experiencing, if not a mode of existence, of which one cannot be deprived. In this sense, melancholy can become a choice, «an ideal condition, inherently pleasurable, however painful» (Klibansky, Panofsky and Saxl 1979 [1964], 233), and embracing it means preserving individuality. With this in mind, it is easy to see why Cowper's early poetry associates normalization or inclusion in society with a feeling of danger, or fear of losing one's self in otherness[40].

This idea is often observable in connection with water-related themes and finds its clearest expression in the motif of drowning, a common metaphor for the annihilation of the self. *Olney Hymns* contains recurring references to streams, floods and fountains. Water imagery is generally linked to the Eucharistic fountain of life, a «living, and life-giving

[39] While he disagreed with most of Battie's ideas, Monro seemed to share the belief that madness was curable (1758, 24-25).

[40] The ambivalent attitude towards mental trouble manifested by Cowper's poetic personae or fictional characters has often been associated with that of the writer himself. Actually, Cowper's letters suggest such a connection; the poet wrote to Lady Hesketh on 9 August 1763: «I am of a very singular temper, and quite unlike all the men that I have ever conversed with. Certainly I am not an absolute fool; but I have more weakness than the greatest of all the fools [...]. In short, [...] I would not change conditions with any Saint in Christendom» (1812, 93). Interestingly, William Blake links Cowper with voluntary insanity, as suggested by some annotations he drafted in the margins of Johann Gaspar Spurzheim's *Observations on the Deranged Manifestations of the Mind, or Insanity* (1817): «Methodism &c p. 154. Cowper came to me & said. O that I were insane always I will never rest. Can you not make me truly insane. I will never rest till I am so. O that in the bosom of God I was hid. You retain health & yet are as mad as any of us all – over us all – mad as a refuge from unbelief – from Bacon Newton& Locke» (Blake, in Adams 2009, 146). On this topic, see also Youngquist 1989, 24-25.

stream» (Cowper 1980, 193; Hymn 54, *My Soul Thirsteth for God*, line 16). Water is also an element of the Communion in a wider sense of the term, and represents the primary connection with other people. Even language, the means of human communication, acquires a liquid quality in the hymns, since words can be «swelling» and speech «fluent» (199; Hymn 60, *A living and a dead faith*, line 19). However, all watery elements hide a peril of drowning: after reaching redemption and commonality, the speakers «plunge» beneath a «flood» or a «wave», assist to the ocean's «mighty flood», and are «pour[ed] down» a stream[41]. Overcoming waters, thus, can symbolize the community that absorbs and extinguishes the individual with its conformity and rules. Somehow, admission into the whole simultaneously preserves and threatens the self: following God's ways grants salvation, but it also causes engulfment and does not prevent from being «tempest toss'd» (178; Hymn 38, *Temptation*, line 17).

In the light of the constant contradictory tensions that animate Cowper's early poetry, it is not surprising to find that the dangers of drowning concern both the pre-and post-conversion self. Water imagery is equally employed to express fear of interaction and fear of isolation, since both can lead to annihilation of the individual. Therefore, in *Olney Hymns*, sinners are often submerged or flooded: in Hymn 7, *Vanity of the World* (1980, 146), they go «down / [...] into endless woe» (lines 17-18), in Hymn 59, *True and False Comforts* (1980, 198) they «[a]re plunging into night» (line 12), and in most other hymns they fight watery storms[42]. We might also remember that in the closing of *Heu! Quam remotus* the insane speaker is shaken by sea waves, and then swallowed by the watery pitch of Hell. Sin and madness are connected in Cowper's poetry and in *Memoir*, as we have already seen; both are in turn related to drowning, a sign of dissolution in transgression and derangement. Madness, like sin, establishes a rupture with the social world, and it is comparable to death in that the individual ceases to exist for the collective eye[43]. Our thoughts inevitably turn to Cowper's later poem *The Cast-away*, an «anti-hymn» where the poet breaks with «the religion [...] which had fed the currents of his despair» and represents the drowning mariner's

[41] See *Olney Hymns*, Hymn 15, *Praise for the Fountain Opened*, line 3 (Cowper 1980, 154); Hymn 2, *Jehovah-Jireh, The Lord Will Provide*, line 13 (141); Hymn 6, *Wisdom*, line 12 (141); Hymn 54, *My Soul Thirsteth for God*, lines 15-16 (193).

[42] See *Olney Hymns*, Hymn 2, *Jehovah-Jireh, The Lord Will Provide*, line 2 (Cowper 1980, 141); Hymn 19, *Contentment*, lines 1-2 (159); Hymn 38, *Temptation*, line 9 (177); Hymn 39, *Looking upwards in a Storm*, lines 3-4 (178); Hymn 44, *Prayer for Patience*, line 5 (183); Hymn 46, *Behold I Make All Things New*, line 5 (185).

[43] When discussing Emily Dickinson's poetry, Sandra Gilbert and Susan Gubar define «death» as a common «metaphor for madness, specifically for the madness attendant upon psychic alienation and fragmentation» (1980 [1979], 627).

sufferings as lesser than his «storm[y] depths of drawn-out inward ordeals» (Newey 2006, 53).

As also suggested by *The Cast-away*, the motif of death by water is closely connected with another recurring image in Cowper's oeuvre: the storm, or tempest. As Charles Ryskamp emphasizes, the storm theme occurs from the very beginning of Cowper's literary activity, and characterizes the early verses beginning «Mortals! Around your destin'd heads» and «Hope, like the short liv'd day» (1959, 107-110). Storms are traditional metaphors for gusts of passion, excesses which could lead to expulsion; «[f]ierce passions discompose the mind, / As tempests vex the sea» (lines 1-2), says the speaker in Hymn 19, *Contentment* (158). The hymns express constant fear that the poetic 'I' will «prove a cast-away» (174; Hymn 36, *Welcome Cross*, line 20), because only God can «[ride] upon the storm» (176; Hymn 35, *Light out of Darkness*, line 4). In Cowper's contributions to *Olney Hymns*, Richard Arnold notes:

> [t]he central metaphor […] is that of the «storm» or «tempest» – nature *out of control* and violent. [Cowper] writes continually of «storms that veil the skies», «looking upwards in a storm», hearing the «thunder roar», «the roaring of the sea», «the great water-floods», «the stormy main», and high winds and swelling billows that threaten his very life. The storm seems to represent everything associated with the perils and difficulties of earthly existence. (2012, 121-122, original emphasis)

Tempests can be a symbol of the blows of fortune, but in Cowper's production they rather stand for the «turbulence of […] emotions», as Lillian Feder notes (1980, 189). This connection is established even in a letter to Joseph Hill dated 25 September 1770, where Cowper defines his first nervous attack as the «storm of sixty-three», which «made a wreck of [his] friendships» (1812, 201). In another letter, Cowper admits to his mixed feelings about storms, and writes of his fascination for them, once again suggesting an ambivalent attitude towards his own interior turmoil (394)[44].

This journey through the poetry of madness has opened with the tempest described by James Carkesse in the opening of *Lucida Intervalla*; now, it moves towards its end by analysing other images of tempest in Cowper's poetry. In this closing of a circle, it can be useful to stress that similar themes are treated very differently in a period of about a century. For

[44] «I was always an admirer of thunder storms, even before I knew whose voice I heard in them; but especially an admirer of thunder rolling over great waters. There is something singularly majestic in the sound of it at sea, where the eye and the ear have uninterrupted opportunity of observation […]» (Cowper 1812, 394). See also Ryskamp 1959, 107.

Carkesse, the storm and shipwreck are primarily associated to landing in an elsewhere, which is simultaneously the abstract dimension of insanity and the concrete space of Bethlem, a place of otherness to society and public life. For Cowper, the storm is primarily an interior phenomenon: it has to do with the surges of madness, but also with those of rebellion against an established, 'natural' order. Inner disruption and chaos provoke suffering, but, to use Cowper's own words, there is «something singularly majestic» in them (1812, 394), because they are an affirmation of individuality, a will to power in denying – or defying – the norm[45].

Oversimplifying, we might say that Carkesse and Cowper's works signal a clear shift of focus from the outside to the inside. Yet, these two dimensions engage in a much more complex dialectic relationship in the comparison between the authors: Carkesse fights to reconquer a place inside society, whereas Cowper chooses a threshold which is neither inside nor outside the eighteenth-century discourse. To borrow Trinh Minh-ha's words, Cowper is «a deceptive insider and a deceptive outsider» who unsettles «every definition of otherness» (1991, 74). I have previously defined the dynamic of this book as circular; however, in the light of the distance between the positions from which Carkesse and Cowper write, it might be necessary to redefine it as a spiral, an image that embraces continuity and change, sameness and variation.

[45] In this sense, the storms in Cowper's poetry can be connected with both Shakespeare's *The Tempest* and Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus*. The intersections between the two plays are analysed by David Lucking (2000).

7

CONCLUSIONS: «A MADNESS GREATLY DIFFERENT IN ITS APPEARANCES»

7.1 *Finding a direction*

According to Michel Foucault, the causes of madness have been historically conceived in relation to a body/soul dichotomy (1972b, 249; 2006, 231), a double perspective that found one of its earliest expressions in Plato's *Τίμαιος* (1513; *Timaeus*, 1804). Mary Margaret Mackenzie explains that for Plato «diseases of the soul occur through the disorders of the body», so that mental illness is related to vice, and it has bodily origins: disease results in moral deviation, and in turn such deviation is caused by disease (1981, 176). Throughout the history of madness, the idea of a body/soul duality developed into an interplay of complementary aspects rather than into a dialectic, and enriched itself through a set of corollary notions.

Disease, and mental disease in particular, maintained a constant connection with moral disorder in seventeenth- and eighteenth-century Britain, since physicians often recognized the most common causes of insanity in vice and intemperance. In the seventeenth century, Robert Burton believed that «Lust, Anger, Ambition, Pride» and jealousy could produce melancholy (1638, 6); Thomas Tryon imputed «phrensie, madness or distraction» to various «extream Inclinations» that slighted «the counsel of the voice of Wisdom» (1689, 251-253), and Thomas Willis admitted that «Drunkenness», with «hatred, envie, indignation» contributed to frenzy (1683, 184 and 1685, 455). Similarly, eighteenth-century physicians viewed drunkenness and debauchery as common sources of mental trouble, in addition to «insatiable avarice», mentioned by both Richard Mead and Richard Hale (Mead 1762, 490)[1]. Thomas Arnold remarked on the role that «a guilty conscience» had in mental illness and emphasized a historical continuity of thought, stating that physicians

[1] In Chapter III of his *Medical Precepts and Cautions*, Richard Mead mentions and supports the authoritative opinion of Dr Hale, «physician to the Bethlehem-hospital» (1762, 489).

I. Natali, *«Remov'd from human eyes»: Madness and Poetry 1676-1774*, ISBN (online) 978-88-6453-319-3
ISSN (online) 2420-8361, CC BY-NC-ND 3.0 IT, 2016 Firenze University Press

«from Galen down to those of the present day» had universally agreed that «the pernicious influence of [...] enervating indulgence» could generate «most formidable kinds of insanity» (1786, 182-183).

The British philosophy of body and soul can be further expanded if we consider that «soul» could acquire many and variable meanings. As John Sutton remarks, «terms such as "soul", "spirit", and "mind"» were «under negotiation» in the seventeenth century, and their understanding depended on a combination of metaphysics, natural philosophy and ethical questions (2013, 286)[2]. According to Burton's *Anatomy*, in fact, human beings had either «three distinct Soules», or one soul subdivided into three main faculties, «Vegetal, Sensitive and Rationall» (1638, 20). The vegetal soul superintended nutrition and generation, the sensitive soul controlled perception coming from both the «outward» senses (sight, hearing etc.) and the «inner» senses («Phantasie and Memory»), and the rational soul governed all other faculties, acting as an instrument of interpretation and judgement (Burton 1638, 21-23). In mechanist approaches, often influenced by Descartes' dualism[3], the «soul» could have a «corporeal» component: Thomas Willis postulated the existence of a third, intermediate substance that interposed between the body and the soul, and had «not only Extension, but Members, and as it were Organical Parts» (1683, i). Thus, to Willis «Brutes have a Soul Co-extended to the whole Body», and patients can be often «rather sick in Soul, yea first, and chiefly than in Body», because the «Corporeal Soul doth extend its Sicknesses, not only to the Body, but to the Mind or rational Soul» (1683, i-ii).

Laura Quinney notes that also in the eighteenth century the term «soul», with «its divine origin and transcendental substance, was replaced by "mind", an organic rational faculty» (2014, 331)[4]. In fact, «soul» could stand for intellect, but also embrace the 'lower' faculties of sensation and imagination. Since madness affected «the whole Soul», it could proceed from each of its faculties, including aberrant imagination (Willis 1683, 192)[5]. Alongside with bodily disorder and moral laxity, the «inward senses», as Tryon defined imagination, perception and memory (1689, 251), played an important role in the aetiology of madness. In this respect, Cartesian thought had an evident impact on British philosophy and medicine: Descartes distinguished between body and soul and ad-

[2] On this subject, see also Rocco Coronato's essay on the body/mind problem in the eighteenth century (2011).

[3] See Heyd 1995, 196. For in-depth analysis of Descartes' thought, see Rozemond 1998.

[4] On this topic, see also Reed 1997.

[5] See also Willis' ideas of «hurt imagination» (1683, 193) and its «monstrous notions» (200).

mitted the existence of «facultates specialibus quibusdam modis cogitandi præditas, puta facultates imaginandi, & sentiendi» (Descartes 1678 [1641], 39; Cottingham 1996, 54: «faculties for certain special modes of thinking, namely imagination and sensory perception»). Although John Locke largely confuted *Meditations*, to some extent his conceptions were indebted to Descartes' theories, and so was his special attention on perception and imagination. In particular, Locke believed that the latter could act on the brain repressing reason, a concept which bears connections with the irreconcilability of rational and imaginary structures postulated by Descartes[6]. Locke's influence on the eighteenth-century medical discourse was multifaceted, and offered new inflections for the body/soul duality. Under the spell of a renewed attention to mind issues, Blackmore maintained that melancholy was «accompanied with great disturbance of the imagination and fancy» (1725b, 155), William Battie defined madness as «deluded imagination» (1758, 5), and Benjamin Fawcett compared the effects of imagination to those of vapours (1780, 3).

These observations on the body/soul duality in medicine and philosophy reveal that the conception of madness in the years 1676-1774 consisted of a complex interaction of diverse factors. Insanity stemmed from imbalance in humours, pathological states of the vital organs, or disorders of the nervous system. It also originated in aberrant imagination, perception or judgement; moreover, it could be rooted in deviations of moral life[7]. The poetry of James Carkesse, Anne Finch, William Collins, Christopher Smart, and William Cowper tackle questions concerning the 'mad' body, 'inward senses', and the moral implications of insanity. By shedding new light on the interplay of the body, mind and soul in mental disease, they allow for deeper insight into the multiple aetiology of mental disorder in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. *Vice versa*, adopting contemporary theories of madness as a lens through which these authors' work can be read opens up new lines of interpretation and proposes a richer understanding of their verse.

It must be stressed that the moral dimension of madness is a subject of constant concern for the authors under analysis in this study, and can be seen as a conspicuous element of continuity in their poems. However, commonality of themes does not purport similarity of perspectives. In

[6] On this point, see Schlutz 2009, 53-58.

[7] As early as 1801, there emerged a partial awareness of the multifaceted picture that the scientific discourse had painted of madness in the previous decades. Its main features were described in these terms: «We may remark that there are two theories of insanity – the one materialistic, the other purely psychological; the one teaches that the disease originates from, and is dependent upon some physical change [...]; the other, that the mind may itself be subject to aberration» (*Autobiography of the Insane* 1801, 52).

bold strokes, we may distinguish between two general attitudes: Carkesse, Finch and Smart deny that their (alleged) insanity is connected with moral value, whereas Collins and Cowper suggest that there exists a complex relationship between madness and moral corruption.

Reference to virtue and vice is one of Carkesse's weapons of defence against allegiances of madness in *Lucida Intervalla*: when the poet refuses the label of lunacy, he insists that his fury against the dissenters is inspired by God, and his fight against «Popery» is a battle against devilish forces (1679, 17-18). Carkesse defines his self in terms of moral uprightness and religious zeal. In this respect, he stands in opposition to his physician, a quack who leaves behind Browne's *Religio Medici* and, with it, any ethical reflection on medicine in the light of the moral traditions of Christianity (1679, 5, 11). Similarly to Carkesse, Anne Finch often employs the idea that insanity descends from vice as a means to attack the medical world, and rejects the widespread idea that patients are the authors of their own illness. In *For the Better* and *To D^r. Waldron*, physicians invent new and non-existent maladies to pursue economic profit, subordinate science to their own pride, and then blame on their patients the same faults to which they are most vulnerable. Greed, arrogance and debauchery, *To D^r. Waldron* suggests, make medical practitioners not less 'mad' and deviant than their diseased patients. Christopher Smart's *Jubilate Agno* professes a sense of moral rectitude that bears some points of resemblance with *Lucida Intervalla*: the speaker is a «fool for the sake of Christ» (B51), and seems to accept confinement as a form of sacrifice, or even martyrdom, an ultimate giving of life for the faith. Even more importantly, Smart assumes the role of a psalmist, thus re-actuating the procedures of identification that Jerome Creach recognizes in the biblical Psalms: he is the «righteous» speaker who «suffers unjustly at the hands of a cruel and evil enemy» (2013, 52).

Collins and Cowper propose a different view on the moral dimension of madness, and attach to it either a negative or an ambiguous value. In Collins' poetry, insanity is often linked to moral failure: indulgence in excessive passions brings about lack of harmony with both the self and the external world (*The Passions*), or leads to self-annihilation (*No longer ask me Gentle Friends*). Deviating from the norm or succumbing to immoderate emotion is both dangerous and immoral, but *An Ode on the Popular Superstitions* and *No longer ask me Gentle Friends* indicate that it may also be unavoidable; therefore, the deviant subject is at fault and a victim at the same time. Cowper's early poems similarly establish a connection between the sinner and the madman: in the contributions to *Olney Hymns*, following God's ways means salvation from all evil, including the interior suffering caused by mental trouble. However, Cowper's rejection of both sin and madness is ambivalent, because departing from the norm can be a means to express one's individuality and distinctiveness against a background of standardised 'personhood', as in *Hatred and vengeance* and *Ephraim Repenting*.

Carkesse, Finch, Collins, Smart and Cowper's poems also show elements of continuity and discontinuity with respect to their representation of 'mad' identity and predicament. In particular, they emphasize that both illness and the doctor-patient relationship were not uniform experiences over the years 1676-1774, but they modulated in meaning and implications. Even in this respect, the body/soul duality comes to the foreground as a central trope in defining both the poetic self and the idea of disease, although in this case the «soul» is to be understood as human thought in its distinct faculties: sensation, reflection, imagination, memory, and will[8].

The body seems to dominate Carkesse and Finch's representation of insanity. *Lucida Intervalla* is primarily about the physical therapies adopted in seventeenth-century Bethlem, which involved procedures of taming and restraint. The physician figures prominently in the poems: he is ridiculed, contested, or even challenged to a duel of lancet against pen. Carkesse is very clear in stating to be an object of invasive and ineffective medical practices, whereas his assumptions on the aetiology of madness are more confused. Possibly, Carkesse protests against being treated as a lunatic, but not against Dr Allen's medical therapy in itself: when comparing England to the body of a madman, the poet seems to adhere to the theory of humours and suggest that their imbalance should be cured through purges and bleeding (1679, 18). Carkesse also discusses the role of astral influences on his person and behaviour, referring to the traditional belief that celestial bodies «send out rays which confer astral qualities on the '*spiritus mundanus*' which then passes them on to its counterpart, namely the '*spiritus humanus*'», and affect «both body and soul» (Klibansky, Panofsky and Saxl 1979 [1964], 265). These 'astral influences' are said to make the speaker's body abnormally strong (Carkesse 1679, 15) and his mind celestially inspired to write verse (Carkesse 1679, 50).

The war against medical practitioners characterizes also Anne Finch's corpus, where quack doctors and their theories are repeatedly undermined and ridiculed. *For the Better* and *An Epistle from Alexander* represent a tension between the patients' feelings, sufferings or needs, and the unsympathetic will of the physician. Actual war imagery, however, is more commonly found when the poetic personas discuss their fight against melancholy, so that Finch's verses can be said to stage a battle on two different fronts. Similarly to *Lucida Intervalla*, the body and its symptoms are at the centre of Finch's poetry: she traces melancholy back to its physical signs, focusing on the concrete pain of the «Flesh» (*For the Better*, line 25). This does not mean that Finch disregards mental suffering: however, *The Spleen*, *Ardelia to Melancholy* and *Fragment at Tunbridge Wells* suggest

[8] For this notion of «soul», see, for instance, Berkeley 1734 [1710], 36, 57, 100, 240 and *passim*.

that investigating this aspect of melancholy can lead to vain and empty speculation, as non-corporeal symptoms of insanity are variable and difficult to grasp. Abstract divagation, according to Finch, has long characterized medical theories about mental affections, and doctors were never able to point a finger at the actual causes of melancholy, or mental disorder in general. Neither medical diagnosis nor therapy is meant to cure: they are rather instruments that physicians use to establish their power and reinforce patriarchal authority.

Although none of Collins' texts was written during or after his periods of insanity and internment, his *Odes* concern questions of deviant perception or non-standard thought. In particular, *The Passions* shows awareness of the bodily 'marks' that characterize madness: the «[e]xulting, trembling, raging, fainting» (line 5) characters of the poem are reminiscent of Bacchus' festivals and show exterior signs that at the time were ascribable to enthusiasm. Bodily symptoms of derangement, however, remain in the background of Collins' poems, if compared to the constant preoccupation about abstract mental processes that the *Odes* introduce. Indeed, *The Manners* focuses especially on the ways in which imagination can blur and confuse vision, giving the impression that the external world is constantly changing. Collins' later production further develops this idea: in *An Ode on the Popular Superstitions*, to see differently is to think differently, and when the poetic personae follow the illusions of sight, they are led to confusion, or even death.

Collins' experience with mental institutions and the medical world remains divorced from his poetry; hence, not much can be said about his representation of these aspects of madness. Interestingly, however, he was long believed to be the author of an epigram ridiculing a physician in Chichester:

> Seventh son of doctor John,
> Physician and chirurgeon,
> Who hath travelled wide and far,
> Man-midwife to a man of war,
> In Chichester hath ta'en a house,
> Hippocrates, Hippocratous. (in Dyce 1827, 17-18)

This poem of uncertain attribution circulated widely in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, quoted as a typical example of Collins' 'wit'; today, various scholars have excluded it from the author's canon. Beyond questions of authorship, this epigram shows that Collins' contemporaries attributed to him an attitude of mistrust and scorn towards physicians which bears similarity to Carkesse and Finch's viewpoints.

Christopher Smart and William Cowper's poetry signals a change in the way allegedly mad writers understand mental disease and represent

the experience of it. Collins' work can be said to mark the transitional period within a shift in focus away from the body and towards the «soul» (or mind) of the diseased subject. With *Jubilate Agno*, the body disappears from the literary discourse related to insanity and internment, and so does the figure of the physician or his relationship with the patient. Smart does not seem to consider madness as deviation, and certainly he does not view it as a medical condition: it is a state of disempowerment that falls within a wider concept of degradation and suffering, a condition that has affected humankind since the beginning of times. In *Jubilate Agno*, insanity is represented as an existential predicament that binds human beings to all creation and is inherent to the concept of life itself. Moreover, similarly to Collins, Smart considers questions of distorted perception (B426). He advocates the possibility of 'seeing' differently and pursuing a perspective that does not conform to accepted or postulated norms. The interpretation of the mind's processes, Smart suggests, can be subjective and variable, but the totalizing scientific discourse is incapable of conceiving difference.

For Cowper, mental disease seems to lie in distorted ideas, or Battie's «deluded imagination» (1758, 5). The author's autobiographic *Memoir* describes derangement as seeing falsely, interpreting falsely and acting according to mistaken perceptions and mental processes. The protagonist of *Memoir* does not only see or imagine things that do not exist, but he also trusts such misrepresentations, in what Monro would have defined an error «in the judgment» (1758, 21). While Cowper's early poems often concern questions of deviant thought or behaviour, they never address these issues directly. Insanity is represented as some sort of 'private', interior trouble which concerns the sufferer alone, finds no counterpart or equivalent in other individuals, much less in the natural world (*Prayer for Patience, The Shrubbery*). The only figure of a physician is introduced in *Memoir*, and it displays a significant departure from Carkesse and Finch's earlier representations of doctors and doctoring. Dr Cotton is described as playing a positive fatherly role: instead of an enemy, he is a guide, who appeals to the spiritual side of his patients and helps them to keep their excesses under control. As Foucault remarks, by the end of the eighteenth century «ce n'est pas comme savant que l'homo medicus prend autorité dans l'asile, mais comme sage» (Foucault 1972b, 524; Murphy 2006, 504: «it was not as a scientist that homo medicus gained authority in the asylum, but as a wise man»). Accordingly, Cowper's early production seems to associate the doctor's figure with that of God, for they both represent moral principles of order that bring about sanity through self-government, and they both ask the individual to sacrifice his or her own self in the process.

I wish to point out that the changes in the representation of insanity which emerge from Carkesse, Finch, Collins, Smart, and Cowper's works are probably less linear than I have suggested above. It is true that the po-

ems analysed in this study evidence a shift in what is perceived to be the aetiology, or even the epistemology of madness, but outlining such shift inevitably implies falling into some sort of simplification. The movement from a body-based to a «soul»-based model of insanity is more a matter of emphasis on different aspects of the disease than of real conceptual transformation. When tackling such change of emphasis, I find it necessary to stress that various ideas and notions intersected and coexisted in both the literary and the medical discourse on mental trouble between 1676 and 1774. Different categories of insanity not only overlapped, but also included an array of corollary effects, some of which deserve due attention. For instance, analysis of the five 'mad' poets has revealed a path that runs parallel to the philosophical-medical discourse and concerns the social dimension of madness.

Nowadays, we would define the transformations in the social image of the insane as the development of an increasingly sympathetic feeling towards mental disease. The different capacity in which Carkesse, Finch, Collins, Smart, and Cowper could participate in the public scene has emerged from both their works and lives; their legitimacy as literary authors was similarly varied. If we compare Carkesse and Cowper's experience of insanity, the contrast is sharp: the first was an object of public amusement in Bethlem, and the title page of his collection omitted his name in favour of a disparaging definition, whereas the second was a celebrated poet who reached the height of popularity during his lifetime. Viewed against the backdrop of British laws, the major changes in the responses to insanity occurred roughly in coincidence with the *Madhouses Act* of 1774, which not only distinguished madness from other kind of social marginalization, but also considered the specific needs of the insane.

The progressive development of a new way of looking at madness at the end of the eighteenth century could have given way to a less troubled sense of adjustment to the 'sane' other. Carkesse, Finch, Collins, and Smart represent (mental) nonconformity as a condition which puts the individual in contrast with the outer world, and on a metaphorical battlefield. War imagery pervades their production: while the objects of the 'poetic fights' may vary, the poems all stage the assault of something coming from outside. Carkesse fights against his physician, Finch's poetic personas take arms against both the disease and the medical world; Collins' speaker asks to be shielded from the «Giant Follies» of contemporary thought (*The Manners*, line 12), and Smart portrays God's creation as in need of systems of attack and defence from outward threat. Cowper's early texts partially depart from this sense of external menace, and identify the source of conflict in the speaker's self, rather than in the world. The individual cannot harmonize with the environment because he lacks interior harmony in the first place: he is torn by contrasting emotions and shaken by inner storms rather than outer attacks (*The Shrubbery*, *Olney Hymns*, *The Cast-away*).

Accordingly, Cowper is the only author who does not combat the definitions of madness by playing with different identities in his poems: the poetic personas he represents are split between opposing attitudes, but the overall integrity of their selfhood is not put into question. By contrast, the other four authors in this study use several masks and selves, constantly changing the position from which they speak. Carkesse is at once a poet, a parson, a physician, an actor and a warrior in *Lucida Intervalla*; Finch inverts gender roles adopting both masculine and feminine voices in *The Spleen* and *By Love persu'd*. Collins stages complex fragmentations of selves and voices in *No longer ask me Gentle Friends*, and Smart constructs his poetic persona in relation to various key figures of the biblical tradition, whose words he appropriates in *Jubilate Agno*. The search for new fictional identities has to do with negotiating a legitimate location from which to produce poetry. By concealing themselves behind other, more authoritative voices, or simply by questioning the concept of identity itself, these authors discuss the criteria for inclusion in society and in the literary world.

Most of the 'mad' poets analysed in this book engage in a battle against the normalization of society and culture, a conflict that finds expression in the imagery used in the texts and in the definition of their poetic selves. But their battle extends well beyond these two fields: it is also fought on the level of language and literary form. Discussing these aspects involves coping with questions concerning poetical standards and epochal tendencies, which deserve to be treated separately.

7.2 *The (poetic) performance for 'sane' eyes*

By re-examining both Locke and Foucault's thought, Allan Ingram emphasizes that the 'mad' linguistic performance has long been at the centre of the understanding of insanity (1991, 10-11). The scholar suggests that the act of writing literature itself denies the raving quality traditionally associated with mad speech, and includes the latter in a codified system, or norm. The poetic text poses some specific problems that Ingram illustrates in these terms:

> […] how far does the order of written English (at its most demanding in the forms and requirements of poetry) actually order madness into prearranged patterns that violate the primal existence of madness? If the forms of poetry, even for the eighteenth century, have the tendency to render ordered the experience of vision, inspiration, passion, is it in fact possible to write a mad poem? (1991, 12)

There are some conclusions that can be drawn from Ingram's reflections. To some extent, considering eighteenth-century poetry involves

looking at a literary genre which, more than others, inherently negates disorder. We can infer that, from the perspective of 'mad' writers, choosing this communicative practice assumes the status of a statement, for poetry refutes the idea that mental trouble produces any dissolution of logic coherence. Therefore, in the context of 'mad' writing, poetry as a genre is charged with a distinct extra-textual meaning: with its 'rational' formal structure and rhetorical patterns, it can become an instrument of (re)affirming the acceptability of mad expression within the linguistic and cultural canons of society.

However, if we read the 'poetry of madness' merely as assertion of the author's ability to produce logical discourse, the risk is to oversimplify the ambivalence of much more complex issues. For one thing, there is a potential fallacy in considering the poetic genre *per se* as a procedure of normalization, as emerges from both structuralist and post-structuralist approaches to literature. I am thinking, in particular, of Mukařovský's concept of foregrounding in poetry as a form of deviance from the norm (1964, 19) and Riffaterre's theories on stylistic commutation (1959)[9]. In addition, the authors under analysis in this study show that writing poetry is not always, or not only, a procedure aimed at obtaining inclusion in culture, society and 'sane' thought. In fact, poetry can be the ideal place to articulate a dissident discourse; the history of literature, as Allen Thiher remarks, has shown that it is possible to remain within the *logos* of a system while simultaneously transcending or re-shaping it (1999, 308). The border between madness and reason can be approached through transgression, the «irreducible third element» (May 1993, 14): as we have seen at the beginning of our discussion, Foucault sees it as an intermediate component which turns the binary opposition between inclusion and exclusion into a tripartite system (1994 [1963], 249; 1977, 51).

Before exploring the ways in which transgression operates within the poems under analysis, it might be useful to observe that broad questions of literary genre are not the only issue at stake when discussing 'mad' writing. The specific articulations of literary culture in different decades play a fundamental role in shaping the poetic representation of insanity, since each literary tendency is dominated by conventional forms and themes that govern its production. Carkesse, Finch, Collins, Smart, and Cowper's poetry relies not only on genre expectations, but also on specific patterns connected with the main currents of literary taste. To different extents,

[9] Monika Fludernik defines stylistic commutation as «the theory that stylistic deviation consists in an intentional stylistic *choice* of a particular lexeme or syntactic structure over an expected (unmarked) norm for which it substitutes» (1993, 343, original emphasis). Fludernik also offers detailed insights into Michael Riffaterre's principles, as they emerge from his *Review of Ullman's* Style in the French Novel (Riffaterre 1959).

all the 'mad' poets in the present work comply with the conventions of their period: Carkesse, for instance, adopted satire and lampoon at a time when these forms flourished, in order to be counted in the same «Tribe» with famous contemporary writers (1679, 51). Hence, his sharp attacks on Dr Allen are the fruit of his personal perspective on mental disease as much as of literary fashion. Similar questions concern the other four writers under analysis.

The dominant genres in Finch's *Miscellany Poems* are fables, songs and odes, together with other «fashionable lyrics», as Paula R. Backscheider defines them (2005, 39). Popular literary forms such as fables and songs could be considered as especially suitable for a woman writer at the time: Dianne Dugaw notes that they bordered on anonymity for the «the commonality of cultural materials» they referred to (2000, 264). We might suppose, therefore, that form, theme and subject of *Democritus and his Neighbors* are at least partially connected with the model of authorship then available for women writers, as well as to the fact that La Fontaine had «come more into vogue than any other Author», as Addison remarked in 1711 (1755, 61). In addition, Finch's constant references to Shakespearian plays and figures from classical history may suggest a display of erudition deriving from her early connections with court circles; in this sense, *An Epistle from Alexander* is often quoted by current scholarship as an example of «classical ambition» combined «with romance» (Wilson 2012, 507).

Celebrating both the British literary tradition and political power is often considered as the main concern of Collins' works[10]. Most of his *Odes* belong to the Pindaric tradition of encomiastic verse and, as is the case with *The Manners* and *The Passions*, they foster a return to traditional models of literature. Even more importantly, themes and form of Collins' collection are nowadays considered to be typical features of the so-called pre-romantic period, when those writers who «sought to centralise the subjective and perhaps deviant relationship between the speaking presence, language and the world» favoured the ode as a means of expression (Bradford 1993, 76). There is little need to dwell upon the success that themes like imagination, or fancy (Collins' favoured term) were enjoying by the mid-eighteenth century. Nowadays, Collins' «investigation of the tension between interest and imagination» is seen as «so characteristic» of the literary tendencies of his time (White 2000, 32).

The form of *Jubilate Agno* is definitely more difficult to place in a single literary tradition; however, as far as Psalm writing is concerned, Smart's work is partially a product of the seventeenth- and eighteenth-century cultural milieu and the heightened interest in rewriting the word of God. The Reformation had replaced papal authority with the biblical one, so the

[10] On this topic, see Weinbrot 1990, 3-39, Griffin 2002, 123.

Scriptures were a common source of inspiration for both worshippers and religious enthusiasts. William Cowper's contributions to *Olney Hymns* can be read in a similar context, as both Smart and Cowper adhered in different ways to a new eighteenth-century orientation towards applying «biblical texts to the individual condition» (Watson 2012, 342-343). J. R. Watson defines Cowper's choice of passages from the Bible and their treatment as «conventional» and «traditional», but he also emphasizes other aspects to his hymns: he says that «Cowper is capable of using the Bible with great freedom», and that he often introduces new meanings by slight variation of otherwise «impeccable references» (342-343).

Elements of variation from the norm are essential to understanding Carkesse, Finch, Collins, Smart and Cowper's relationship with both the literary tradition and the literary culture of their day. Under an apparent patina of conformity, these poets pervade their works with destabilizing elements in form and contents. In so doing, they undermine the ideas of (literary) «order» and «canon» at their very roots. To be sure, our discussion has revealed that Cowper re-reads not only the patterns of hymnal verse in *Olney Hymns*, but also the conventions of the retirement theme in *The Shrubbery* and the evangelical conversion narrative in *Memoir*. Smart's work contains radical experimentation: *Jubilate Agno* evades any literary norm, to the point that it has often been considered a 'symptom' of insanity. This poem proceeds by accumulation and excess, simultaneously affirming and denying any specific structural principle.

Transgression is also a common feature of Carkesse, Finch, and Collins' works. Carkesse, Ingram says, forces language into «ungainly feats of gymnastry», through frequent use of «puns and wordplay» or inversions of «forms and addresses of sane society» (1991, 166). Finch, as we have seen, uses irony, satire and gender inversions, creating a new mode of expression that fits neither in the «Dryden-and-Pope-centered conception of Augustan poetry», nor in the «second low tradition that runs from Butler and Rochester through Swift» (Hinnant 1994, 16). Finch also includes subtle but significant variations in the popular forms of the fable and song, transforming a 'collective' tradition into a means of personal and subjective expression. Finally, Collins employs dislocated and fragmented syntax in his *Odes* and experiments boldly with both form and content in *No longer ask me Gentle Friends*. We may now view Collins' approach to the theme of fancy as conventional, but at the time it was perceived as much more innovative and described in terms of the transgressive zeal of religious enthusiasm[11]. Significantly, his treatment of established poetic subjects in *The*

[11] I am especially referring to Samuel Johnson and Hugh Blair's remarks on the new, 'imaginative' poetic trends discussed in § 4.1 of the present study. See Johnson 1779, 309 and Blair 1783, 155-156.

Passions was so disturbing for his contemporaries that part of the text was rewritten for the musical adaptation of the poem[12].

The above description provides only a few essential examples of what has emerged throughout this study; the 'mad' poems under analysis contain so many different deviations from literary standards that it is hardly possible to summarize them effectively. Conventions are unsettled or transgressed through mingling of forms, fragmentation of the poetic self and subject matter, cataloguing, reversal of roles, and instability of the poetic images. Moreover, subversions of literary schemes range from conspicuous transformations of accepted compositional techniques to subtle variations in form and rhythm. By using different strategies and procedures, the five 'mad' authors under study demonstrate that alternative modes of expression are as valid as standard ones, thereby validating also the non-conformity of their thoughts and perceptions. Poetry becomes a means of affirming the authoritativeness of diversity: Carkesse, Finch, Collins, Smart and Cowper adhere to the mainstream literary criteria of their time and simultaneously question them, so they construct a specific and unique poetic vision that challenges the logic behind uniformity. While expanding the boundaries of literary standards, the five 'mad' authors also search for new grounds of dialogue with the «norm», taken in its wider sense. Such a commonality of aims is worthy of note especially in the light of the different periods and literary contexts in which these poets wrote.

So far, our discussion has suggested that the works of the five poets are dissimilar in many respects, but pursue some similar themes, methods and strategies. These points of contact might be rooted in a shared perception of one's position in relation to both literary and social standards. The works analysed in this study reveal that the poetic self is often constructed in accordance with and in opposition to a 'sane' non-self, as they show constant awareness of an inside and outside of thought, language, society and culture. Some texts seem to negotiate ways to (re) admission, others describe procedures of exclusion, but they all tackle a shared idea: to put it in Ingram's terms, «being mad is subject only to the eye of the spectator» and «appearance is at the heart [...] of being or not being mad» (Ingram and Faubert 2003, 88, 185).

Appearance, sight and vision emerge as key thematic threads that run throughout the poetic production of the authors[13]. In order to illustrate their import in the context of mad writing, I would like to rely on Man-

[12] See § 4.2 of the present study, note 36.

[13] Useful discussions of the functions of sight and vision in literature include Francesca Di Blasio's essay on the connections between sight and cognition across different cultural contexts (2001) and Sergio Rufini's analysis of perspective illusions in the language of Shakespeare, Donne, and Herbert (1992).

fred Pfister's remarks about identity in national interactions, which prove very relevant also to our case:

> [...] the construction of the other is always informed by the construction of one's self and vice versa; [...] performing one's cultural identity is always a performance *against* the backdrop of the other performing culture or even *for* it; [...] our performances of national identity react and respond to expectations and role scenarios projected by the other culture; [...] we are always both performers and spectators, performers aware of an audience and an audience aware of performances, at one and the same time. (2008, 10, original emphasis)

With slight adaptation, Pfister's comments are very fit to describe the relationship that the 'mad' writers examined in this study establish with the world of 'sound minds'. As if living at the intersection between different cultures, or in a «separate country entirely» (Atwood 1996, 33), the 'mad' poets simultaneously adapt and react to norms and expectations. They appear to be on a metaphorical stage, aware of being in the eye of the 'sane other', who can decide about their mental health. Carkesse, a Bedlamite who was on stage even outside metaphor, openly defines himself as a performer in *Lucida Intervalla*; the protagonist of Cowper's *Memoir* does so implicitly, when he manages «voice and countenance» in front of his interlocutors (Cowper 1816, 44). Performances and stages are set up also in Finch's *The Spleen*, Collins' *The Manners* and *The Passions*, and Smart's *Jubilate Agno*, where either the speaker or other poetic figures act and feign.

It is noteworthy that the ideas of appearance, sight, and vision took on a new urgency in poetry at a time when medical discourse increasingly focused on observation of the patient. For Sydenham, medicine was «accurate observation» (1742, 301); similarly, the Italian physician Giorgio Baglivi believed that «duo sunt præcipui medicinæ cardines, Ratio, & Observatio; Observatio tamen est filu, ad quod dirigi debant Medicorum ratiocinia» (Baglivi 1754 [1696], 3; [Unknown Translator] 1723, 9: «the two chief Pillars of Physick are Reason and Observation: But Observation is the Thread to which Reason must point»). Observation was not only the primary access to knowledge for the physician, but also the ideal means to keep the patient's course of treatment under control. This propensity to 'look at' the patient in medicine run hand in hand with more popular conceptions of mental disease, which often took the form of curiosity for the 'madhouse show'. I believe that a very representative example in this sense is Richard Newton's caricature *A Visit to Bedlam*, etched in 1794, where some visitors look into the cells of a hospital for the insane, and appear shocked by the inmates' eccentric behaviour[14].

[14] Richard Newton's *A Visit to Bedlam* is reproduced in Byrd 1974, plate 3. For quick reference, a digital reproduction is accessible through the website and blog of the Ar-

«The role of sight», Mary De Young argues, «if not fixing in the manner that [Francis] Willis and [Benjamin] Rush had so successfully used it, became central to the asylum physician-patient interaction» in the early nineteenth century (2015, 139). Benjamin Rush used «fixing» as a «coercive strategy», a means of «diagnostic assessment» and a «therapeutic tool» (De Young 2015, 138; Rush 1812). Significantly, much of Rush's theories on the power of the doctors' sight were derived from the treatments advocated by physician Francis Willis (1718-1807), who imposed a «*basiliskan* authority» on his royal patient George III (Hunter and Macalpine, eds, 1963, 272). The madness of King George encapsulates and explains much about eighteenth-century developments in the history of madness, including some issues tackled by Carkesse, Finch, Collins, Smart, and Cowper. George III's «cérémonie de destitution», or «sacre à l'envers» (Foucault 2003, 22 ; Burchell 2008 [2006], 21: «deposition», «reverse coronation»), as Foucault defines it, marked not only a change in the physician-patient relationship, but also a shift from sovereignty to disciplinary power that later affected social and political life at large.

Possibly, as Robert Detweiler notes, George III suffered from the first episodes of insanity as early as 1765. It was only after a severe attack in 1788, however, that the king came to be regarded as a «neurotic, prone to collapse under strain» (Detweiler 1972, 38)[15]. Suddenly, the archetypal figure of the mad king that had long pervaded British literature assumed historical dimensions, moved to the realm of concrete experience, and faced even the bodily aspects of disease. Before Francis Willis was summoned to Court, the monarch was not only straitjacketed, but also administered vomits, purges, bleedings, blistering, cuppings, and leeches. The king's malady hit Britain like the storm in *Lucida Intervalla*, as the «mad monarch signified 'constitutional crisis' of a public as well as private kind: a double threat which found ready expression in a language resonant with metaphors of body politic» (Small 1996, 72). Simultaneously, public acknowledgment of the king's illness took place on the magnificent 'stage' of the court, among ceremonies and rituals which eroded the distance between the real and the represented, as was the case with the theatre of madness in Bethlem.

chives and Museum service at Bethlem Royal Hospital, *Bethlem*: *Museum of the Mind*, <http://goo.gl/s45fHV> (01/2015).

[15] Detweiler quotes various sources attesting that George III was deranged as early as 1765. In addition, he remarks: «We seem to be faced with a classic cycle of interpretation. The earliest accounts report that [King George's] illness was physical. […] By the 1930's and after, however, scholars changed their approach and maintained that his condition was mental, resulting from causes to be found in the environment in which the King grew up and the stresses under which he lived and worked. Quite recently some scholars have challenged this environmental approach and returned to the physical viewpoint» (1972, 38).

George III's «cérémonie de destitution», or «sacre à l'envers» (Foucault 2003, 22 ; Burchell 2008 [2006], 21: «deposition», «reverse coronation») that the king's recovery was perceived as a question of re-establishing appearances and realizing that «being a king is a matter of presentation, rather than of any authentic being» (Hancock 2013, 129). It is along the same line that Helen Small analyses the concert held during «the Duke of Cambridge's night» at Windsor Castle, which was presumably meant to divert George III during one of his 'lucid intervals'. The scholar notes that this event dislocated the king's disease «outside the bonds of ordinary experience» and cast him beside tragic fictional figures of the western culture (Small 1996, 74) – a 'hyperbolic' procedure that we have already seen at work in *Jubilate Agno*. Small adds:

> [At the concert] the gap between medical representations of the King's condition and contemporary artistic representation of insanity becomes apparent. The non-mimetic function of representation, in this instance, is essential to its therapeutic value. If music heals it is because it offers the King a transformed vision of insanity, one which makes of madness something heroic, passionate, even sublime. (1996, 75)

The same transformed vision of madness is pivotal to the study of the five mad poets considered in this book. In the mid-eighteenth century, medical treatises emphasized various aspects to the functions of sight in the treatment of mental disease. After Boerhaave and Battie, attention was paid not only to the doctor's scrutinizing eye, but also to the patient's 'diseased' one. The cause of madness was believed to lie somewhere between the reception of visual input and its interpretation in the brain, so defective sight acquired an increasingly central role in the study of mental disturbance. The idea that a disturbed vision could provoke deviant understanding became so rooted in the medical discourse that it extended well into the nineteenth century. In 1841, Nathaniel Bingham, a member of the Royal College of surgeons, still maintained that «insanity is generally characterized by images or ideas of things clearly presented to the mind, with all the vividness of truth, when there are no corresponding external objects to cause them» (18).

The five poets under study do not deny that insanity distorts vision and causes the sufferer to see things differently. Cowper even addresses this specific medical problem, when the protagonist of *Memoir* relates his apex of nervous disorder to troubled eyesight (1816, 45). Carkesse, Finch, Collins, Smart, and Cowper repeatedly cope with illusions, cheatings of the sight or obfuscated vision as signs of non-conformity. However, as is the case with literary tradition, these writers appropriate the medical discourse in a subversive way, re-reading and transforming its original meaning. Their poetic personae see differently, in that they have access

to angles of vision forbidden to the majority. *Jubilate Agno* is exemplary in this respect: the madman's eye is able to capture multiple perspectives simultaneously, or, like Hooke's microscope, it can transcend the limitations of the human body and see the veiled connections that exist between microcosm and macrocosm.

The poetry analysed in this book includes speakers and selves who can see beyond appearance, explore uncharted territories of the mind, view «shifting images», access hidden poetic sources, and ambitiously utter «I prophecy»[16]. From Isaac Newton onwards, the scientific discourse had stripped the human eye of any ability to go beyond earthly matters; the five 'mad' poets restore the transcendental reference to vision, and specifically to insane vision. Under the surface of their texts, which often comply with contemporary assumptions about mental disease, there lie multiple hints at madness as a privileged condition. Alternative ways of thinking and feeling may appear troubled to society, but they open the door to a superior dimension, where reality still has the mystical and spiritual auras denigrated by science. In comparison with such widening of knowledge, the perspective of reason appears monocular, or cyclopic, and limited to mechanistic experiment.

Carkesse, Finch, Collins, Smart, and Cowper, therefore, re-establish the 'poet as seer' equation, enriching it with additional meanings. The ability to move between the world of medical knowledge and that of artistic creativity is essential to their role as mediators between ordinary and non-ordinary reality. Such movement, however, is commonly perceived as hindered or prevented by contemporary culture. The new scientific era has turned the transcendent dimension into a non-place, and society views excess of curiosity as punishable in Faustian terms. Therefore, the poet-*vates* remains trapped in a limbo between two realms, condemned to re-enact Pentheus' fate, as described by Bacon:

> [...] Pentheus desiring to pry into the hidden Mysteries of Bacchus's Sacrifice; and climbing a Tree for that purpose; was struck with a Phrenzy. This Phrenzy of Pentheus caused him to see [T]hings double; particularly the Sun, and his own City Thebes; so that running homewards, and immediately espying another Thebes, he runs towards that; and thus continues incessantly tending first to the one, and then to the other, without coming at either. (1733, 589)

This study has merely scratched the surface of all the factors involved in the study of poetry written by imputed-mad authors. It has shown elements of continuity and discontinuity between the understanding and

[16] The quotation «shifting images» is taken from William Collins' *The Manners*, line 30. «For I prophecy» is the initial formula of a series of lines in *Jubilate Agno*, C59-77.

representation of madness in literary and non-literary texts, or between literature and science. Much still remains to be explored, especially regarding the perspective of the imputed insane on their alleged disease, and how such discourse is articulated in literary terms. In my opinion, the task at hand does not necessarily entail rediscovery of historically silenced voices, but mainly consists in adopting a new angle of vision on the already known. Research on mad literature does not lend itself to neat definition and categorization, and it is difficult to predict its future directions; however, one might identify a recent shift away from the aural metaphor that has long dominated this field. Now, scholars are hardly ever seen as collecting a 'confession' of those who were prevented from speaking; in other words, poetry is losing its status of testimony to acquire a new one. I believe that there is an increasing tendency towards recognizing the 'literature of madness' as a specific practice of writing, where the textual performance of insanity becomes a site of subjectivity and identity formation. I hope that the present book has contributed to this critical orientation, by achieving a main purpose: demonstrating that seventeenth- and eighteenth-century 'mad' authors created a sub-genre of poetry, a sub-genre which is defined by adherence to a set of tropes and dominant questions, and which takes on a more nuanced significance when read against the backdrop of contemporary scientific concerns.

WORKS CITED

Primary Sources

A Case Humbly Offered to the Consideration of Parliament (1763), «Gentleman's Magazine», 33: 25-26, <https://goo.gl/Ecx15p> (01/2016).

A Pill to Purge the Dispensary Doctors: or, a Cure for the Present State of Physick (1702), printed for the Author, London, <https://goo.gl/s3nusw> (01/2016).

A Treatise of Diseases of the Head, Brain and Nerves (1727 [1714]), printed by the Author, London, <https://goo.gl/2dtEXE> (01/2016).

Adair J.M. (1786), *Medical Cautions, chiefly for the Consideration of Invalids*, Printed by Richard Cruttwell, Bath, <https://goo.gl/5VDEyJ> (01/2016).

Addison Joseph (1721), *The Works of the Right Honourable Joseph Addison*, vol. III, printed for Jacob Tonson, London, <https://goo.gl/6piknJ> (01/2016).

— (1755), *The Spectator, 29 September 1711, No. 183*, in *The Spectator*, vol. III, printed for Peter Wilson, Dublin, 60-63, <https://goo.gl/8SCnSG> (01/2016).

Aikin John (1771), *Thoughts on Hospitals*, printed for Joseph Johnson, London, <https://goo.gl/7BM2qK> (01/2016).

Akenside Mark (1744), *The Pleasures of Imagination. A Poem in Three Books*, London, <https://goo.gl/Qwyq8f> (03/2016).

— (1781), *The Poetical Works of Mark Akenside*, vol. I, Apollo Press, Edinburg, <http://goo.gl/Vt6Tau> (01/2016).

An Universal History (1747), vol. IX, printed for Thomas Osborne, London, <https://goo.gl/rdwUEq> (01/2016).

A new mad tom of Bedlam, or, the man in the moon drinks claret with powder beef turnip and caret, the tune is Grayes Inne mask (1690 [orig. ed. unknown], London, <http://goo.gl/j1yWnV> (01/2016).

Autobiography of the Insane (1801), «The Journal of Psychological Medicine and Mental Pathology», 3: 40-54, <https://goo.gl/DyOQrp> (01/2016).

Aquinas Thomas (1265-1274), *Summa Theologiae*, trans. by The Fathers of the English Dominican Province (1978 [1919]), *Summa Theologica,* Hayes Barton Press, Raleigh.

Aristotle (1991 [1499]), *Περὶ Ψυχῆς,* trans. by R.D. Hicks, *De Anima*, Prometheus Books, Amherst.

Arnold Thomas (1782), *Observations on the Nature, Kinds, Causes, and Prevention of Insanity, Lunacy or Madness*, vol. I, printed by George Ireland, Leicester, <https://goo.gl/s57W7G> (01/2016).

— (1786), *Observations on the Nature, Kinds, Causes, and Prevention of Insanity, Lunacy or Madness*, vol. II, printed by George. Ireland, Leicester, <https://goo.gl/mBcDAE> (01/2016).

I. Natali, *«Remov'd from human eyes»: Madness and Poetry 1676-1774*, ISBN (online) 978-88-6453-319-3
ISSN (online) 2420-8361, CC BY-NC-ND 3.0 IT, 2016 Firenze University Press

Art. LI (1755), in *The Monthly Review*, vol. XIII, printed for Ralph Griffiths, London, 434-438, <https://goo.gl/5H8q8Y> (01/2016).
Atwood Margaret (1996), *Alias Grace*, Bloomsbury, London.

B.A. (1674), *The Sick-man's Rare Jewel*, printed by T. R. *et al.*, London, <http://goo.gl/BQNDI9> (01/2016).
Bacon Francis (1733), *The Philosophical Works of Francis Bacon*, vol. III, ed. by Peter Shaw, printed for James John and Paul Knapton *et al.*, London, <https://goo.gl/rSwVEs> (01/2016).
— (2002), *The Major Works*, ed. by Brian Vickers, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
Baglivi, Giorgio (1754 [1696]), *De praxi medica ad priscam observandi rationem revocanda*, in Id., *Opera omnia medico-practica, et anatomica*, Typis Remondinianis, Venetiis: 1-120, <https://goo.gl/zxrZG1> (01/2016). Trans. by [Unknown Translator] (1723 [1704]), *The Practice of Physick, Reduc'd to the ancient Way of Observations*, The Second Edition, Printed for Daniel Midwinter et al, London, <https://goo.gl/BqhsBI> (01/2016).
Ball John (1760), *The Modern Practice of Physic*, vol. II, printed for Andrew Millar, London, <https://goo.gl/cEhHI1> (01/2016).
Battie William (1758), *A Treatise on Madness*, printed for John Whiston *et al.*, London, <https://goo.gl/zIS86f> (01/2016).
— (1962), *A Treatise on Madness, by William Battie, M.D., and Remarks on Dr. Battie's Treatise on Madness, by John Monro, M.D. A Psychiatric Controversy of the Eighteenth Century*, ed. by Richard Hunter and Ida Macalpine, Dawsons, London.
Beaumont John (1705), *An Historical, Physiological and Theological Treatise of Spirits. An Historical, Physiological and Theological Treatise of Spirits, Apparitions, Witchcrafts and other Magical Practices*, printed for Donald Browne *et al.*, London, <https://goo.gl/4yLFWQ> (01/2016).
Berkeley George (1734 [1710]), *A Treatise Concerning the Principles of Human Knowledge*, printed for Jacob Tonson, London, <https://goo.gl/oSdV3w> (01/2016).
— (1744), *Siris: A Chain of Philosophical Reflexions and Inquiries concerning the Virtues of Tar Water*, printed for William Innys and Charles Hitch, Dublin and London, <https://goo.gl/CuuFxz> (01/2016).
— (1754 [1734]), *The Analyst: or, A Discourse Addressed to an Infidel Mathematician*, printed for Jacob and Richard Tonson and Somerset Draper, London, <https://goo.gl/shL0FV> (01/2016).
— (2005 [1871]), *The Works of George Berkeley*, ed. by A. C. Fraser, Thoemmes Continuum, London.
Bingham Nathaniel (1841), *Observations on the Religious Delusions of Insane Persons and on the Practicability, Safety, and Expediency of Imparting to them Christian Instruction*, John Hatchard & Son, London.
Blackmore Richard (1725a), *A Critical Dissertation upon the Spleen*, printed for John Pemberton, London.
— (1725b), *A Treatise of the Spleen and Vapours: or, Hypocondriacal and Hysterical Affections: with Three Discourses on the Nature and Cure of the Cholick, Melancholy, and Palsies*, printed for John Pemberton, London, <https://goo.gl/O0nttf> (01/2016).
Blair Hugh (1783), *Lectures on Rhetoric and Belles Lettres*, vol III, printed for Whitestone, Colles, Burnet *et al.*, Dublin.
Blondel J.A. (1729), *The Power of the Mother's Imagination over the Foetus Examin'd*, Sold by John Brotherton, London, <https://goo.gl/BwalZo> (01/2016).

Boerhaave Herman (1709), *Aphorismi de cognoscendis et curandis morbis*, Apud Johannem Vander Linden, Lugduni Batavorum, <https://goo.gl/5Ghu44> (01/2016). Trans by. [Unknown Translator] (1715), *Boerhaave's Aphorisms Concerning the Knowledge and Cure of Diseases*, trans. from the Last Edition printed in Latin at Leyden, 1715, ed. by Jean Delacoste, printed for Benjamin Cowse and William Innys, London, <https://goo.gl/vjJMYJ> (01/2016).

— (1746 [1708]), *Institutiones Medicae*, Apud Johannem et Hermannem Verbech, Cornelium Haak, Lugduni Batavorum et Apud Johannem D. Beman, Rotterdami, <https://goo.gl/B9rV58> (01/2016). Trans. by Joseph Browne (1714), *Institutions in Physick*, printed for Jonah Browne, London, <https://goo.gl/e4iDau> (01/2016).

—(1751 [1739]), *Praelectiones academicae in proprias Institutiones rei medicae*, Tomus Quartus, Apud Simonem Occhi, Venetiis, <https://goo.gl/DvAKTC> (01/2016). Trans. by [Unknown Translator] 1745, *Dr. Boerhaave's Academical Lectures on the Theory of Physic*, vol. IV, printed for William Innys, London, <https://goo.gl/tVJ1TL> (01/2016).

Bonnet Charles (1747), *New Observations on Insects*, in John Martyn (ed.), *The Philosophical Transactions: From the Year 1732, to the Year 1744*, printed for William Innys, London: 39-54, <https://goo.gl/LVeYkP> (01/2016).

Boyer Abel (1729), *The Political State of Great Britain for the month of July, 1729*, vol. XXXVIII, printed for the Author, London, <https://goo.gl/rxENIJ> (01/2016).

Boyle Robert (1725), *The Philosophical Works of the Honourable Robert Boyle*, vol. II, printed for William and John Innys, London, <https://goo.gl/fDAHPP> (01/2016).

— (1999 [1772]), *The Works of the Honourable Robert Boyle*, ed. by Peter Alexander, Thoemmes, Bristol.

Bradley Richard (1721), *A Philosophical Account of the Works of Nature*, printed for William Mears, London, <https://goo.gl/QCp4eH> (01/2016).

Brant Sebastian (1494), *Das Narrenschiff*, Johann Bergmann von Olpe, Basel. Trans. from German by Jacob Locher (1497), *Stultifera navis*, Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Darmstadt, Germany. Trans. from Latin by Alexander Barclay (1874 [1509]), *The Ship of Fools*, vol. I, William Paterson, Edinburgh, <https://goo.gl/twKRgy> (01/2016).

— (1971), *The Ship of Fools*, trans. by William Gillis, Folio Society, London.

Brent J.T. (2010 [1893]), *Early Voyages and Travels in the Levant*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Brown Thomas (1760 [1707]), *The Works of Mr. Thomas Brown*, vol. II, printed for Charles Hitch *et al*., London, <https://goo.gl/lT7xPN> (01/2016).

Browne Joseph (1707), *An Account of the Wonderful Cures Perform'd by the Cold Baths*, John Howard, London.

Browne Richard (1729), *Medicina Musica: or a Mechanical Essay on the Effects of Singing, Musick and Dancing on Human Bodies*, printed for John Cooke, London.

Browne Thomas (1642), *Religio Medici*, printed for Andrew Crooke, London, <http://goo.gl/QjZhlD> (01/2016).

— (2012), *Religio Medici and Hydriotaphia, or Urne-Buriall*, ed. by Stephen Greenblatt and Ramie Targoff, New York Review Books, New York.

Burgess Joshua (1858), *The Medical and Legal Relations of Madness: Showing a Cellular Theory of Mind, and of Nerve Force, and Also of Vegetative Vital Force*, John Churchill, London, <https://goo.gl/vFBuFd> (01/2016).

Burton Robert (pseud. Democritus Junior) (1638 [1621]), *The Anatomy of Melancholy: What it is, with all the kinds causes, symptomes, prognostickes & seuerall cures of it*, printed for Henry Cripps, Oxford, <https://goo.gl/ywyAjC> (01/2016).

— (2001), *The Anatomy of Melancholy*, ed. by Jackson Holbrook and W.H. Gass, New York Review of Books, New York.
Butler Samuel (1754 [1715]), *The Posthumous Works of Mr. Samuel Butler*, printed for Richard Baldwin, London, <https://goo.gl/pmxLbo> (01/2016).
Byron G.G. (1976), *Byron's Letters and Journals: The Complete and Unexpurgated Text of All The Letters Available in Manuscript and the Full Printed Version of All Others, 1816-1817, «So late into the night»*, vol. V, ed. by L.A. Marchand and John Murray, Harvard University Press, London.
Bysshe Edward (1714 [1702]), *The Art of English Poetry*, printed by Sam Buckley, London, <https://goo.gl/zzjgXC> (01/2016).

Campbell Thomas, ed. (1819), *Specimens of the British Poets. Sewell, 1726, to Carey, 1763*, vol. V, John Murray, London, <https://goo.gl/Vd5pWQ> (01/2016).
Carkesse James (1679), *Lucida Intervalla, Containing divers Miscellaneous Poems, Written at Finsbury and Bethlem by the Doctors Patient. Extraordinary*, n. p., London, <http://goo.gl/BgDlAZ> (01/2016).
— (1979 [1679]), *Lucida Intervalla, A Facsimile of the Edition Printed in London*, ed. by M.V. DePorte, William Andrews Clark Memorial Library University of California, Los Angeles.
Chambers Ephraim (1743 [1728]), *Cyclopaedia, or an Universal Dictionary of Arts and Sciences*, vol. II, printed for William Innys & C., London, <https://goo.gl/t044as> (01/2016).
Cheselden William (1730 [1713]), *The Anatomy of the Human Body*, printed by William Bowyer, London, <https://goo.gl/6ztFA3> (01/2016).
Cheyne George (1725 [1724]), *An Essay on Health and Long Life*, printed for George Strahan, London, <https://goo.gl/YCdesy> (01/2016).
— (1733), *The English Malady*: *or, A Treatise of Nervous Diseases of All Kinds*, printed for George Strahan and James Leake, London, <https://goo.gl/seiSve> (01/2016).
— (1742), *The Natural Method of Cureing the Diseases of the Body, and the Disorders of The Mind Depending on the Body*, printed for George Strahan, London, <https://goo.gl/qlEwRi> (01/2016).
— (1991 [1733]), *The English Malady*, ed. by Roy Porter, Routledge, London.
Chiarugi Vincenzo (1991 [1793]), *Della pazzia in genere, e in specie. Trattato medico-analitico*, ed. by Vittorino Andreoli and Luciano Bonuzzi, CIC, Roma. Trans. by George Mora (1987), *On Insanity and Its Classification*, Science History Publications, Canton.
Cobbett William (1813), *The Parliamentary History of England: From the Earliest Period to the Year 1803. A.D. 1771-1774*, vol. XVII, Longman & Co., London, <https://goo.gl/6Moq4F> (01/2016).
Coleridge S.T. (2004 [1997]), *The Complete Poems of Samuel Taylor Coleridge*, ed. by William Keach, Penguin, Harmondsworth.
Collins William (1747), *Odes on Several Descriptive and Allegoric Subjects*, printed for Andrew Millar, London, <http://goo.gl/mJhmVh> (01/2016).
— (1765), *The Poetical Works of William Collins*, ed. by John Langhorne, printed for Thomas Becket and D.A. Dehondt, London <https://goo.gl/fXH35R> (01/2016).
— (1827), *The Poetical Works of William Collins*, ed. by Alexander Dyce, William Pickering, London, <https://goo.gl/ZHViTY> (01/2016).
— (1858), *The Poetical Works of William Collins*, ed. by William Moy Thomas, Bell and Daldy, London, <https://goo.gl/lZdxuY> (01/2016).

— (1956), *Drafts & Fragments of Verse*, ed. by J.S. Cunningham, Clarendon Press, Oxford.
— (1979), *The Works of William Collins*, ed. by Charles Ryskamp and Richard Wendorf, Oxford University Press, Clarendon, doi: 10.1093/actrade/9780198127499.book.1.
Cooper A.A., Earl of Shaftesbury (1714 [1711]), *Characteristicks of Men, Manners, Opinions, Times*, vol. III, n. p., London, <https://goo.gl/aHvc0e> (01/2016).
Cowper William (1812), *The Life and Letters of William Cowper, Esquire*, vol. I, ed. by William Hayley, printed for Joseph Johnson, London, <https://goo.gl/LTynZX> (01/2016).
— (1816), *Memoir of the Early Life of William Cowper, Esquire*, printed for Richard Edwards, Crane Court, Fleet Street, London, <https://goo.gl/ld4LHV> (01/2016).
— (1979), *The Letters and Prose Writings of William Cowper:* Adelphi *and Letters 1750-1781*, vol. I, ed. by James King and Charles Ryskamp, Clarendon Press, Oxford, doi: 10.1093/actrade/9780198118633.book.1.
— (1980), *The Poems of William Cowper 1748-1782*, vol. I, ed. by J.D. Baird and Charles Ryskamp, Clarendon Press, Oxford, doi: 0.1093/actrade/9780198118756.book.1.
— (1995), *The Poems of William Cowper 1782-1785*, vol. II, ed. by J.D. Baird and Charles Ryskamp, Oxford University Press, Clarendon, doi: 10.1093/actrade/9780198123392.book.1.
Cox J.M. (1806 [1804]), *Practical Observations on Insanity; in which some Suggestions are offered towards an improved Mode of treating Diseases of the Mind and some Rules are proposed which it is hoped may lead to a more Humane and successful Method of Cure*, printed for Charles and Richard Baldwin, London, <https://goo.gl/VwkTMR> (01/2016).
Crouch Humphrey (1637) [uncertain date], *The Mad-Mans Morrice: Wherin You Shall Finde His Trouble And Grief* [...], printed for Richard Harper, London, <http://goo.gl/a5Kme8> (01/2016).
Culpeper Nicholas (1666), *The English Physitian Enlarged*, printed for John Streater, London, <http://goo.gl/7x3C6v> (01/2016).

Delirium Poeticum: or, the History of Poetical Lunacy (1745), printed for Edmund Curll, London, <https://goo.gl/EfQg6l> (01/2016).
Dennis John (1701), *The Advancement and Reformation of Modern Poetry: A Critical Discourse*, printed for Rich *et al.*, London, <https://goo.gl/5f6uUH> (01/2016).
Derham William (1714 [1713]), *Physico-theology: or, A Demonstration of the Being and Attributes of God from his Works of Creation*, printed for William Innys, London <https://goo.gl/cHrzLU> (01/2016).
Descartes René (1678 [1641]), *Meditationes de prima philosophia*, Apud Danielem Elsevirium, Amstelodami, <https://goo.gl/bIi2lD> (01/2016). Trans. and ed. by John Cottingham (1996), *Meditations on First Philosophy*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
Dodsley Robert, ed. (1782), *A Collection of Poems in Six Volumes. By Several Hands*, vol. I, James Dodsley, London.
Dove John [uncertain author] (1750), *Rational Religion Distinguish'd from that which is Enthusiastic*, printed for James Buckland, London, <https://goo.gl/Dzhhfi> (01/2016).
Dryden John (2003), *John Dryden: The Major Works*, ed. by Keith Walker, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Encyclopaedia Britannica. Or a Dictionary of Arts and Sciences (1771), vol. III, printed for Andrew Bell and Colin Macfarquhar, Edinburgh, <https://goo.gl/c2C622> (01/2016).

Fawcett Benjamin (1780), *Observations on the Nature, Causes and Cure of Melancholy*, printed for John Eddowes, Shrewsbury.

Finch Anne, Countess of Winchilsea (1713), *Miscellany Poems, on Several Occasions, Written by the Right Honble Anne, Countess of Winchilsea*, printed for John Barber, London, <http://goo.gl/xRr4hn> (01/2016).

— (1903), *The Poems of Anne Countess of Winchilsea*, ed. by Myra Reynolds, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, <https://goo.gl/99EuIk> (01/2016).

— (1979), *Selected Poems of Anne Finch, Countess of Winchilsea,* ed. by K.M. Rogers, Ungar, New York.

— (1988), *The Wellesley Manuscript Poems of Anne Countess of Winchilsea: From an Unpublished Manuscript*, ed. by J.M. Ellis D'Alessandro, Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia, Università degli Studi di Firenze, Firenze.

— (1998), *The Anne Finch Wellesley Manuscript Poems*, ed. by Barbara McGovern and C.H. Hinnant, University of Georgia Press, Athens-London.

Fletcher John (1639), *Monsieur Thomas, A comedy. Acted at the Private House in Blacke Fryers*, printed by Thomas Harper, London <http://goo.gl/ndWDCx> (01/2016).

— (1697 [1647]), *The Humorous Lieutenant, or, Generous Enemies*, printed for H.N., London, <http://goo.gl/ApIrrX> (01/2016).

— (1700 [1647]), *The Pilgrim*, printed for Benjamin Tooke, London.

Floyer John (1697), *An Enquiry into the Right Use and Abuses of the Hot, Cold and Temperate Baths in England*, printed for Robert Clavel, London, <http://goo.gl/mn-8bls> (01/2016).

— (1715 [1702]), *Psychrolousia or, the History of Cold Bathing: Both Ancient and Modern*, printed for William Innys, London, <https://goo.gl/C5j9L6> (01/2016).

Ford John (1629), *The Louers Melancholy*, printed by Felix Kingston, London, <http://goo.gl/VzfxTJ> (01/2016).

Free Briton, Jan 10, No. 219 (1734), in *The Gentleman's Magazine for the Year 1734*, vol. IV, printed for Francis Jeffries, London,14-16, <https://goo.gl/GGMNKu> (01/2016).

Froud John (1700), *Daphnis: or a Pastoral Elegy Upon the Unfortunate and much-lamented Death of Mr. Thomas Greech*, printed by John Deeve, London, <https://goo.gl/TBTTEM> (01/2016).

Gildon Charles (1718), *The Complete Art of Poetry*, vol. I, printed for Charles Rivington, London, <https://goo.gl/lntmwY> (01/2016).

Gilpin Richard (1677), *Daemonologia Sacra: or, A Treatise of Satan's Temptations*, printed by John Darby for Richard Randel and Peter Maplisden, London, <https://goo.gl/557zoe> (01/2016).

Gordon W. (1625), *Pharmaco-Pinax, or a Table and Taxe of the Pryces of all Usuall Medicaments,* Edward Raban, Aberdene, <http://goo.gl/H9Rd7U> (01/2016).

Gray Thomas (1816), *The Works of Thomas Gray. The Letters*, vol. II, ed. by John Mitford, printed for John Mawman, London, <https://goo.gl/owDq21> (01/2016).

Gray Thomas and William Collins (1970 [1967]), *Selected Poems of Thomas Gray and William Collins*, ed. by Arthur Johnston, University of South Carolina Press, Columbia.

Hale Matthew (1736), *Historia Placitorum Coronae: The History of the Pleas of the Crown*, vol. I, printed by Elizabeth and Richard Nutt *et al.*, London, <https://goo.gl/dECZHw> (01/2016).

Haller Albrecht von (1753), *De partibus corporis humani sensibilius et irritabilius*, «Commentarii Societatis Regiae Scientium Gottingensis», vol. II: 114-158. Trans. by August Tissot (1755), *Dissertation on the Sensible and Irritable Parts of Animals*, Jean Nourse, London.

Hartley David (1749), *Observations on Man: his Frame, his Duty and his Expectations*, printed by Samuel Richardson, London <https://goo.gl/zWUDEJ> (01/2016).

Harvey Gideon (1700 [1699]), *The Vanities of Philosophy and Physick*, printed for William Turner & C, London, <https://goo.gl/JT7rmB> (01/2016).

Hobbes Thomas (1750), *The Moral and Political Works of Thomas Hobbes*, n. p., London <https://goo.gl/0nHPDO> (01/2016).

— (2003 [1651]), *Leviathan*, vol. I, ed. by G.A.J. Rogers and Karl Schuhmann, Thoemmes, Bristol.

Hooke Robert (1665), *Micrographia, or, Some Physiological Descriptions of Minute Bodies Made by Magnifying Glasses*, printed by John Martyn and James Allestry, London, <https://goo.gl/AQa3ej> (01/2016).

— (1998), *Micrographia, or, Some Physiological Descriptions of Minute Bodies Made by Magnifying Glasses: Facsimiles*, Octavo, Palo Alto.

Horace [Quintus Horatius Flaccus] (c.a. 1470), *Opera Omnia* [without date, place, name of printer]. Trans. by Thomas Creech (1684), *The Odes, Satyrs and Epistles of Horace*, Jacob Tonson, London.

--- (1564 [ca. 1470]), *Ars Poetica Horatii*, Ex officina Christophori Plantini, Antverpiæ, <https://goo.gl/NlAeXB> (01/2016). Trans. by Thomas Drant (1567), *Horace his arte of Poetrie, pistles, and Satyrs, Englished and to the Earle of Ormounte, by Tho. Drant*, Thomas Marshe, London. Trans. by T.S. Dorsch (1965), *Classical Literary Criticism. Aristotle:* On the Art of Poetry, *Horace:* On the Art of Poetry, *Longinus:* On the Sublime, Penguin, Harmondsworth.

Hume David (1739), *A Treatise of Human Nature: Being an Attempt to Introduce the Experimental Method of Reasoning into Moral Subjects*, vol. I, printed for John Noon, London, <http://goo.gl/UQgLq2> (01/2016).

— (1768 [1739]), *Essays and Treatises on Several Subjects*, vol. II, printed for Andrew Millar, London.

— (2007), *A Treatise of Human Nature: A Critical Edition*, ed. by D.F. Norton and M.J. Norton, Claredon, Oxford.

Hunter R.A. and Ida Macalpine, eds (1963), *Three Hundred Years of Psychiatry, 1535-1860,* Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Ingram Allan, ed. (1998), *Patterns of Madness in the Eighteenth Century: A Reader*, Liverpool University Press, Liverpool.

Instances of Abuses in Private Mad-houses (1763), «The Scots Magazine» 25: 37-40, <https://goo.gl/x2ScMx> (01/2016).

Jacob Giles (1723 [1718]), *The Poetical Register, or the Lives and Characters of All the English Poets*, vol. I, printed for Edmund Curll, London, <https://goo.gl/twKb6e> (01/2016).

Johnson Samuel (1779), *Ode on the Poetical Character*, in Samuel Johnson (ed.), *The Works of the English Poets*, vol. L, printed by George Bigg, London: 309-310, <https://goo.gl/X4GvPo> (01/2016).

— (1783), *The Lives of the Most Eminent English Poets with critical observations on their works: A New Edition, Corrected*, vol. IV, printed for Charles Bathurst *et al*., London, <https://goo.gl/Pejfdk> (01/2016).

— (1958-1971), *The Yale edition of the Works of Samuel Johnson*, ed. by H.W. Liebert and A.T. Hazen, Oxford University Press, London, 9 vols.

Jones John (1635), *Adrasta: or, The Womans Spleene, and Loves Conquest. A tragi-comedie*, printed for Richard Royston, London, <http://goo.gl/bKofZW> (01/2016).

Jonson Ben (1641), *The vvorkes of Beniamin Ionson. Containing these playes, viz. 1 Bartholomew Fayre. 2 The staple of newes. 3 The Divell is an asse*, printed by John Beale *et al.*, London, <http://goo.gl/kYF53y> (01/2016).

— (2012), *The Cambridge Edition of the Works of Ben Jonson*, ed. by David Bevington, Martin Butler and Ian Donaldson, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 7 vols.

Kaysersberg Johannes Geiler von (1511), *Navicula penitentie* (Ship of penitence), n. p., Straßburg, <http://goo.gl/1PGshu> (01/2016).

Kippis Andrew *et al.*, eds (1789 [1747]), *Biographia Britannica: or, The Lives of The Most Eminent Persons who Have Flourished in Great Britain and Ireland*, vol. IV, printed by Rivington and Marshall, London.

Kyd Thomas (1603 [1592]), *The Spanish Tragedie*, imprinted by William White, London, <http://goo.gl/g9TFIJ> (01/2016).

La Fontaine Jean de (1668), *Fables choisies, mises en vers par M. de La Fontaine*, Cl. Barbin, Paris. Trans. by Gordon Pirie and intr. by Robert Chandler (2008), *Fables*, Hesperus, London.

La Hire Philippe de (1769 [1711]), *Remarques sur quelques Couleurs*, in *Recueil de mémoires, ou collection de pièces académiques*, Tome III, Chez François des Ventes et al., Dijon: 171-172, <https://goo.gl/NEm7yQ> (01/2016). Trans. by [Unknown Translator] (1742), *Remarks on Some Colours*, in John Martyn and Ephraim Chambers, eds, *The Philosophical History and Memoirs of the Royal Academy of Sciences at Paris*, printed for John and Paul Knapton, London: 133-135, <https://goo.gl/QbMGBQ> (01/2016).

La Roche Michel de (1726), *New Memoirs of Literature, Containing an Account of New Books Printed Both at Home and Abroad*, vol. IV, printed for William and John Innys, London, <https://goo.gl/FB8plb> (01/2016).

Lavington George (1754), *The Enthusiasm of Methodists and Papists Compared*, vol. II, printed for John and Paul Knapton, London, <https://goo.gl/0xuouN> (01/2016).

Leake John (1777), *Medical Instructions towards the Prevention, and Cure of Chronic or Slow Diseases Peculiar to Women*, vol. I, printed for Richard Baldwin, London, <https://goo.gl/XJomq1> (01/2016).

Lee Nathaniel (1696), *Caesar Borgia, Son of Pope Alexander the Sixth*, printed for Richard Bentley, London, <http://goo.gl/jzqN0h> (01/2016).

Lemnius Levinus (1583), *De miraculis occultis naturae*, Libri III, Coloniae Agrippinae, Theodorum Baumium, <http://goo.gl/JBim9J> (01/2016). Trans. by [Unknown Translator] (1658), *The Secret Miracles of Nature*, printed by John Streater, London, <https://goo.gl/rnjPVJ> (01/2016).

Leslie Charles (1721), *The Theological Works of the Reverend Mr. Charles Leslie*, vol. II, printed by William Bowyer, London, <https://goo.gl/QTYvQL> (01/2016).

Linnaeus Carl (1758), *Systema naturae*, Salvius, Stockholm, 3 vols, <http://goo.gl/biR5G3> (01/2016).

— (2010), *Systema naturae 250: The Linnaean Ark*, ed. by Andrew Polaszek, CRC Press, Boca Raton.

Locke John (1706 [1690]), *An Essay concerning Humane Understanding*, printed for Awnsham and John Churchill, London, <https://goo.gl/3lF2mU> (01/2016).

— (1694), *An Essay concerning Humane Understanding*, Second Edition, printed for Awnsham and John Churchill, London.
— (2014), *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding: With the Second Treatise of Government*, ed. by M.G. Spencer, Wordsworth Editions, Ware, Hertfordshire.
Longinus Dionysus (1544), *Dioniysii Longini Rhetoris Praestantissimi liber, de grandi, sive svblimi orationis genere. Nunc primùm à Francisco Robortello Vtinensi in lucem editus [...]*, trans. by Francesco Robortello, Johannes Oporinus, Basel. Trans. by John Hall (1652), *Peri hypsous [Περὶ Ὕψους], or Dionysius Longinus of the height of eloquence. Rendred out of the originall*, printed by Roger Daniel, London. Trans. by William Smith (1996 [1743]), *On the Sublime*, in Andrew Ashfield and Peter de Bolla (eds), *The Sublime: A Reader in Eighteenth-Century Aesthetic Theory*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge: 22-30.
Lowth Robert (1753), *De Sacra Poesi Hebræorum*, E Typographeo Claredoniano, Oxonii, <https://goo.gl/hYV3ax> (01/2016). Trans. by George Gregory (1787), *Lectures on the Sacred Poetry of the Hebrews*, Joseph Johnson, London.
Lynch Bernard (1744), *A Guide to Health through the Various Stages of Life*, printed for the Author, London <https://goo.gl/uSDMKt> (01/2016).

Malebranche Nicolas (1749 [1674]), *De la recherche de la vérité*, Durand, Paris, <https://goo.gl/t8eACK> (01/2016). Trans. by Richard Sault (1694), *Malebranch's Search after Truth: or, a Treatise of the Nature of the Humane Mind*, vol. I, printed for John Dunton *et al.*, London, <http://goo.gl/bBF4Tp> (01/2016).
Malpighi Marcello (1669), *Marcelli Malpighii philosophi & medici Bononiensis dissertatio epistolica de bombyce* (Epistolary Dissertation on the Silkworm), Apud Joannem Martyn & Jacobum Allestry, Londini, <http://goo.gl/As9XNh> (01/2016).
— (1665), *Epistolae anatomicae de cerebro, ac lingua* (Anatomical letters on the brain and the tongue), Typis Antonij Pisarrii, Bononiae.
— (1967), *Opere scelte di Marcello Malpighi* (Selected Works by Marcello Malpighi), ed. by Luigi Belloni, UTET, Torino.
Mandeville Bernard (1730 [1711]), *A Treatise of Hypochondriack and Hysterick Passions*, printed for Jacob Tonson, London.
Manning Francis (1703), *All for the Better: or, the Infallible Cure*, printed by Baron Bragg, London.
Maplet John (1567), *A greene forest, or A naturall historie: vvherein may bee seene first the most sufferaigne vertues in all the whole kinde of stones & mettals: next of plants, as of herbes, trees, [and] shrubs, lastly of brute beastes, foules, fishes, creeping wormes [and] serpents, and that alphabetically: so that a table shall not neede*, printed by Henry Denham, London, <http://goo.gl/RjXlUq> (01/2016).
Marston John (1604), *The Malcontent*, printed by Valentine Simmes, London, <http://goo.gl/yNSWJR> (01/2016).
Martin Martin (1716 [1695]), *A Description of the Western Islands of Scotland*, printed for Andrew Bell, London, <https://goo.gl/ijb7Fd> (01/2016).
Massinger Philip (1633), *A New Way to Pay Old Debts*, printed by Elizabeth Purslowe, London, <http://goo.gl/htnBrT> (01/2016).
Maubray John (1724), *The Female Physician*, printed for James Holland, London, <https://goo.gl/5FdsuZ> (01/2016).
Maudsley Henry (1895), *The Pathology of the Mind: A Study of its Distempers, Deformities and Disorders*, Macmillan & Co., London.

Mead Richard (1762), *The Medical Works of Richard Mead*, printed for Charles Hitch *et al.*, London, <https://goo.gl/phJRcI> (01/2016).
Middleton Thomas and William Rowley (1653), *The Changeling*, printed for Humphrey Moseley, London, <http://goo.gl/3KXYeO> (01/2016).
Midriff John (pseud.) (1721), *Observations on the Spleen and Vapours*, printed for James Roberts, London, <https://goo.gl/Rv2ifv> (01/2016).
Mihles Samuel (1745a), *Medical Essays and Observations Relating to the Practice of Physic and Surgery*, vol. I, printed for Samuel Birt, London, <https://goo.gl/zF9hm5> (01/2016).
— (1745b), *Medical Essays and Observations Relating to the Practice of Physic and Surgery*, vol. II, printed for Samuel Birt, London, <https://goo.gl/ONFCCw> (01/2016).
Milton John (2003 [1957]), *Complete Poems and Major Prose*, edited by Merritt Hughes, Hackett Publishing, Cambridge and Indianapolis.
— (2006 [1667]), *Paradise Lost*, Vintage Classic, London.
Molière (1972 [1670]), *Le Bourgeois gentilhomme*, ed. by Gilles Laizeau, Hachette, Paris. Trans. by Albert Bermel (1987 [1672]), *The Doctor in Spite of Himself and The Bourgeois Gentleman*, Applause Theatre Book Publishers, New York.
Monro John (1758), *Remarks on Dr Battie's Treatise on Madness*, printed for John Clarke, London, <https://goo.gl/cMFqMw> (01/2016).
Moore Edward (pseud. Fitz-Adam Adam) (1757), *The World by Adam Fitz-Adam*, vol. VI, printed for R. and J. Dodsley, London, <https://goo.gl/aTWwvo> (01/2016).
More Henry (1656), *Enthusiasmus Triumphatu; Or a Brief Discourse of The Nature, Causes, Kinds and Cure of Enthusiasme*], printed by James Flesher, London, <http://goo.gl/PGu1q9> (01/2016).
— (1712 [1662]), *A Collection of Several Philosophical Writings of Dr. Henry More*, printed by Joseph Downing, London, <https://goo.gl/xMlJtz> (01/2016).
Mossom Robert [author uncertain] (1711 [1651]), *A Summary of Divine Truths, Agreeable to the Faith Profess'd by the Church of England, confirm'd from Scripture and Reason*, John Morphew, London, <https://goo.gl/ePOJwt> (01/2016).

New Mad Tom of Bedlam: or, The Man in the Moon drinks Clarret, With Powder-beef, Turnep and Carret. The Tune is, Grays-Inn-Mask (1874), in W. M. Chappell (ed.), *The Roxburghe Ballads*, printed for the Ballad Society, Hartford: 259-261, <https://goo.gl/3Kfght> (01/2016).
Newton Isaac (1687), *Philosophiae naturalis principia mathematica*, Jussu Societatis Regiae ac Typis Josephi Streater, Londini, <http://goo.gl/Q8blz4> (01/2016). Trans. by Andrew Motte (1729), *The Mathematical Principles of Natural Philosophy*, printed for Benjamin Motte, London.
— (1718 [1704]), *Opticks: or, A Treatise of the Reflections, Refractions, Inflections and Colours of Light: The Second Edition with Additions*, printed for William and John Innys, London, <https://goo.gl/lzTI8s> (01/2016).
— (2004), *Philosophical Writings*, ed. by Andrew Janiak, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Observations on Sapphic Verse, as Used by the Roman Poets (1784), in *The London Magazine Enlarged and Improved, For January, February, March, April, May, June 1784*, vol. II, printed for Richard Baldwin, London: 305-306, <https://goo.gl/kJnUcA> (01/2016).
On Fashions in Physic (1825), in *The London Magazine, New Series: September to December 1825*, vol. III, Published by Hunt and Clarke, London: 177-191, <https://goo.gl/QO59lk> (01/2016).

Paley William (1824 [1794]), *Evidences of Christianity*, Published by Samuel King, New York, <https://goo.gl/U1BpBR> (01/2016).

Paré [or Parey] Ambrose (1582), *Opera Ambrosii Parei Regis Primarii et Pariniensis Chirvrgi*, apud Jacobum Du-Puys, sub signo Samaritanae, Parisiis. *Les Oevvres de M. Ambrose Paré, Conseiller, et Premier Chirvrgien du Roi* (1585), chez Gabriel Buon, Paris, <http://goo.gl/xYELxd> (01/2016). *The Workes of that Famous Chirurgion Ambrose Parey translated out of Latine and compared with the French* (1634), by Tho. Johnson, translated by Thomas Johnson, printed by Richard Cotes, London, <http://goo.gl/7L3X9a> (01/2016).

Pargeter William (1792), *Observations on Maniacal Disorders*, printed for the Author, Reading.

Parkinson John (1640), *Theatrum Botanicum, the theater of plants. Or, An herball of a large extent*, printed by Thomas Cotes, London, <http://goo.gl/ZUa7qz> (01/2016).

Pepys Samuel (1893), *The Diary of Samuel Pepys. Transcribed from the Shorthand Manuscript in the Pepysian Library by the Rev. Mynors Bright, Magdalene College, Cambridge*, vol. XIII, ed. by Henry B. Wheatley, George Bell & Sons, London.

Perfect William (1787), *Select Cases in the Different Species of Insanity, Lunacy, or Madness, with the Practice as Adapted in the Treatment of Each*, printed by Webster Gillman, Rochester.

Philosophical Transactions: Giving Some Accompt[sic] *of the Present Undertakings, Studies and Labours of the Ingenious in Many Considerable Parts of the World* (1670), vol. IV, printed by T. N. for John Martyn, London, <https://goo.gl/TESYsv> (01/2016).

Phippen James (1844), *Colbran's New Guide for Tunbridge Wells*, printed by John Colbran, Tunbridge Wells, <https://goo.gl/ItJkQH> (01/2016).

Pitcairn Archibald (1718), *The Philosophical and Mathematical Elements of Physick*, printed for Andrew Bell and John Osborn, London, <https://goo.gl/cUlnCg> (01/2016).

Plato (1513), *Ἅπαντα τὰ τοῦ Πλάτωνος, Omnia Platonis opera*, in aedib. Aldi, et Andreae Soceri, Venetiis, <https://goo.gl/J0BkWw> (01/2016). Trans. by Thomas Taylor (1804), *The Works of Plato*, viz. his Fifty-five Dialogues, and Twelve Epistles, printed for Thomas Taylor, London <https://goo.gl/jbCOIu> (01/2016).

Plato (1997), *Complete Works*, ed. by J.M. Cooper and D.S. Hutchinson, Hackett, Indianapolis.

Plot Robert (1686), *The Natural History of Stafford-shire*, n. p., Oxford, <http://goo.gl/xL4lp0> (01/2016).

Pope Alexander (1719 [1708]), *Ode for Musick: On St. Cecilia's Day. Written by Mr. Pope*, printed for Bernard Lintot, London, <https://goo.gl/RmlXJc> (01/2016).

— (1749 [1728]), *The Dunciad*, printed for John and Paul Knapton, London, <https://goo.gl/XsLEMX> (01/2016).

— (1806 [1713]), «The Guardian», March 16, in Id., *The Works of Alexander Pope*, ed. by W.L. Bowles, printed for Joseph Johnson & C, London, vol. IX <https://goo.gl/B48ReS> (01/2016).

— (1978), *Poetical Works*, ed. by Herbert Davis, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Pratt S.J., ed. (1808), *The Cabinet of Poetry, Containing the Best Entire Pieces to be Found in the Works of The British Poets*, vol. IV, printed for Richard Phillips, London, <https://goo.gl/kqX2mn> (01/2016).

Purcell John (1707), *A Treatise of Vapours, or Hysterick Fits*, printed for Edward Place, London, <https://goo.gl/DSLkdh> (01/2016).

Ravenscroft Edward (1675 [1672]), *Mamamouchi, or The Citizen Turn'd Gentleman*, printed for Thomas Dring, London, <http://goo.gl/h9KKT9> (01/2016).
Ray John (1714), *The Wisdom of God Manifested in the Works of the Creation*, printed for William Innys, London, <https://goo.gl/JJYASe> (01/2016).
Reflexions upon the Moral State of the Nation (1701), printed for Mattew Wotton, London, <https://goo.gl/AYHDnW> (01/2016).
Reynolds Joshua (1780 [1779]), *On Genius and taste. From Reynolds's* Academical Discourses, in «The Annual Register, or a View of the History, Politics and Literature for the Year 1779», 22: 147-156, <https://goo.gl/oPmosP> (01/2016).
Richardson John (1755), *Thoughts upon Thinking, or, a New Theory of the Human Mind*, printed for the Author, London, <https://goo.gl/G3Q6Mx> (01/2016).
Robinson Nicholas (1725), *A New Theory of Physick and Diseases, Founded on the Principles of the Newtonian Philosophy*, printed for Charles Rivington, London, <https://goo.gl/sK9LXW> (01/2016).
— (1729), *A New System of the Spleen, Vapours and Hypochondriack Melancholy*, printed for Arthur Bettesworth *et al*., London.
Rush Benjamin (1812), *Medical Inquiries and Observations upon the Diseases of the Mind*, Kimber and Richardson, Philadelphia.

Salmon William (1710), *Botanologia: The English Herbal: or, History of Plants*, printed by Ichabod Dawks, London, <https://goo.gl/TMD4cz> (01/2016).
Scofield C.I., ed. (1967), *The New Scofield Reference Bible*, Oxford University Press, New York.
Seneca L.A. (65 ad), *Epistulae morales ad Lucilium*, trans. and ed. by Robert Campbell (1969), *Letters from a Stoic. Epistulae morales ad Lucilium*, Penguin, Harmondsworth.
Shakespeare William (1793), *The Plays of William Shakespeare*, vol. III, ed. by George Steevens, printed for Charles Bathurst *et al*, London.
— (1993a [1623]), *As You Like It*, ed. by Alan Brissenden, Oxford University Press, Oxford-New York.
— (1993b [1560]), *The Merchant of Venice*, ed. by J.L. Halio, Oxford University Press, Oxford-New York.
— (1994 [1600]), *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, ed. by Peter Holland, Oxford University Press, Oxford-New York.
Short Thomas (1740), *An Essay towards a Natural, Experimental, and Medicinal History of the Principle Mineral Waters*, printed for the Author, Sheffield, <https://goo.gl/la2kXH> (01/2016).
— (1746), *Medicina Britannica*, printed for R. Maneby and Hanry Shute Cox, London, <https://goo.gl/QSfPzv> (01/2016).
— (1749), *A General Chronological History of the Air, Weather, Seasons, Meteors, &c*, vol. I, printed for Thomas Longman and Andrew Millar, London, <https://goo.gl/11OVtG> (01/2016).
Smart Christopher (pseud. Mary Midnight) (1753), *The Midwife: or Old Woman's Magazine*, vol. III, printed for Thomas Carnan, London, <https://goo.gl/R6liRp> (01/2016).
Smart Christopher (1756), *Hymn to the Supreme Being: on Recovery from a dangerous Fit of Illness*, printed for John Newbery, London, <https://goo.gl/sS3MnX> (03/2016).
— (1767), *The Works of Horace Translated into Verse, with a Prose Interpretation*, vol. I, William Flexney, London.

— (1939), *Rejoice in the Lamb: A song from Bedlam*, ed. by William Force Stead, Jonathan Cape, London.
— (1954), *Jubilate Agno*, ed. by W.H. Bond, Greenwood Press, Westport. Trad. it. e a cura di F.R. Paci (1983), *Jubilate Agno*, Guanda, Milano.
— (1980), *The Poetical Works of Christopher Smart:* Jubilate Agno, vol. I, ed. by Karina Williamson, Clarendon Press, Oxford, <http://goo.gl/kANixG> (01/2016).
— (1987), *The Poetical Works of Christopher Smart: Miscellaneous Poems, English and Latin*, vol. IV, ed. by Karina Williamson, Claredon Press, Oxford, <http://goo.gl/87RZGl> (01/2016).
— *Jubilate Agno: Manuscript, 1759-1763, MS Eng 719, Houghton Library, Harvard University, Cambridge, Harvard University Library Page Delivery Service*, <http://pds.lib.harvard.edu/pds/view/18807694> (01/2016).
Smith Adam (1777 [1759]), *The Theory of Moral Sentiments*, printed by John Beatty and Charles Jackson, Dublin.
Smith William (1768), *A Dissertation upon the Nerves*, printed for the author, London, <https://goo.gl/SF6zJt> (01/2016).
Snape Andrew (1718), *A Sermon Preach'd before the Right Honourable the Lord-Mayor: the Aldermen, Sheriffs, and Governours of the several Hospitals of the City of London, in St. Bridget's Church, on Easter Wednesday, April 16. 1718*, printed for Jonah Bowyer, London.
Sterne Laurence (1983 [1759-1766]), *The Life and Opinions of Tristram Shandy, Gentleman*, ed. by I.C. Ross, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
Storey T.A. (1935 [1924]), *Principles of Hygiene*, Stanford University Press, Stanford.
Stukeley William (1723), *Of the Spleen*, printed for the Author, London.
Swammerdam Johannis (1669), *Historia insectorum generalis*, Meinardus van Dreunen, t'Utrrecht, <https://goo.gl/gtYzKq> (01/2016).
Swift Jonathan (1966), *The Poems of Jonathan Swift*, ed. by Harold Williams, Clarendon Press, Oxford.
— (1981 [1739]), *Verses on the Death of Dr Swift* (1739), in Id., *Gulliver's Travels and Other Writings*, ed. by Miriam Kosh Starkman, Bantam, Toronto.
Sydenham Thomas (1729 [1696]), *The Whole Works of that Excellent Practical Physician, Dr. Thomas Sydenham*, printed for John Darby *et al*., London, <https://goo.gl/xUZXFy> (01/2016).
— (1742), *The Entire Works of Dr. Thomas Sydenham*, ed. by John Swan, printed for Edward Cave, London.
— (1966), *Dr. Thomas Sydenham (1624-1689): His Life and Original Writings*, ed. by Kenneth Dewhurst, Wellcome Historical Medical Library, London.

Techo Nicholas del (1673), *Historia provinciae Paraquariae societatis Jesu*, Johannes Mathiæ Hovii, Leodii. Trans. by [unknown translator] (1704), *The History of the Provinces of Paraguay, Tucuman, Rio de la Plata, Parana, Guaira and Urvaica, in A Collection of Voyages and Travels, Some now First Printed from Original Manuscripts*, vol. IV, printed for Awnsham and John Churchill, London: 680-807, <https://goo.gl/4h29wW> (01/2016).
The Geography of England: Done in the Manner of Gordon's Geographical Grammar (1744), printed for Robert Dodsley, London, <https://goo.gl/ZyiWbc> (01/2016).
The Present State of Physick & Surgery in London. With an Estimate of the Prizes of All the Medicines Now in Use (1701), printed for Thomas Speed, London, <https://goo.gl/YASG7W> (01/2016).

Thomson Alexander (1781), *An Enquiry Into the Nature, Causes, and Method of Cure, of Nervous Disorders*, printed for John Murray, London, <https://goo.gl/c862Z9> (01/2016).

Thomson James (1793 [1728]), *The Seasons*, ed. by Percival Stockdale, printed for Abraham Hamilton, London.

— (1986), *Liberty, The Castle of Indolence, and Other Poems*, ed. by James Sambrook, Clarendon, Oxford.

Transactions of the Royal Society of Edinburgh (1788), vol. I, printed for James Dickson, Edinburgh, <https://goo.gl/LCLRs0> (01/2016).

Trotter Thomas (1808), *A View of the Nervous Temperament*, published by Wright, Goodenow and Stockwell, Troy N.Y., <https://goo.gl/rX88YE> (01/2016).

Trusler John (1766), *The Difference, Between Words, Esteemed Synonymous, in the English Language*, printed for James Dodsley, London, <https://goo.gl/VTigso> (01/2016).

Trye Mary (1675), *Medicatrix, or the Woman-physician*, printed by T.R. & N.T., and sold by Henry Broome and John Leete, London, <http://goo.gl/D8F7VH> (01/2016).

Tryon Thomas (1689), *A Treatise of Dreams & Visions* [...] *to which is Added, a Discourse of the Causes, Natures, and Cure of Phrensie, Madness or Distraction*, n. p., London, <http://goo.gl/mtFBQx> (01/2016).

Tucker Abraham (pseud. Edward Search) (1768), *The Light of Nature Pursued*, vol. I, printed by Thomas Jones, London, <https://goo.gl/0yM5nX> (01/2016).

Two Dissertations Concerning Sense, and the Imagination (1728), printed for Jacob Tonson, London, <https://goo.gl/V1d1Av> (01/2016).

Wanley Nathaniel (1673), *The Wonders of the Little World*, printed for Thomas Basset, London, <http://goo.gl/mvcxho> (01/2016).

Warton Joseph (1746), *Advertisement*, in Joseph Warton, *Odes on Various Subjects*, printed for Robert Dodsley, London, <https://goo.gl/1LtoU0> (01/2016).

— (1806 [1747]), *Ranelagh House*, in John Wooll, *Biographical Memoirs of the Late Revd. Joseph Warton*, printed for Thomas Cadell and William Davies, London: 174-190.

Watts Isaac (1729), *Logick: or, the Right Use of Reason in the Enquiry after Truth*, printed for John Clark &c, London, <https://goo.gl/T8O7I9> (01/2016).

Webster John (1640 [1623]), *The Dutchesse of Malfy: A Tragedy*, printed by John Raworth, London, <http://goo.gl/O7dWks> (01/2016).

Whytt Robert (1765), *Observations on the Nature, Causes, and Cure of Those Disorders which Have Been Commonly Called Nervous Hypochondriac or Hysteric. To which are prefixed some Remarks on the Sympathy of the Nerves*, printed for Thomas Becket *et al.*, Edinburgh, <https://goo.gl/jv0E3k> (01/2016).

— (1768), *The Works of Robert Whytt*, printed for Thomas Becket and P.A. Dehondt, London, <https://goo.gl/LrsdP4> (01/2016).

Willis Thomas (1664), *Cerebri anatome : cui accessit nervorum descriptio et usus*, Martyn Allestry, London, <https://goo.gl/pj6YbI> (01/2016).

— (1672), *De Anima Brutorum*, n. p., Oxford.

— (1683), *Two Discourses Concerning the Soul of Brutes*, printed for Thomas Dring, London, <http://goo.gl/QlGNBR> (01/2016).

— (1685 [1681]), *The London Practice of Physick*, trans. by Samuel Pordage, printed for Thomas Basset *et al.*, London, <https://goo.gl/RqhHh0> (01/2016).

— (1971), *Two Discourses Concerning the Soul of Brutes, Which is That of the Vital and Sensitive of Man. A Facsimile Reproduction, of the translation by S. Pordage,*

1683, with an introduction by Solomon Diamond, Scholars' Facsimiles & Reprints, Gainesville.
Woolf Virginia (2015), *A Room's of One's Own and Three Guineas*, ed. by Anna Snaith, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
Wordsworth William and S.T. Coleridge (2005 [1798]), *Lyrical Ballads*, ed. by R.L. Brett and A.R. Jones, Routledge, London.
Wortley Montagu Mary (1837), *Letter to Sir James Stewart* (5 September 1758), in *The Letters and Works of Lady Mary Wortley Montagu*, vol. III, Richard Bentley, London: 270-274, <https://goo.gl/vvOCEw> (01/2016).

Young Edward (1992 [1759]), *Conjectures on Original Composition*, in Hazard Adams (ed.), *Critical Theory since Plato*, Jovanovich College Publishers, Harcourt Brace: 338-347.

Digital Archives and Online Dictionaries

Bethlem: Museum of the Mind, <http://museumofthemind.org.uk/> (01/2016).
ECCO (*Eighteenth Century Collections Online*), <http://quod.lib.umich.edu/e/ecco> (01/2016).
EEBO (*Early English Books Online*), <http://eebo.chadwyck.com> (01/2016).
Harvard University Library Page Delivery Service <http://fts.lib.harvard.edu/fts/search> (01/2016).
Oxford English Dictionary, Online Edition, Oxford University Press, Oxford, <http://www.oed.com/> (01/2016).
The Clergy Database, <http://www.theclergydatabase.org.uk> (01/2016).

Secondary Sources

Adams Hazard (2009), *Blake's Margins: An Interpretive Study of the Annotations*, McFarland, Jefferson.
Allderidge P.H. (1985), *Bedlam: Fact or Fantasy?*, in Roy Porter, W.F. Bynum, and Michael Shepherd (eds), *The Anatomy of Madness: Essays in the History of Psychiatry*, vol. II, Tavistock, London: 17-33.
Allen Graham (2000), *Intertextuality*, Routledge, London.
Almond P.C. (2004), *Demonic Possession and Exorcism in Early Modern England: Contemporary Texts and their Cultural Contexts*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
American Psychiatric Association (2013), *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders: Fifth Edition, DSM-5*, American Psychiatric Publishing, Washington-London.
Anderson F.E. (1974), *Christopher Smart*, Twayne Publishers, New York.
Andrews Jonathan (1988), *The Lot of the 'Incurably' Insane in Enlightenment England*, «Eighteenth-century Life», 12, 1: 1-18.
— (1991), *Bedlam Revisited: A History of Bethlem Hospital c1634-1770*, Ph.D. Thesis, Queen Mary and Westfield College, London University, London, <http://goo.gl/Gm2IbS> (01/2016).
— (1994), *«Hardly a Hospital, but a Charity for Pauper Lunatics?» Therapeutics at Bethlem in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries*, in Jonathan Barry and Colin Jones (eds), *Medicine and Charity before the Welfare State*, Routledge, London: 63-81.

— *et al.* (1997), *The History of Bethlem*, Routledge, London-New York.
— (1998a), *Begging the Question of Idiocy: The Definition and Socio-cultural Meaning of Idiocy in Early Modern Britain: Part 1*, «History of Psychiatry», 9: 65-95, doi: 10.1177/0957154X9800903306.
— (1998b), *Case Notes, Case Histories, and the Patient's Experience of Insanity at Gartnavel Royal Asylum, Glasgow, in the Nineteenth Century*, «Social History of Medicine», 11, 2: 255-281.
— (2003), *Grand Master of Bedlam: Roy Porter and the History of Psychiatry*, «History of Science», 41: 269-286, <http://goo.gl/7CAgd6> (01/2016).
Arieno M.A. (1989), *Victorian Lunatics: A Social Epidemiology of Mental Illness in Mid-nineteenth Century England*, Susquehanna University Press, Selinsgrove.
Arnold Catharine (2009), *Bedlam: London and its Mad*, Pocket, London.
Arnold Richard (2012), *Trinity of Discord: The Hymnal and Poetic Innovations of Isaac Watts, Charles Wesley, and William Cowper*, Peter Lang, New York.
Arthur P.L. (2010), *Virtual Voyages: Travel Writing and the Antipodes 1605-1837*, Anthem, London.
Axelsson Karl (2007), *The Sublime: Precursors and British Eighteenth-century Conceptions*, Peter Lang, Bern-Oxford.

Backscheider P.R. (2005), *Eighteenth-century Women Poets and their Poetry: Inventing Agency, Inventing Genre*, Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore-London.
Baird J.D. and Charles Ryskamp (1980a), *Commentary*, in William Cowper, *The Poems of William Cowper 1748-1782*, vol. I, ed. by J.D. Baird and Charles Ryskamp, Claredon Press, Oxford: 459-564.
— (1980b), *Cowper and His Poetry 1731-1782*, in William Cowper, *The Poems of William Cowper 1748-1782*, vol. I, ed. by J.D. Baird and Charles Ryskamp, Claredon Press, Oxford: ix-xxvi.
Baker John (2011), *'Strange Contrarys': Figures of Melancholy in Eighteenth-century Poetry*, in Allan Ingram *et al.* (eds), *Melancholy Experience in Literature of the Long Eighteenth Century: Before Depression, 1660-1800*, Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke: 83-113.
Bakhtin Mikhail (1965), *Tvorchestvo Fransua Rable*, Khudozhestvennia literature, Moskva. Trans. by Helene Iswolsky (1984), *Rabelais and His World*, Indiana University Press, Bloomington (orig. ed. 1965).
Balfour Ian (2002), *The Rhetoric of Romantic Prophecy*, Stanford University Press, Stanford.
Baly M.E. (1995 [1973]), *Nursing and Social Change*, Routledge, London-New York.
Bandiera Laura (1995), *Settecento e malinconia: saggi di letteratura inglese* (Eighteenth-century Melancholy: Essays in English Literature), Pàtron, Bologna.
— (2002), *L'ermafrodita imperfetto: William Cowper poeta di* The Task (The Imperfect Hermaphrodite: William Cowper as the Author of *The Task*), in L.M. Crisafulli and Cecilia Pietropoli (a cura di), *Le poetesse romantiche inglesi* (English Women Romantic Poets), Carocci, Roma: 314-326.
Barash Carol (1991), *The Political Origins of Anne Finch's Poetry*, «Huntington Library Quarterly», 54, 4: 327-351.
Barash Moshe (2001), *Blindness: The History of a Mental Image in Western Thought*, Routledge, New York-London.
Barbalet Jack (2007), *The Moon before the Dawn: A Seventeenth-century Precursor of Smith's* The Theory of Moral Sentiments, in Geoff Cockfield *et al.*, eds, *New Per-*

spectives on Adam Smith's The Theory of Moral Sentiments, Edward Elgar, Cheltenham-Northampton: 84-105.

Barbour Reid (2001), *Literature and Religious Culture in Seventeenth-century England*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Barker-Benfield G.J. (1992), *The Culture of Sensibility: Sex and Society in Eighteenth-century Britain*, Routledge, London.

Barry Jonathan and Colin Jones, eds (1994), *Medicine and Charity before the Welfare State*, Routledge, London.

Barry Kevin (1987), *Language, Music, and the Sign: A Study in Aesthetics, Poetics and Poetic Practice from Collins to Coleridge*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Barthes Roland (1991 [1964]), *Essais critiques*, Éditions du Seuil, Paris. Trans. by Richard Howard (1972), *Critical Essays*, Northwestern University Press, Evanston.

— (1984), *Le bruissement de la langue: essais critiques IV*, Éditions du Seuil, Paris. Trans. by Richard Howard, *The Rustle of Language*, Basil Blackwell, Oxford.

Bartlett Peter and David Wright, eds (1999), *Outside the Walls of the Asylum: The History of Care in the Community 1750-2000*, Athlone, London.

Bassiri Nima (2013), *The Brain and the Unconscious Soul in Eighteenth-century Nervous Physiology: Robert Whytt's* Sensorium Commune, «Journal of the History of Ideas», 74, 3: 425-448.

Bauman Richard and C.L. Briggs (2003), *Voices of Modernity: Language Ideologies and the Politics of Inequality*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Baumgartner J.N. and J.K. Burns (2013), *Measuring Social Inclusion: A Key Outcome in Global Mental Health*, «International Journal of Epidemiology», 12, doi: 10.1093/ije/dyt224.

Bean Philip (2008), *Madness and Crime,* Willan Publishing, Cullompton.

Beard J.P. (1989), *The Diagnosis and Treatment of Mental Illness: An Introduction*, Wayne State University Press, Detroit.

Beatty H.R. (2012), *Nervous Disease in Late Eighteenth-century Britain: The Reality of a Fashionable Disorder,* Pickering & Chatto, London.

Bentall R.P. (2003), *Madness Explained: Psychosis and Human Nature,* Allen Lane, London.

Bernaerts Lars *et al.* (2009), *Narrative Threads of Madness*, «Style», 43, 3: 283-290.

Bertelsen Lance (1992), *Journalism, Carnival and* Jubilate Agno, «ELH», 59, 2: 357-384, doi: 10.2307/2873347.

Bevington David (2000), *The Major Comedies*, in Richard Hart and Stanley Stewart (eds), *The Cambridge Companion to Ben Jonson*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge: 72-89.

Bewley Thomas (2008), *Madness to Mental Illness*, Royal College of Psychiatry Publications, London.

Bezrucka Yvonne (2002), *Genio ed immaginazione nel Settecento inglese* (Genius and imagination in Eighteenth-century England), Università di Verona, Valdonega.

Biele Joelle (2010), «*For he can creep*»: *Christopher Smart and Anaphora*, in Blas Falconer *et al.* (eds), *Mentor and Muse: Essays from Poets to Poets*, Southern Illinois University Press, Carbondale: 93-100.

Bigliazzi Silvia, ed. (2012), *Distraction Individualized: Figures of Insanity in Early Modern England*, Cierre Grafica, Verona.

Bini Benedetta (1998), *Il romanzo dei sentimenti* (The novel of sensibility), in Franca Ruggieri (a cura di), *L'età di Johnson: La letteratura inglese del secondo Settecento* (The age of Johnson: English literature in the second half of the eighteenth century), Carocci, Roma: 133-156.

Binni Francesco (1968), *L'idolo e il vero: Cowper nella crisi preromantica* (The idol and the truth: Cowper and the pre-romantic crisis), Argalia, Urbino.
Blanchot Maurice (1969), *L'Entretien infini*, Gallimard, Paris. Trans. and ed. by Susan Hanson (2003), *The Infinite Conversation*, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis.
Blaydes S.B. (1966), *Christopher Smart as a Poet of his Time. A Re-appraisal*, Mouton & Co., Paris.
Bloom Harold (1962), *The Visionary Company: A Reading of English Romantic Poetry*, Faber & Faber, London.
— ed. (1986), *Poets of Sensibility and the Sublime*, Chelsea House, New York.
— (1986), *From Topos to Trope: Collins's «Ode to Fear»*, in Id. (ed.), *Poets of Sensibility and the Sublime*, Chelsea House Publishers, New York: 165-184.
Bloxam J.R. (1863), *A Register of the Presidents, Fellows, Demies, Instructors in Grammar of Saint Mary Magdalen College. A Register of the Presidents, Fellows, Demies, Instructors in Grammar and in Music, Chaplains, Clerks, Choristers, and other Members of Saint Mary Magdalene College in the University of Oxford from the Foundation of the College to the Present Time* , vol. III, John Henry, Oxford.
Bogue David and James Bennett (1833), *The History of the Dissenters, From the Revolution to the Year 1808*, vol. II, Frederick Westley and A.H. Davis, London.
Bond W.H. (1954), *Introduction*, in Christopher Smart, *Jubilate Agno*, ed. by W.H. Bond, Greenwood Press, Westport: 11-24.
Boswell James (1799 [1768]), *The Life of Samuel Johnson, LL. D.*, vol. I, printed for Thomas Cadell *et al*., London.
Boyne Roy (1990), *Foucault and Derrida: The Other Side of Reason*, Routledge, London.
Brackett Virginia (2008), *The Facts On File Companion to British Poetry: 17th and 18th Centuries*, Facts on File, New York.
Bradford Richard (1993), *A Linguistic History of English Poetry*, Routledge, London-New York.
Branch Lori (2006), *Rituals of Spontaneity: Sentiment and Secularism from Free Prayer to Wordsworth*, Baylor University Press, Waco.
Brewster Scott (2012), *Seeing Things: Gothic and the Madness of Interpretation*, in David Punter (ed.), *A New Companion to The Gothic*, Wiley-Blackwell, Malden: 481-495.
Brown Marshall (1991), *Preromanticism*, Stanford University Press, Standford.
Brown T.E. (1994), *Dance of the Dialectic? Some Reflections (Academic and Otherwise) on the Recent State of Nineteenth-century Asylum Studies*, «Canadian Bulletin of Medical History», 11: 267-295.
Bruner J.S. (1990), *Acts of Meaning*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge.
Brunström Conrad (2004), *William Cowper: Religion, Satire, Society*, Bucknell University Press, Lewisburg.
Buickerood James (2002), *Two Dissertations Concerning Sense, and the Imagination, with an Essay on Consciousness (1728): A Study in Attribution*, «1650-1850: Ideas, Aesthetics, and Inquiries in the Early Modern Era», 7: 51-86.
Bullough Geoffrey (1962), *Mirror of Minds: Changing Psychological Beliefs in English Poetry*, University of Toronto Press, Toronto.
Burwick Frederick (1996), *Poetic Madness and the Romantic Imagination*, Pennsylvania State University Press, University Park.
Bynum W.F. (1974), *Rationales for Therapy in British Psychiatry, 1780-1835*, «Medical History», 18, 4: 317-334, <http://goo.gl/S0bgL7> (01/2016).

— (2008), *History of Medicine: A Very Short Introduction*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Byrd Max (1974), *Visits to Bedlam: Madness and Literature in the Eighteenth Century*, University of South Carolina Press, Columbia.

Calvi Lisanna (2013), *«Is't Lunacy to call a spade, a spade?»: James Carkesse and the Forgotten Language of Madness*, in Rachel Falconer and Denis Renevey (eds), *Medieval and Early Modern Literature, Science and Medicine*, Narr Verlag, Tübingen: 143-156.

Campbell Thomas (1819), *William Collins*, in Id. (ed.), *Specimens of the British Poets. Sewell, 1726, to Carey, 1763*, vol. V, John Murray, London: 310-312, <https://goo.gl/nDMwbv> (01/2016).

Camus Marianne (2004), *Gender and Madness in the Novels of Charles Dickens*, Edwin Mellen Press, Lewiston-Lampeter.

Canfield J.D. (2003), *The Baroque in English Neoclassical Literature*, University of Delaware Press, Newark.

Canziani Tatiana, Grego Kim and Giovanni Iamartino, eds (2014), *Perspectives in Medical English*, Polimetrica, Monza.

Carroll David (1987), *Paraesthetics: Foucault, Lyotard, Derrida,* Methuen, New York.

Carver P.L. (1967), *The Life of a Poet: A Biographical Sketch of William Collins*, Sidgwick & Jackson, London.

Chan Wendy, D.E. Chunn and Robert Menzies, eds (2005), *Women, Madness and the Law: A Feminist Reader*, Glass House, London.

Chantler Ashley, Michael Davies and Philip Shaw, eds (2013), *Literature and Authenticity, 1780-1900: Essays in Honour of Vincent Newey*, Ashgate, Farnham.

Chevalier Noel (2013), *Breaking the Circle of the Sciences: Newton, Newbery, and Christopher Smart's New Learning*, in Min Wild and Noel Chevalier (eds), *Reading Christopher Smart in the Twenty-first Century: «by succession of delight»*, Bucknell University Press, Lewisburg: 125-142.

Ciocca Rossella (1990), *I volti dell'Altro. Saggio sulla diversità* (The face of the other. Essay on diversity), Istituto Universitario Orientale, Napoli.

Clark Hilary, ed. (2008), *Depression and Narrative: Telling the Dark*, SUNY Press, Albany.

— (2008), *«Repenting Prodigal»: Confession, Conversion and Shame in William Cowper's* Adelphi, in Id. (ed.), *Depression and Narrative: Telling the Dark*, SUNY Press, Albany: 55-65.

Cleary Scott (2010), *Castles in the Air: Christopher Smart and the Concept of System*, «Eighteenth-century Studies», 43, 2: 193-206, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25642181> (01/2016).

Clegg Jeanne (2002), *Luoghi curiosi nell'Inghilterra settecentesca* (Curious places in eighteenth-century England), in Laura Di Michele (a cura di), *La politica e la poetica del mostruoso nella letteratura e nella cultura inglese e angloamericana* (The politics and poetics of the monstrous in English and Angloamerican literature and culture), Liguori, Napoli: 75-84.

Clifford J.L., ed. (1968), *Man versus Society in Eighteenth-century Britain: Six Points of View*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Colborne Catherine and Dolly Mackinnon, eds (2003), *Madness in Australia: Histories, Heritage and the Asylum St. Lucia*, University of Queensland Press, Queensland.

Colburn Glen, ed. (2008), *The English Malady: Enabling and Disabling Fictions*, Cambridge Scholars Publishing, Newcastle.

Collins Martha (1975), *The Self-Conscious Poet: The case of William Collins*, «ELH», 42, 3: 362-377, doi: 10.2307/2872709.

Cook D.L. (1968), *Christopher Smart: Stylistic Patterns in his Major Devotional Poems*, Ph.D. Thesis, Graduate Faculty of Texas Technological College, Lubbock, <http://search.proquest.com/docview/302354348?accountid=15928> (01/2016).

Cooper David (1978), *The Language of Madness*, Allen Lane, London.

Copenhaver B.P. (2003), *Magic*, in Katharine Park and Lorraine Daston (eds), *The Cambridge History of Science. Early Modern Science*, vol. III, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge: 518-540.

Coppock Vicki, and John Hopton (2000), *Critical Perspectives on Mental Health*, Routledge, New York-London, doi: 10.1093/bjsw/bct202.

Corona Daniela, a cura di (2002), *Rappresentazioni della follia e contesti culturali: narrazioni delle differenze* (Representations of insanity and cultural contexts: narrating differences), S.F. Flaccovio, Palermo.

Coronato Rocco (2011), *A Sentimental Journey Through the Body and Other Eighteenth-century Automata*, «La Questione Romantica», 3, 1: 29-39.

Costa Dennis (2002), *Language in Smart's* Jubilate Agno, «Essays in Criticism», 52, 4: 295-313.

Cox Philip (1996), *Gender, Genre, and the Romantic Poets: An Introduction*, Manchester University Press, Manchester.

Cragg G.R. (1968), *The Churchman*, in J.L. Clifford (ed.), *Man Versus Society in Eighteenth-century Britain: Six Points of View*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge: 54-69.

Craighead W. Edward *et al.*, eds (2008), *Psychopathology: History, Diagnosis, and Empirical Foundations*, John Wiley, Hoboken.

Creach J.F.D. (2013), *Violence in Scripture*, Westminster John Knox Press, Louisville.

Crisafulli L.M. and Cecilia Pietropoli, a cura di (2002), *Le poetesse romantiche inglesi* (English women Romantic poets), Carocci, Roma.

Curran Stuart (1986), *Poetic Form and British Romanticism*, Oxford University Press, New York-Oxford.

Curry Neil (2005), *Christopher Smart*, Northcote House Publishers, Devon.

Davies Michael (2013 [2011]), *Authentic Narratives: Cowper and Conversion*, in Ashley Chantler, Michael Davies and Philip Shaw (eds), *Literature and Authenticity, 1780-1900: Essays in Honour of Vincent Newey*, Ashgate, Farnham: 9-24.

Davis Gayle (2008), *The Cruel Madness of Love: Sex, Syphilis and Psychiatry in Scotland, 1880-1930*, Rodopi, Amsterdam.

Dawson Virginia (1987), *Nature's Enigma: The Problem of the Polyp in the Letters of Bonnet, Trembley and Réaumur*, American Philosophical Society, Philadelphia.

Dearnley Moira (1968), *The Poetry of Christopher Smart*, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.

De Nooy Juliana (1998), *Derrida, Kristeva, and the Dividing Line: An Articulation of Two Theories of Difference*, Garland, New York-London.

De Young Mary (2015), *Encyclopedia of Asylum Therapeutics 1750-1950s*, McFarland, Jefferson.

Del Sapio Garbero Maria (2011), *Potenziamenti dello sguardo e ri-scritture dell'umano nell'età di Shakespeare* (Expanding the gaze and re-writing the human in the age of Shakespeare), «Testi e Linguaggi», 5: 41-57, <http://goo.gl/Wv9VzO> (01/2016).

Deleuze Gilles (1968), *Différence et repétition*, Presses Universitaires de France, Paris. Trans. by Paul Patton (2001), *Difference and Repetition*, Continuum, London-New York.

Dent R.W. (1964), *Imagination in A Midsummer Night's Dream*, «Shakespeare Quarterly», 15, 2: 115-129, doi: 10.2307/2867882.

Dente Carla (2012), *Rules and Textual Construction of the Vocational Practices of Actors and Lawyers in Early Modern England*, «Journal of Early Modern Studies», 1, 1: 155-173, doi: JEMS-2279-7149-10642.

— (2014), *Renaissance Actors and Lawyers: Instability of Texts and of Social Trafficking:* The Comedy of Errors, «Pólemos», 8, 2: 309-320.

Department of Health and Children (2006), *A Vision for Change: Report of the Expert Group on Mental Health Policy*, Stationary Office, Dublin, <http://goo.gl/a2caMz> (02/2016).

DePorte M.V. (1970), *Digressions and Madness in* A Tale of a Tub *and* Tristram Shandy, «Huntington Library Quarterly», 34, 1: 43-57, doi: 10.2307/3816862.

— (1974), *Nightmares and Hobbyhorses: Swift, Sterne, and Augustan Tales of Madness*, Huntington Library, San Marino.

Derrida Jacques (1967), *L'écriture et la différence*, Éditions du Seuil, Paris. Trans. by Alan Bass (1978), *Writing and Difference*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

— (1992), *Penser la folie: Essais sur Michel Foucault*, «Revue d'Histoire des Sciences», 47, 3: 520-521, <http://goo.gl/PHPQA3> .

— (1994), *«To Do Justice to Freud»: The History of Madness in the Age of Psychoanalysis*, trans. by Pascale-Anne Brault and Michael Naas,«Critical Inquiry», 20, 2: 227-266.

— (2006), *L'animal que donc je suis*, Galilée, Paris. Trans. by David Wills (2008), *The Animal That Therefore I Am*, ed. by Marie-Louise Mallet, Fordham University Press, New York.

Detweiler Robert (1972), *Retreat from Environmentalism: A Review of the Psychohistory of George III*, «The History Teacher», 6, 1: 37-46, doi: 10.2307/492622.

Devlin Christopher (1961), *Poor Kit Smart*, Rupert Hart-Davis, London.

Di Blasio Francesca (2001), *Teoria e pratiche dello sguardo*: *Percorsi nella letteratura inglese e americana* (Theory and practice of the human gaze: a path through English and American Literature), Sestante, Bergamo.

Di Michele Laura, a cura di (2002), *La politica e la poetica del mostruoso nella letteratura e nella cultura inglese e angloamericana* (The politics and poetics of the monstrous in English and Angloamerican literature and culture), Liguori, Napoli.

Digby Ann (1985), *Madness, Morality and Medicine: A Study of the York Retreat, 1796-1914*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Doody Margaret (1985), *The Daring Muse: Augustan Poetry Reconsidered*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Drake Nathan, ed. (1811), «The Gleaner», IV: 477.

Dugaw Dianne (2000), *Women and Popular Culture: Gender, Cultural Dynamics, and Popular Prints*, in Vivien Jones (ed.), *Women and Literature in Britain, 1700-1800*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge: 263-284.

Dumit Joseph (2003), *Is It Me or My Brain? Depression and Neuroscientific Facts*, «Journal of Medical Humanities», 24, 1-2: 35-47, <http://goo.gl/wO7ALg> (01/2016).

Dwyer Ellen (1987), *Homes for the Mad; Life inside Two Nineteenth-century Asylums*, Rutgers University Press, New Brunswick-London.

Dyce Alexander (1827), *Notes on Dr. Johnson's Life of Collins*, in William Collins, *The Poetical Works of William Collins*, ed. by Alexander Dyce, William Pickering, London: 9-38, <https://goo.gl/ZHViTY> (01/2016).

Eagle Christopher, ed. (2014), *Literature, Speech Disorders, and Disability*, Routledge, New York.

Easton Fraser (1999), *Mary's Key and the Poet's Conception: the Orphic versus the Mimetic Artist in* Jubilate Agno, in Clement Hawes (ed.), *Christopher Smart and the Enlightenment*, St Martin's, New York: 161-163.

Elfenbein Andrew (1999), *Romantic Genius: The Prehistory of a Homosexual Role*, Columbia University Press, New York.

Elliott R.C. (1960), *The Power of Satire: Magic, Ritual, Art*, Princeton University Press, Princeton.

Ellis D'Alessandro J.M. (1989), *When in the Shade...: Imaginal Equivalents in Anne the Countess of Winchilsea's Poetry*, Del Bianco Editore, Udine.

Engstrom E.J. *et al*., eds (1999), *Knowledge and Power: Perspectives in the History of Psychiatry*, Verlag für Wissenschaft und Bildung, Münich-Berlin.

Eribon Didier (1989), *Michel Foucault*, Flammarion, Paris. Trans. by Betsy Wing (1991), *Michel Foucault*, Faber, London.

Erskine-Hill Howard and R.A. McCabe, eds (1995), *Presenting Poetry: Composition, Publication, Reception*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Faas Ekbert (1991 [1988]), *Retreat into the Mind: Victorian Poetry and the Rise of Psychiatry*, Princeton University Press, Princeton.

Fairer David (2002), *English Poetry of the Eighteenth Century, 1700-1789*, Longman, Harlow.

Falconer Blas *et al*., eds (2010), *Mentor and Muse: Essays from Poets to Poets*, Southern Illinois University Press, Carbondale.

Farrar Thaddeus Janice (1965), *Insanity and Poetry: William Collins, William Cowper, and Christopher Smart*, Ph.D. Thesis, Columbia University, New York, <http://search.proquest.com/docview/302315926?accountid=15928> (01/2016).

Faubert Michelle (2003), *Romantic Madness: A Cultural Study 1780-1850*, Ph.D. Thesis, University of Toronto, Toronto <http://search.proquest.com/docview/305255857?accountid=15928> (01/2016).

— (2009), *Rhyming Reason: The Poetry of Romantic-era Psychologists*, Pickering & Chatto, London.

Feder Lillian (1980), *Madness in Literature*, Princeton University Press, Princeton.

Felman Shoshana (1985), *Writing and Madness (Literature/ Philosophy/Psychoanalysis)*, Cornell University Press, New York.

— and Dori Laub (1992), *Testimony: Crises of Witnessing in Literature, Psychoanalysis, and History*, Routledge, New York-London.

— (2003), *Writing and Madness (Literature/ Philosophy/Psychoanalysis)*, Stanford University Press, Palo Alto.

Fennell Phil (1986), *Law and Psychiatry: The Legal Constitution of the Psychiatric System*, «Journal of Law and Society», 13, 1: 35-65.

Ferrari Roberta, a cura di (2000), *Un luogo pieno di voci: l'isola nella letteratura di lingua inglese* (A place full of voices: the island in English-language literature), Edizioni ETS, Pisa.

Finch Casey (1987), *Immediacy in the Odes of William Collins*, «Eighteenth-century Studies», 20, 3: 275-295.

Fisher Philip (2002), *The Vehement Passions*, Princeton University Press, Princeton.

Fisher-Homberger Esther (1983), *Hypochondriasis*, in Michael Shepherd and O.L. Zangwill (eds), *Handbook of Psychiatry: General Psychopathology*, vol. I, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge: 46-47.

Fissell Mary and Roger Cooter (2008), *Exploring Natural Knowledge: Science and the Popular*, in Roy Porter (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Science*, vol. IV, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge: 129-158.

Flather Amanda (2007), *Gender and Space in Early Modern England*, Boydell Press, Woodbridge.

Florio Parrinello Francesco (1969), *William Cowper precursore del Romanticismo inglese* (William Cowper, a forerunner of English Romanticism), Editrice Scolastica Italiana, Marsala.

Fludernik Monika (1993), *The Fictions of Language and the Languages of Fiction: The Linguistic Representation of Speech and Consciousness*, Routledge, London-New York.

Foucault Michel (1963), *Naissance de la clinique: une archéologie du regard médical*, Presses Universitaires de France, Paris. Trans. by A. M. Sheridan-Smith (2003), *The Birth of the Clinic*, Routledge, London-New York.

— (1964 [1961]), *Folie et déraison. Histoire de la folie*, Plon, Paris. Trans. by Richard Howard (1965), *Madness and Civilization; A History of Insanity in the Age Of Reason*, Pantheon Books, New York.

— (1994 [1963]), *Préface à la transgression*, in Id., *Dits et écrits I, 1954-1988*, Gallimard, Paris: 233-250. Trans. and ed. by Donald F. Bouchard (1977), *Nietzsche, Genealogy, History*, in Id., *Language, Counter-memory, Practice. Selected Essays and Interviews by Michel Foucault*, Cornell University Press, Ithaca: 29-52.

— (1966), *Les mots et les choses :une archéologie des sciences humaines*, Gallimard, Paris. Trans. by A.M. Sheridan-Smith (1970), *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences*, Tavistock, London.

— (1969), *L'archéologie du savoir*, Gallimard, Paris. Trans. by A.M. Sheridan-Smith (1972a), *The Archaeology of Knowledge*, Tavistock Publications, London.

— (1971 [1969]), *Nietzsche, la généalogie, l'histoire*, in Sherry Simon *et al.* (eds), Hommage à Jean Hyppolite, Paris: 145-172. Trans. and ed. by Donald F. Bouchard (1977), *Nietzsche, Genealogy, History*, in Id., *Language, Counter-memory, Practice. Selected Essays and Interviews by Michel Foucault*, Cornell University Press, Ithaca: 139-164.

— (1972b), *Histoire de la folie à l'age classique: suivi de mon corps, ce papier, le feu et la folie, l'absence d'oeuvre*, Gallimard, Paris. Trans. by Jonathan Murphy (2006) , *History of Madness*, ed. by Jean Khalfa, Routledge, London.

— (1975), *Surveiller et punir*, Gallimard, Paris. Trans. by A.M. Sheridan-Smith (1979), *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, Penguin, Harmondsworth.

— (2001), *La vérité et les formes juridiques*, in Id., *Dits et écrits I, 1954-1975*, Gallimard, Paris: 1406-1513. Trans. and ed. by J.D. Faubion (2001), *Truth and Juridical Forms, Essential Works of Foucault 1954-1984. Vol. 3: Power*, Penguin, London: 6-89.

— (2003), *Le Pouvoir psychiatrique. Cours au Collège de France (1973-1974)*, Gallimard, Seuil. Trans. by Graham Burchell (2008 [2006]), *Psychiatric Power: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1973-1974*, St. Martin's Press, New York.

Free W.N. (1970), *William Cowper*, Twayne Publishers, New York.

Freedman Robert (2010), *The Madness Within Us: Schizophrenia as a Neuronal Process*, Oxford University Press, New York-Oxford.

Frye Northrop (1947), *Fearful Symmetry: A Study of William Blake*, Princeton University Press, Princeton.

Fulford Tim (1996), *Landscape, Liberty and Authority: poetry, criticism and politics from Thomson to Wordsworth*, Cambridge University Press, New York.

Furdell E.L. (2002), *Publishing and Medicine in Early Modern England*, University of Rochester Press, Rochester.

Geekie Jim and John Read (2009), *Making Sense of Madness: Contesting the Meaning of Schizophrenia*, Routledge, London.
Gibbons Brian (2000), *Spirituality and the Occult*, Routledge, London.
Gilbert Sandra and Susan Gubar (1980 [1979]), *The Madwoman in the Attic: The Woman Writer and the Nineteenth-century Literary Imagination*, Yale University Press, New Haven.
Gillingham Susan (2008), *Psalms through the Centuries*, Blackwell, Oxford.
Gilman Sander (1982), *Seeing the Insane*, Wiley and Sons, New York.
— (1988), *Disease and Representation: Images of Illness from Madness to AIDS*, Cornell University Press, Ithaca.
Glasgow Rupert (1995), *Madness, Masks and Laughter: An Essay on Comedy*, Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, Madison.
Gliserman Kopans Dana (2006), *The English Malady: Engendering Insanity in the Eighteenth Century*, Ph.D. Thesis, Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, <http://search.proquest.com/docview/305359128?accountid=15928> (01/2016).
— (2008), «With the Affection of a Parent»: The Invention of the Patriarchal Mad-Doctor, in Glen Colburn (ed.), *The English Malady: Enabling and Disabling Fictions*, Cambridge Scholars Publishing, Newcastle: 124-152.
Goddard Michael (2011), *Out of Place: Madness in the Highlands of Papua New Guinea*, Berghahn, Oxford.
Goffman Erwin (1961), *Asylums,* Doubleday & Co., Garden City.
Goldberg Ann (1998), *Sex, Religion, and the Making of Modern Madness in Germany, 1815-1849*, Oxford University Press, Oxford-New York.
Gomory Tomi, David Cohen and Stuart Kirk (2013), *Madness or Mental Illness? Revisiting Historians of Psychiatry*, «Current Psychology», 32, 2: 1-17.
Goodey C.F. (2011), *A History of Intelligence and «Intellectual Disability»: The Shaping of Psychology in Early Modern Europe*, Ashgate, Farnham.
Gould Gibson Rebecca (1988), «My Want of Skill»: Apologias of British Women Poets, 1660-1800, in F.M. Keener and S.E. Lorsch (eds), *Eighteenth-century Women and the Arts*, Greenwood Press, New York: 79-86.
Gowland Angus (2012), *Burton's Anatomy and the Intellectual Traditions of Melancholy*, «Babel», 25: 221-257, <http://goo.gl/daX5zD> (01/2016).
Gozzi Francesco (1991), *Il romanzo inglese nel Settecento e nell'Ottocento: Sterne, Walpole, Dickens, Hardy* (The eighteenth- and nineteenth-century British novel: Sterne, Walpole, Dickens, Hardy), Edizioni ETS, Pisa.
Gozzi Francesco, A.L. Johnson, a cura di (1997), *Scienza e immaginario* (Science and imagery), Edizioni ETS, Pisa.
Greene D.J. (1953), *Smart, Berkeley, the Scientists and the Poets: A Note on Eighteenth-century Anti-Newtonianism*, «Journal of the History of Ideas», 14, 3: 327-352, doi: 10.2307/2707805.
Greenfeld Liah (2013), *Mind, Modernity, Madness: The Impact of Culture on Human Experience*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge-London.
Gregori Flavio (2008), *Follia e civiltà: Pope e l'ira di Achille* (Madness and civilization: Pope and the Fury of Achilles), in Roberto Baronti Marchiò (a cura di), *Lezioni di Dottorato 2007* (Doctoral lessons 2007), Edizioni Spartaco, Santa Maria Capua Vetere: 147-177, <http://goo.gl/GvRgQy> (01/2016).
Greville C.C.F. (1927 [1834]), *The Greville Diary*, ed. by Philip Whitwell Wilson, Doubleday, Page and Company, Garden City.
Grierson Herbert and J.C. Smith (1947), *A Critical History of English Poetry*, Chatto and Windus, London.

Griffin Dustin (1990), *Redefining Georgic: Cowper's Task*, «ELH» 57, 4: 865-879, doi: 10.2307/2873088.
— (2002), *Patriotism and Poetry in Eighteenth-century Britain*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
— (2004), *Collins, William (1721-1759)*, in H.C. G. Matthew and B.H. Harrison (eds), *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, doi:10.1093/ref:odnb/5957.
Grigson Geoffrey (1961), *Christopher Smart*, Longmans, Green & Co., London.
Griswold C.L. (1999), *Adam Smith and the Virtues of Enlightenment*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
Gross C.G. (2009), *A Hole in the Head: More Tales in the History of Neuroscience*, MIT Press, Cambridge-London.
Gross G.S. (1992), *This Invisible Riot of the Mind: Samuel Johnson's Psychological Theory*, University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia.
Grundy Isobel (1999), *Lady Mary Wortley Montagu: Comet of the Enlightenment*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
Guest Harriet (1989), *A Form of Sound Words: The Religious Poetry of Christopher Smart*, Clarendon, Oxford.
Guimón José (2001), *Inequity and Madness: Psychosocial and Human Rights Issues*, Kluwer Academic/Plenum, New York-London.

Hamilton J.T. (2008), *Music, Madness, and the Unworking of Language*, Columbia University Press, New York.
Hammond Paul (2002), *The Restoration Poetic and Dramatic Canon*, in John Barnard and D.F. McKenzie (eds), *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain, 1557-1695*, vol. IV, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge: 388-409.
Hancock Stephen (2013), *The Romantic Sublime and Middle-class Subjectivity in the Victorian Novel*, Routledge, New York.
Hankinson R.J. , ed. (2008), *The Cambridge Companion to Galen*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
Harms Ernst (1967), *Origins of Modern Psychiatry*, C.C. Thomas, Springfield.
Harpin Anna and Juliet Foster, eds (2014), *Performance, Madness and Psychiatry: Isolated Acts*, Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke.
Hartman G.H. (1974), *Christopher Smart's Magnificat: Toward a Theory of Representation*, «ELH», 41, 3: 429-454, doi: 10.2307/2872595.
Hawes Clement (1995), *Smart's Bawdy Politic: Masculinity and the Second Age of Horn in* Jubilate Agno, «Criticism», 37, 3: 413-442, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23116608> (01/2016).
— (1996), *Mania and Literary Style: The Rhetoric of Enthusiasm from the Ranters to Christopher Smart*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
— ed. (1999), *Christopher Smart and the Enlightenment*, St. Martin's, New York.
— (2013), *Poised Poesis: Ecstasy in* Jubilate Agno, in Min Wild and Noel Chevalier (eds), *Reading Christopher Smart in the Twenty-first Century: «by succession of delight»*, Bucknell University Press, Lewisburg: 87-104.
Hawkins P.S. (2014), *The Psalms in Poetry*, in W.P. Brown (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of the Psalms*, Oxford University Press, Oxford-New York: 99-113.
Hay M.G. (1979), *Understanding Madness: Some Approaches to Mental Illness circa 1650-1800*, Ph.D. Thesis, University of York, York, <http://search.proquest.com/docview/302997015?accountid=15928> (01/2016).

Hazlitt William (1870 [1818]), *Lectures on the English Poets and the English Comic Writers*, Bell & Daldy, London.
Heighes Simon (1995), *The Life and Work of William and Philip Hayes*, Garland, New York-London.
Heinrichs R.W. (2001), *In Search of Madness: Schizophrenia and Neuroscience*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
Hellegers Desiree (1993), *«The Threatening Angel and the Speaking Ass»: The Masculine Mismeasure of Madness in Anne Finch's «The Spleen»*, «Genre», 26, 2-3: 119-218.
Heller Deborah (1993), *Seeing but Not Believing: The Problem of Vision in Collins's Odes*, «Texas Studies in Literature and Language», 35, 1: 103-123, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40755002> (01/2016).
— (1995), *Cowper's* Task *and the Writing of a Poet's Salvation*, *«Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900»*, 35, 3: 575-598, doi: 10.2307/450898.
Henighan Tom (1982), *Natural Space in Literature*, Golden Dog Press, Ottawa.
Hess Scott (2005), *Authoring the Self: Self-Representation, Authorship, and the Print Market in British Poetry from Pope through Wordsworth*, Routledge, New York-London.
Heyd Michael (1995), *«Be sober and reasonable»: The Critique of Enthusiasm in the Seventeenth and Early Eighteenth Centuries*, Brill, Leiden, New York-Koln.
Himberg Kay (2002), *«Against the Spleen»: Sterne and the Tradition of Remedial Laughter*, in Manfred Pfister (ed.), *A History of English Laughter: Laughter from Beowulf to Beckett and Beyond*, Rodopi, Amsterdam-New York: 69-82.
Hinnant C.H. (1994), *The Poetry of Anne Finch: An Essay in Interpretation*, University of Delaware Press, Newark.
Hodgkin Katharine (2007), *Madness in Seventeenth-century Autobiography*, Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke.
Hopps Gavin and Jane Stabler, eds (2006), *Romanticism and Religion from William Cowper to Wallace Stevens*, Ashgate, Aldershot.
Hubert Jane, ed. (2000), *Madness, Disability and Social Exclusion: The Archaeology and Anthropology of 'Difference'*, Routledge, London.
Hubert S.J. (2002), *Questions of Power: The Politics of Women's Madness*, University of Delaware Press, Newark.
Huet M.H. (1993), *Monstrous Imagination*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge-London.
Hutchings Bill (1983), *The Poetry of William Cowper*, Groom Helm, Beckenham.

Iannaccaro Giuliana and Alessandra Petrina (2014), *To and From the Queen: Modalities of Epistolography in the Correspondence of Elizabeth I*, «Journal of Early Modern Studies», 3: 69-89, doi: JEMS-2279-7149-14165.
Ingleby David, ed. (1981), *Critical Psychiatry: The Politics of Mental Health*, Harmondsworth, Penguin.
— (1982), *The Social Construction of Mental Illness*, in Peter Wright and Andrew. Treacher (eds), *The Problem of Medical Knowledge*, Edinburgh University Press, Edinburgh: 123-143.
Ingram Allan (1991), *The Madhouse of Language: Writing and Reading Madness in the Eighteenth Century*, Routledge, London.
— (2002), *Identifying the Insane: Madness and Marginality in the Eighteenth Century*, «Lumen: Selected Proceedings from the Canadian Society for Eighteenth-century Studies», 21: 143-157, <https://goo.gl/7ZZYxq> (01/2016).

Ingram Allan and Michelle Faubert (2003), *Cultural Constructions of Madness*, New York, Palgrave.
— (2006), *Death in Life and Life in Death: Melancholy and the Enlightenment*, «Gesnerus», 63: 90-102, <http://goo.gl/m5CWiJ> (01/2016).
— *et al.*, eds (2011), *Melancholy Experience in Literature of the Long Eighteenth Century: Before Depression, 1660-1800*, Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke.
Innocenti Loretta, Franco Marucci and Paola Pugliatti, a cura di (1994), *Semeia. Itinerari per Marcello Pagnini* (Semeia. Itineraries for Marcello Pagnini), Il Mulino, Bologna.
Innocenti Loretta (2003), *Modalità del visibile e modalità dell'udibile nella poesia religiosa del Seicento inglese* (Modality of the visible and modality of the audible in seventeenth-century English religious poetry), in Carmela Nocera, Gemma Persico and Rosario Portale (eds), *Rites of Passage: Rational/Irrational Natural/Supernatural Local/Global*, Rubbettino Editore, Soveria Mannelli: 11-29.
Interesting Particulars of the Poet Collins, not included in the narratives of Johnson or Langhorne (1821), in *The Literary Gazette and Journal of Belles Lettres, Arts, Sciences &c. for the Year 1821*, n. p., London: 203-204, <https://goo.gl/wSt2UB> (01/2016).
Irlam Shaun (1999), *Elations: The Poetics of Enthusiasm in Eighteenth-century Britain*, Stanford University Press, Stanford.
Isler Hansruedi (2009), *The Development of Neurology and the Neurological Sciences in the 17th Century*, «Handbook of Clinical Neurology», 95: 91-106.

Jackson Ken (2005), *Separate Theaters: Bethlem («Bedlam») Hospital and the Shakespearean Stage*, University of Delaware Press, Newark.
Jackson S.W. (2007), *A History of Melancholia and Depression*, in Edwin Wallace and John Gach (eds), *History of Psychiatry and Medical Psychology*, Springer, New York: 443-460.
Jagger Nicholas (2004), *Carkesse, James (b.c.1636)*, in H.C.G. Matthew and B.H. Harrison (eds), *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, doi:10.1093/ref:odnb/4666.
Jones Colin and Roy Porter, eds (1994), *Reassessing Foucault: Power, Medicine and the Body*, Routledge, London.
— (1994), *Introduction*, in Id. (eds), *Reassessing Foucault: Power, Medicine and the Body*, Routledge, London: 1-16.
Jones Vivien, ed. (2000), *Women and Literature in Britain, 1700-1800*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
Jordan Sarah (2003), *The Anxieties of Idleness: Idleness in Eighteenth-century British Literature and Culture*, Bucknell University Press, Lewisburg.
Josephs K.B. (2013), *Disturbers of the Peace: Representations of Madness in Anglophone Caribbean Literature*, University of Virginia Press, Charlottesville.
Jung Sandro (2000), *William Collins and 'The Poetical Character': Originality, Original Genius and the Poems of William Collins*, C. Winter, Heidelberg.
— (2010), *William Collins and Haplotes*, «Studies in Philology», 107, 3: 416-428.

Kaplan Cora (1986), *Sea Changes: Culture and Feminism*, Verso, London.
Katritzky M.A. (2007), *Women, Medicine and Theatre, 1500-1750: Literary Mountebanks and Performing Quacks*, Ashgate, Aldershot.
Keener F.M. and S.E. Lorsch, eds (1988), *Eighteenth-century Women and the Arts*, Greenwood Press, New York.

Keiser Jess (2014), *What's the Matter with Madness? John Locke, the Association of Ideas, and the Physiology of Thought*, in Chris Mounsey (ed.), *The Idea of Disability in the Eighteenth Century*, Bucknell University Press, Plymouth: 49-70.

Keith Jennifer (2005), *Poetry and the Feminine from Behn to Cowper*, University of Delaware Press, Newark.

Keller R.C. (2007), *Colonial Madness: Psychiatry in French North Africa*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago-London.

Kellner Hans (2005), *Longinus, On the Sublime*, in Michelle Ballif and M.G. Moran (eds), *Classical Rhetorics and Rhetoricians*, Praeger, Westport-London: 245-249.

Kennedy Deborah (2013), *Poetic Sisters: Early Eighteenth-century Women Poets*, Bucknell University Press, Lewisburg, co-published with the Rowman & Littlefield Pub. Group, Lanham.

Keymer Tom (1995), *Presenting Jeopardy: Language, Authority and the Voice of Smart in* Jubilate Agno, in Howard Erskine-Hill and R.A. McCabe (eds), *Presenting Poetry: Composition, Publication, Reception*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge: 97-116.

Kim Jeong-Oh (2014), *Anne Finch's Strategic Retreat into the Country House*, in Mona Narain and Karen Gevirtz (eds), *Gender and Space in British Literature, 1660-1820*, Ashgate, Burlington: 173-191.

King Steve and Gillian Gear, eds (2013), *A Caring County? Social Welfare in Hertfordshire from 1600*, University of Hertfordshire Press, Hatfield.

Klein Lawrence (1994), *Shaftesbury and the Culture of Politeness*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

— (1995), *Gender and the Public/Private Distinction in the Eighteenth Century: Some Questions about Evidence and Analytic Procedure*, «Eighteenth-century Studies», 29: 97-109.

Klibansky Raymond, Erwin Panofsky and Fritz Saxl (1979 [1964]), *Saturn and Melancholy, Studies in the History of Medical Philosophy, Religion and* Art, Klaus Reprint, Nendeln.

Kourany J.A. (2003), *Socially Responsible Directions for Philosophy of Science*, in C.L. Pinnick and Noretta Koertge (eds), *Scrutinizing Feminist Epistemology: An Examination of Gender in Science*, Rutgers University Press, New Brunswick-London: 202-219.

Kristeva Julia (1969), *Le Mot, le dialogue et le roman*, in Id., *Semeiotike: recherches pour une semanalyse*, Editions du Seuil, Paris: 143-173. Trans. by Thomas Gora, Alice Jardine and Leon Roudiez (1980), *Word, Dialogue, and Novel*, in Id., *Desire in Language, Columbia University Press*, New York: 64-91.

Kromm Jane (2002), *The Art of Frenzy: Public Madness in the Visual Culture of Europe, 1500-1850*, Continuum, London.

Lacoue-Labarthe Philippe and Jean-Luc Nancy (1978), *L'absolu littéraire: théorie de la littérature du romantisme allemand*, Éditions du Seuil, Paris. Trans by Philip Barnard and Cheryl Lester (1988), *The Literary Absolute: The Theory of Literature in German Romanticism*, State University of New York Press, Albany.

Lafrance Marc (2009), *Skin and the Self: Cultural Theory and Anglo-American Psychoanalysis*, «Body Society», 15, 3: 3-24, doi: 10.1177/1357034X09339099.

Laing R.D. (1960), *The Divided Self: A Study of Sanity and Madness*, Tavistock Publications, London.

Langhorne John (1765), *Memoirs of the Author*, in William Collins, *The Poetical Works of William Collins*, ed. by John Langhorne, printed for Thomas Becket and D.A. Dehondt, London: i-viii, <https://goo.gl/fXH35R> (01/2016).

Lawlor Clark (2011), *Fashionable Melancholy*, in Allan Ingram *et al.* (eds), *Melancholy Experience in Literature of the Long Eighteenth Century: Before Depression, 1660-1800*, Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke: 25-53.
Lederer David (2006), *Madness, Religion and the State in Early Modern Europe*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
Levine J.A. (1962), *The Status of the Verse Epistle before Pope*, «Studies in Philology», 59, 4: 658-684, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4173400> (01/2016).
Lewis Jayne (1996), *The English Fable: Aesop and Literary Culture, 1651-1740*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
Lilienfeld S.O. and Lori Marino (1999), *Essentialism Revisited: Evolutionary Theory and the Concept of a Mental Disorder*, «Journal of Abnormal Psychology», 108: 400-411.
Loeb L.E. (2010), *Reflection and the Stability of Belief: Essays on Descartes, Hume, and Reid*, Oxford University Press, New York-Oxford.
LoLordo Antonia (2012), *Locke's Moral Man*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
Lucking David (2000), *Our Devils Now Are Ended: A Comparative Analysis of* The Tempest *and* Doctor Faustus, «*Dalhousie Review*», 80, 2: 151-67, <https://goo.gl/lZ4Ro9> (01/2016).
Lund M.A. (2010), *Melancholy, Medicine and Religion in Early Modern England*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

MacDonald Michael (1981a), *Mystical Bedlam: Madness, Anxiety and Healing in Seventeenth Century England*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
— (1981b), *Insanity and the Realities of History in Early Modern England*, «Psychological Medicine», 11: 11-25.
Mackenzie M.M. (1981), *Plato on Punishment*, University of California Press, Berkeley.
MacLennan George (1992), *Lucid Interval: Madness and Subjective Writing in History*, Leicester University Press, Leicester.
Mandel B.J. (1970), *Artistry and Psychology in William Cowper's* Memoir, «Texas Studies in Literature and Language», 12, 3: 431-442.
Marchetti Leo (2004), *Anatomie dell'altro: l'immaginario teratologico nella letteratura inglese* (Anatomies of the other: teratological imagery in English literature), Liguori, Napoli.
Marks Herbert (2014), *On Prophetic Stammering*, in Christopher Eagle (ed.), *Literature, Speech Disorders, and Disability: Talking Normal*, Routledge, New York: 24-43.
Marrapodi Michele (2011), *Shakespeare, Milton, and the Romantic Imagination*, «TEXTUS», 24: 81-106.
Marsh Christopher (2010), *Music and Society in Early Modern England*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
Marshall Ashley (2013), *The Practice of Satire in England 1658-1770*, Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore.
Marshall Madeleine and Janet Todd (1982), *English Congregational Hymns in the Eighteenth Century*, University of Kentucky Press, Lexington.
Marshall W.G. (1987), *The Presence of 'The Word' in Cowper's* The Task, «Studies in English Literature 1500-1900», 27, 3: 475-487.
— (1989), *Wycherley's «Great Stage of Fools»: Madness and Theatricality in The Country Wife*, «Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900», 29, 3: 409-429.
Martin Raymond and John Barresi (2000 [1999]), *Naturalization of the Soul: Self and Personal Identity in the Eighteenth Century*, Routledge, London.

Martin P.W. (1987), *Mad Women in Romantic Writing*, Harvester, Brighton.
Matthew H.C.G. and B.H. Harrison, eds (2004), *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, doi:10.1093/ref:odnb/5957.
May Todd (1993), *Between Genealogy and Epistemology: Psychology, Politics, and Knowledge in the Thought of Michel Foucault*, Pennsylvania State University Press, University Park.
McGlynn Paul (1979), *Microcosm and the Aesthetics of Eighteenth-century British Literature*, «Studies in English Literature 1500-1900», 19, 3: 363-385.
McGovern Barbara (1992), *Anne Finch and her Poetry: A Critical Biography*, University of Georgia Press, Athens.
McGovern Barbara and C.H. Hinnant (1998), *Introduction*, in Anne Finch, *The Anne Finch Wellesley Manuscript Poems*, ed. by Barbara McGovern and C.H. Hinnant, University of Georgia Press, Athens: xv-xliii.
McGovern Constance (1985), *Masters of Madness: Social Origins of the American Psychiatric Profession*, University Press of New England, Hanover.
McKeon Michael (1987), *The Origins of the English Novel: 1600-1740*, Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore.
McKitterick David (2006), *Libraries and the Organization of Knowledge*, in Elisabeth Leedham-Green and Teresa Webber (eds), *The Cambridge History of Libraries in Britain and Ireland*, vol. I, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge: 592-615.
McNay Lois (1994), *Foucault: A Critical Introduction*, Continuum, New York.
McNeel David (2006), *Notes on Anne Finch's Poems*, <http://www.jimandellen.org/finch/poem134.html> (01/2016).
Meek Heather (2007), *«Spleen Spreads his Dominion»: Cultural, Literary, and Medical Representations of Hysteria, 1670-1810*, Ph.D. Thesis, Dalhousie University, Truro, <http://search.proquest.com/docview/304793266?accountid=15928> (01/2016).
— (2009), *Of Wandering Wombs and Wrongs of Women: Evolving Concepts of Hysteria in the Age of Reason*, «English Studies in Canada», 35, 3: 105-28.
Melehy Hassan (1997), *Writing Cogito: Montaigne, Descartes, and the Institution of the Modern Subject*, State University of New York Press, Albany.
Mellor Anne (1993), *Romanticism and Gender*, Routledge, New York.
Menely Tobias (2012), *'The Present Obfuscation': Cowper's* Task *and the Time of Climate Change*, «PMLA», 127, 3: 477-492, <http://goo.gl/HRjiEm> (01/2016).
Mermin Dorothy (1990), *Women Becoming Poets: Katherine Philips, Aphra Behn, Anne Finch*, «ELH», 57, 2: 335-355, doi: 10.2307/2873075.
Messenger Ann (1981), *Publishing without Perishing: Lady Winchilsea's* Miscellany Poems *of 1713*, «Restoration», 5, 1: 27-37, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/43292332> (01/2016).
Meyer Spacks Patricia (1967), *The Poetry of Vision: Five Eighteenth-century Poets*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge.
— (1986), *William Cowper: The Heightened Perception*, in Harold Bloom (ed.), *Poets of Sensibility and the Sublime*, Chelsea House, New York: 207-244.
— (2009), *Reading Eighteenth-century Poetry*, Wiley-Blackwell, Oxford-Chichester-Malden.
Micale M.S. and Roy Porter, eds (1994), *Discovering the History of Psychiatry*, Oxford University Press, Oxford-New York.
Micale M.S. (1995), *Approaching Hysteria: Disease and Its Interpretation*, Princeton University Press, Princeton.
— (2008), *Hysterical Men: the Hidden History of Male Nervous Illness*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge-London.

Miller C.R. (1984), *Genre as Social Action*, «Quarterly Journal of Speech», 70: 151-167.
Miller Eric (1999), *Taxonomy and Confession in Christopher Smart and Jean-Jacques Rousseau*, in Clement Hawes (ed.), *Christopher Smart and the Enlightenment*, St. Martin's, New York: 99-118.
Minh-ha T.T. (1991), *When the Moon Waxes Red: Representation, Gender and Cultural Politics*, Routledge, New York.
Mitford John (1827), *Additional Notes by the Reverend J. Mitford*, in William Collins, *The Poetical Works of William Collins*, ed. by Alexander Dyce, William Pickering, London: 39-42, <https://goo.gl/ZHViTY> (01/2016).
Moran J.E. (2000), *Committed to the State Asylum: Insanity and Society in Nineteenth-century Quebec and Ontario*, McGill-Queen's University Press, Montreal-Ithaca.
Morin Edgar (1973), *Le paradigme perdu: la nature humaine* (Paradigm lost: human nature), Éditions du Seuil, Paris.
Morini Massimiliano and Romana Zacchi, a cura di (2006), *Forme della censura* (Forms of censorship), Liguori, Napoli.
Moss H.G. (1981), *Glances at Madness and Literature*, in Joanne Trautmann (ed.), *Healing Arts in Dialogue: Medicine and Literature*, Southern Illinois University Press, Carbondale: 111-124.
Mounsey Chris (2001), *Christopher Smart: Clown of God*, Bucknell University Press, Lewisburg.
— ed. (2014), *The Idea of Disability in the Eighteenth Century*, Bucknell University Press, Plymouth.
Moyle Gary (2013), *Madhouses of Hertfordshire 1735-1903*, in Steve King and Gillian Gear (eds), *A Caring County? Social Welfare in Hertfordshire from 1600*, University of Hertfordshire Press, Hatfield: 69-98.
Mukařovský Jan (1964), *Standard Language and Poetic Language*, in P.L. Garvin (ed.), *A Prague School Reader on Esthetics, Literary Structure and Style*, Georgetown University Press, Washington D.C.: 17-30.
Mullini Roberta (2009), *Was Waltho Van Claturbank's Speech Ever Spoken? The Fashion of London Quacks' Speeches between the Seventeenth and the Eighteenth Centuries*, «Biblos», 7: 151-71, <https://goo.gl/q8QTHo> (01/2016).
— (2011), *The First Medical Practitioners in English Drama: Medical Knowledge and Quackery in* The Play of the Sacrament *and in John Heywood's* The Foure PP, «Linguæ &: Rivista di lingue e culture moderne», 1: 43-60, <http://goo.gl/QJ5Grp> (01/2016).
— (2013), *Shakespeare and the Words of Early Modern Physic: Between Academic and Popular Medicine. A Lexicographical Approach to the Plays*, «Journal of Early Modern Studies», 2: 63-89, doi: JEMS-2279-7149-12628.
— (2014), *'Family sayings': Two generations of Italian quack-doctors in 17th-century London*, in Tatiana Canziani, Kim Grego and Giovanni Iamartino (eds), *Perspectives in Medical English*, Polimetrica, Monza: 47-70.
— (2015), *Healing Words: The Printed Handbills of Early Modern London Quacks*, Peter Lang, Frankfurt am Main-Berlin-Bern,-Bruxelles-New York-Oxford-Wien.
Mulvey-Roberts Marie (2014 [1986]), *British Poets and Secret Societies*, Routledge, New York.
Murphy F.E.D. (2008), *Authorship Delayed: Strategies of Deferral in British Women's Writing, 1650-1740*, Ph.D. Thesis, University of California, Berkeley, <http://search.proquest.com/docview/304696687?accountid=15928> (01/2016).
Murry J.M. (1922), *Countries of the Mind*, E.P. Dutton, New York.

Musgrove S. (1943), *The Theme of Collins's Odes*, «Notes and Queries», 9: 214-217.
Musser J.F. Jr. (1979), *William Cowper's Rhetoric: The Picturesque and the Personal*, «Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900», 19, 3: 515-531, doi: 10.2307/450307.

Narain Mona and Karen Gevirtz, eds (2014), *Gender and Space in British Literature, 1660-1820*, Ashgate, Burlington.
Natali Ilaria (2012), *James Carkesse and the Lucidity of Madness*, «The International Journal of the Humanities», 9, 5: 285-298.
— (2013), *Marginality in Seventeenth- and Eighteenth-century English Poetry: Three 'Mad' Writers*, in Ioana Both, Ayşe Saraçgil e Angela Tarantino (a cura di), *Storia, Identità e Canoni Letterari*, Firenze University Press, Firenze: 129-144, <http://goo.gl/MO6irH> (01/2016).
Natali Ilaria and Annalisa Volpone, eds (2016), *Symptoms of Disorder: Reading Madness in British Literature 1744-1845*, Cambria Press, Amherst.
Natali Ilaria (2016), *Perceptions of Madness in the Works of Christopher Smart and William Cowper*, in Ilaria Natali and Annalisa Volpone (eds), *Symptoms of Disorder: Reading Madness in British Literature 1744-1845*, Cambria Press, Amherst: 39-66.
Neely C.T. (2004), *Distracted Subjects: Madness and Gender in Shakespeare and Early Modern Culture*, Cornell University Press, Ithaca.
Nelson H.F. and Laura Ralph (2009), *'Upon the Rack': George Herbert, William Cowper, and the Discourse of Dis/ability*, «The Cowper and Newton Bulletin», 8, 1, <http://goo.gl/j9mL8F> (01/2016).
Nettle Daniel (2001), *Strong Imagination: Madness, Creativity and Human Nature,* Oxford University Press, Oxford.
Newey Vincent (2006), *Cowper Prospects: Self, Nature, Society*, in Gavin Hopps and Jane Stabler (eds), *Romanticism and Religion from William Cowper to Wallace Stevens*, Ashgate, Aldershot: 41-56.
Nigri Lucia (2014), *'And I must now go wander like a Cain': A Journey across Early Modern (Under)worlds*, in Biancamaria Rizzardi, Costanza Fusini and Viktoria Tchernichova (eds), *Managing Diversities in English Literature: Global and Local Imaginaries in Dialogue*, Edizioni ETS, Pisa: 99-107.
Nocera Carmela, Gemma Persico and Rosario Portale, eds (2003), *Rites of Passage: Rational/Irrational Natural/Supernatural Local/Global,* Rubbettino Editore, Soveria Mannelli.
North M.L. (2003), *The Anonymous Renaissance: Cultures of Discretion in Tudor-Stuart England*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
Nussbaum F.A. (1987), *Private Subjects in William Cowper's* Memoir, in Paul Korshin (ed.), *The Age of Johnson*, vol. I, AMS Press, New York: 307-326.

Ober W.B. (1970), *Madness and Poetry: A Note on Collins, Cowper, and Smart*, «Bulletin of the New York Academy of Medicine», 46, 4: 203-266, <http://search.proquest.com/docview/1307631410?accountid=15928> (01/2016).
O'Farrell Clare (1989), *Foucault: Historian or Philosopher?*, Macmillan, Basingstoke.
Ogden Thomas (1989), *The Primitive Edge of Experience*, Jason Aronson, New Brunswick.
Ogilvie R.M. (1962), *The Song of Thyrsis*, «The Journal of Hellenic Studies», 82: 106-110, doi: 10.2307/628546.
Ollman Nadine (1988), *The Poet as Mermaid: Images of Self in Margaret Cavendish and Others*, in F.M. Keener and S.E. Lorsch (eds), *Eighteenth-century Women and the Arts*, Greenwood Press, New York: 87-92.

Oyebode Femi (2009), *Preface*, in Id. (ed.), *Mindreadings: Literature and Psychiatry*, The Royal College of Psychiatrists, London: vii-ix.

Paci F.R. (1983), *Introduzione*, in Christopher Smart, *Jubilate Agno*, trad. it e cura di F.R. Paci, Guanda, Milano: 9-42.

Pagnini Marcello (1964), *La poesia di William Collins* (The poetry of William Collins), Adriatica, Bari.

Paley M.D. (1983), *The Continuing City: William Blake's Jerusalem*, Clarendon, Oxford.

— (1999), *Apocalypse and Millennium in English Romantic Poetry*, Clarendon, Oxford.

Pallotti Donatella (2008), *Shows of Holiness: Women's Prophetic Performance and its Perception in Early Modern England*, in Paola Pugliatti and Alessandro Serpieri (eds), *English Renaissance Scenes: From Canon to Margins*, Peter Lang, Bern-Oxford: 203-258.

— (2012), *'out of their owne mouths'? Conversion Narratives and English Radical Religious Practice in the Seventeenth Century*, «Journal of Early Modern Studies», 1, 1: 73-95, doi: JEMS-2279-7149-10636.

Parisot Eric (2013), *Graveyard Poetry: Religion, Aesthetics and the Mid-eighteenth-century Poetic Condition*, Ashgate, Farnham.

Park Katharine and Lorraine Daston, eds (2003), *The Cambridge History of Science. Early Modern Science*, vol. III, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Parry-Jones W.L. (1972), *The Trade in Lunacy: A Study of Private Madhouses in England in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries*, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.

Paulson Ronald (1998), *Don Quixote in England: The Aesthetics of Laughter*, Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore-London.

Pearson Jaqueline (1996), *Women Reading, Reading Women*, in Helen Wilcox (ed.) *Women and Literature in Britain, 1500-1700*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge: 80-99.

Pedlar Valerie (2006), *The Most Dreadful Visitation: Male Madness in Victorian Fiction*, Liverpool University Press, Liverpool.

Perrucci Robert (1974), *Circle of Madness: On Being Insane and Institutionalized in America*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs.

Persico Gemma (1996), *Ascesa e declino dell'uomo di sentimenti. Saggio su Mackenzie, Godwin, Peacock* (Rise and fall of the man of sentiment. Essay on Mackenzie, Godwin, Peacock), Adriatica, Bari.

Peterson J.M. (1978), *The Medical Profession in Mid-Victorian London*, University of California Press, Berkeley.

Pfister Manfred, ed. (2002), *A History of English Laughter: Laughter from Beowulf to Beckett and Beyond*, Rodopi, Amsterdam-New York.

— (2008), *Introduction: Performing National Identity*, in Manfred Pfister and Ralph Hertel, *Performing National Identity: Anglo-Italian Cultural Transactions*, Rodopi, Amsterdam-New York: 9-28.

Pfister Manfred and Ralph Hertel (2008), *Performing National Identity: Anglo-Italian Cultural Transactions*, Rodopi, Amsterdam-New York.

Pickren W.E. and Alexandra Rutherford (2010), *A History of Modern Psychology in Context*, Wiley, Hoboken.

Pickstone J.V. (1985), *Medicine and Industrial Society: A History of Hospital Development in Manchester and its Region, 1752-1946*, Manchester University Press, Manchester.

Pocock J.G.A. (1985), *Virtue, Commerce, and History: Essays on Political Thought and History, Chiefly in the Eighteenth Century*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Porter Roy (1981), *Being Mad in Georgian England*, «History Today», 31: 42-48.
— (1981-1982), *Was There a Moral Therapy in Eighteenth Century Psychiatry?*, «Lychnos»: 12-26.
— (1982), *Was There a Medical Enlightenment on Eighteenth-century England?*, «British Journal of Eighteenth-century Studies», 5: 49-63.
— (1983), *In the 18th Century were English Lunatic Asylums Total Institutions?*, «Ego: Bulletin of the Department of Psychiatry, Guy's Hospital», 4: 12-34.
— (1985a), «The Hunger of Imagination»: Approaching Samuel Johnson's Melancholy, in Roy Porter, W.F. Bynum, and Michael Shepherd (eds), *The Anatomy of Madness: Essays in the History of Psychiatry*, vol. I, Tavistock, London: 63-88.
— (1985b), *The Patient's View: Doing Medical History from Below*, «Theory and Society», 14: 175-198.
— (1987a), *Mind-forg'd Manacles: A History of Madness in England from the Restoration to the Regency*, Athlone, London.
— (1987b), *A Social History of Madness*, Weidenfeld and Nicolson, New York.
— (1987c), *Bedlam and Parnassus: Mad People's Writing in Georgian England*, in George Levine (ed.), *One Culture: Essays in Science and Literature*, University of Wisconsin Press, Madison: 258-286.
— (1991), *English Society in the Eighteenth Century*, Penguin Books, Middlesex.
— (1992a), *Foucault's Great Confinement*, in Arthur Still and Irving Velody (eds), *Rewriting the History of Madness: Studies in Foucault's* Histoire de la folie, Routledge, London: 119-125.
— (1992b), *Madness and its Institutions*, in Andrew Wear (ed.), *Medicine in Society: Historical Essays*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge: 277-301.
— (2000), *Enlightenment: Britain and the Creation of the Modern World*, The Penguin Press, London.
— (2001a), *Bodies Politic: Disease, Death and Doctors in Britain, 1650-1900*, Cornell University Press, Ithaca.
— (2001b), *Madmen: A Social History of Mad-houses, Mad-doctors, and Lunatics*, Tempus, Gloucester.
— (2002), *Madness: A Brief History*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
Porter Roy, W. F. Bynum and Michael Shepherd, eds (1985), *The Anatomy of Madness: Essays in the History of Psychiatry*, Tavistock, London, 3 vols.
— (1985), *Introduction*, in W.F. Bynum, Roy Porter and Michael Shepherd (eds), *The Anatomy of Madness: Essays in the History of Psychiatry*, vol. I, Tavistock, London, 1-12.
Potter Paul (1992), *The Hippocratic Apocrypha*, «The Classical Review», 42, 2: 287-289, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/713212> (01/2016).
Powell Rosalind (2013), *Towards a New Language: Sublime Aesthetics in Smart's* Jubilate Agno, in Shaun Regan (ed.), *Reading 1759: Literary Culture in Mid-eighteenth-century Britain and France*, Bucknell University Press, Lewisburg: 113-132.
— (2014), *Christopher Smart's* Systema Naturae*: Anti-Newtonianism and the Categorical Impulse in* Jubilate Agno, «Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies», 37, 3: 361-376, doi: 10.1111/1754-0208.12092.
Pratt S.J. (1808), *Collins*, in S.J. Pratt (ed.), *The Cabinet of Poetry, Containing the Best Entire Pieces to be Found in the Works of The British Poets*, vol. 4, Richard Phillips, London: 236-237, <https://goo.gl/kqX2mn> (01/2016).
Profeti M.G., a cura di (2006), *Follia, follie* (Folly, follies), Alinea, Firenze.
Pugliatti Paola (2003), *Beggary and the Theater in Early Modern England*, Ashgate, Aldershot.

— (2008), *Introduction*, in Paola Pugliatti and Alessandro Serpieri (eds), *English Renaissance Scenes: From Canon to Margins*, Peter Lang, Bern-Oxford: 7-11.
— (2013), *People and the Popular, Culture and the Cultural*, «Journal of Early Modern Studies», 2: 19-42, doi: JEMS-2279-7149-12625.
Pugliatti Paola and Alessandro Serpieri, eds (2008), *English Renaissance Scenes: From Canon to Margins*, Peter Lang, Bern-Oxford.

Quinney Laura (2014), *Blake and his Contemporaries*, in Robert DeMaria *et al.*, *A Companion to British Literature, The Long Eighteenth Century 1660-1837*, vol. IV, Blackwell, Chichester: 329-344.

Radcliffe D.H. (1996), *Edmund Spenser: A Reception History*, S.C. Camden House, Columbia.
Radden Jennifer (2000), *The Nature of Melancholy: from Aristotle to Kristeva*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
— (2009), *Moody Minds Distempered: Essays on Melancholy and Depression*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
Ragsdale John (1806), *Particulars of Mr. William Collins, the Poet*, «The Monthly Magazine, or, British Register», 21, 1: 494-495.
Read John and Jacqui Dillon, eds (2013), *Models of Madness: Psychological, Social, and Biological Approaches to Psychosis*, Routledge, London.
Redfield Jamison Kay (1993), *Touched with Fire: Manic-Depressive Illness and the Artistic Temperament*, The Free Press, New York.
Reed E.S. (1997), *From Soul to Mind: The Emergence of Psychology from Erasmus Darwin to William James*, Yale University Press, New Haven.
Regan Shaun, ed. (2013), *Reading 1759: Literary Culture in Mid-eighteenth-century Britain and France*, Bucknell University Press, Lewisburg.
Reiss Benjamin (2008), *Theaters of Madness: Insane Asylums and Nineteenth-century American Culture*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago-London.
Reynolds L.A. and Paul Sawyer (1959), *Folk Medicine and the Four Fairies of A Midsummer-Night's Dream*, «Shakespeare Quarterly», 10, 4: 513-521, doi: 10.2307/2867099.
Richardson Alan (2001), *British Romanticism and the Science of the Mind*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
Rieger B.M., ed. (1994), *Dionysus in Literature: Essays on Literary Madness*, Bowling Green State University Popular Press, Bowling Green.
— (1994), *Introduction*, in B.M. Rieger (ed.), *Dionysus in Literature: Essays on Literary Madness*, Bowling Green State University Popular Press, Bowling Green: 1-15.
Riem Antonella, ed. (1986), *The Labyrinths of the Self: A Collection of Essays on Australian and Caribbean Literature*, FILEF Italo-Australian publications, Leichhardt.
Riffaterre M.C. (1959), *Review of Ullman's* Style in the French Novel, «Word», 15: 401-413.
Rizzardi Biancamaria, Costanza Fusini and Viktoria Tchernichova, eds (2014), *Managing Diversities in English Literature: Global and Local Imaginaries in Dialogue*, Edizioni ETS, Pisa.
Robertson Randy (2009), *Censorship and Conflict in Seventeenth-century England*, Pennsylvania State University Press, University Park.
Robinson J.E. (1961), *Bartholomew Fair: Comedy of Vapors*, «Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900», 1, 2: 65-80.
Rocca Julius (2007), *William Cullen (1710-1790) and Robert Whytt (1714-1766) on the Nervous System*, in Harry Whitaker *et al.* (eds), *Brain, Mind and Medicine: Neuroscience in the 18th Century*, Springer, New York: 85-98.

Rogers K.M. (1989), *Finch's 'Candid Account' vs. Eighteenth-century Theories of the Spleen*, «Mosaic», 22, 1: 17-27, <http://search.proquest.com/docview/1300064944?accountid=15928> (01/2016).

Romaine Suzanne (2001), *Contact with Other Languages*, in John Algeo (ed.), *The Cambridge History of the English Language, English in North America*, vol. VI, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge: 154-183.

Ross Trevor (1998), *The Making of the English Literary Canon: From the Middle Ages to the Late Eighteenth Century*, McGill-Queen's University Press, Montreal-London.

Rossi Sergio, ed. (1987), *Science and Imagination in 18th-century British Culture, Scienza e immaginazione nella cultura inglese del Settecento*, UNICOPLI, Milano.

Rota Felicina (1953), *William Collins*, CEDAM, Padova.

Roudinesco Élisabeth (2008), *Philosophy in Turbulent Times: Canguilhem, Sartre, Foucault, Althusser, Deleuze, Derrida*, Columbia University Press, New York-Chichester.

Rousseau George (2000), *Depression's Forgotten Genealogy: Notes towards a History of Depression*, «History of Psychiatry», 11: 71-106.

Rozemond Marleen (1998), *Descartes's Dualism*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge-London.

Rufini Sergio (1992), *Scritture anamorfotiche* (Anamorphotical writings), Edizioni Scientifiche Italiane, Napoli.

Ruggieri Franca, a cura di (1998), *L'età di Johnson: La letteratura inglese del secondo Settecento* (The Age of Johnson: English Literature in the Second Half of the Eighteenth Century), Carocci, Roma.

Rumbold Valerie (1989), *Women's place in Pope's World*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Ruston Sharon (2013), *Creating Romanticism: Case Studies in the Literature, Science and Medicine of the 1790s*, Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke.

Ryskamp Charles (1959), *William Cowper of the Inner Temple, Esquire: A Study of His Life and Works to the Year 1768*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Ryskamp Charles and Richard Wendorf (1979a), *Introduction*, in William Collins, *The Works of William Collins*, ed. by Charles Ryskamp and Richard Wendorf, Oxford University Press, Clarendon: xxi-xxxviii.

— (1979b), *Commentary*, in William Collins, *The Works of William Collins*, ed. by Charles Ryskamp and Richard Wendorf, Oxford University Press, Clarendon: 97-196.

Saggini Francesca (2003), *La messinscena dell'identità: teatro e teatralità nel romanzo inglese del Settecento*, Sette Città, Viterbo. Trans. by Laura Kopp (2012), *Backstage in the Novel: Frances Burney and the Theater Arts*, University of Virginia Press, Charlottesville-London.

Salkeld Duncan (1993), *Madness and Drama in the Age of Shakespeare*, Manchester University Press, Manchester.

Schlutz A.M. (2009), *Mind's World: Imagination and Subjectivity from Descartes to Romanticism*, University of Washington Press, Seattle.

Schmidt Jeremy (2007), *Melancholy and the Care of the Soul: Religion, Moral Philosophy and Madness in Early Modern England*, Ashgate, Hampshire.

Schwartz J.A. (2012), *Worm Work: Recasting Romanticism*, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis.

Scott Andrew (1999), *Tiresias and the Basilisk: Vision and Madness in Middleton and Rowley's* The Changeling, «Revista Alicantina de Estudios Ingleses», 1, 2: 165-179.

Scull A.T. (1979), *Museums of Madness: The Social Organization of Insanity in Nineteenth-century England*, Allen Lane, London.
— ed. (1981), *Madhouses, Mad-doctors and Madmen: The Social History of Psychiatry in the Victorian Era*, University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia.
— (1989), *Social Order/Mental Disorder: Anglo-American Psychiatry in Historical Perspective,* Routledge, London.
— (1992), *A Failure to Communicate? On the Reception of Foucault's Histoire de la Folie by Anglo-American Historians*, in Arthur Still and Irving Velody (eds), *Rewriting the History of Madness: Studies in Foucault's* Histoire de la folie, Routledge, London: 150-163.
— (1993), *The Most Solitary of Afflictions; Madness and Society in Britain. 1700-1900*, Yale University Press, New Haven-London.
— (1995), *Psychiatrists and Historical 'Facts' Part Two: Re-writing the History of Asylumdom*, «History of Psychiatry», 6, 3: 387-394.
— (2006), *The Insanity of Place/The Place of Insanity: Essays on the History of Psychiatry*, Routledge, London.
— (2011), *Madness: A Very Short Introduction*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
— (2015), *Madness and Civilization. A Cultural History of Insanity from the Bible to Freud, from the Madhouse to Modern Medicine*, Princeton University Press, Princeton.
Segre Cesare (1990), *Fuori del mondo. I modelli nella follia e nelle immagini dell'aldilà* (Out of this world. Insanity and images of afterlife: common patterns), Einaudi, Torino.
— (1994), *Comunicazione e oscurità* (Communication and darkness), in Loretta Innocenti, Franco Marucci and Paola Pugliatti (a cura di), *Semeia. Itinerari per Marcello Pagnini*, Il Mulino, Bologna: 19-28.
Semonin Paul (1996), *Monsters in the Marketplace. Exhibition of Human Oddities in Early Modern England*, in Rosemarie Garland Thompson (ed.), *Freakery: Cultural Spectacles of the Extraordinary Body*, New York University Press, New York-London: 69-81.
Sena J.F. (1971), *Melancholy in Anne Finch and Elizabeth Carter: The Ambivalence of an Idea*, «The Yearbook of English Studies», 1: 109-119, doi: 10.2307/3507060.
Seward William (1798), *Anecdotes of Distinguished Persons: Chiefly of the Present and Two Preceding Centuries*, vol. II, printed for Caldell and Davies, London.
Shafer Robert (1918), *The English Ode to 1660: An Essay in Literary History*, Princeton University Press, Princeton.
Shears Jonathon (2006), *Approaching the Unapproached Light: Milton and the Romantic Visionary*, in Gavin Hopps and Jane Stabler (eds), *Romanticism and Religion from William Cowper to Wallace Stevens*, Ashgate, Aldershot: 25-40.
Sherbo Arthur (1957), *Christopher Smart's Knowledge of Occult Literature*, «Journal of the History of Ideas», 18, 2: 233-241, doi: 10.2307/2707626.
— (1967), *Christopher Smart: Scholar of the University*, Michigan State University Press, East Lansing.
Shorter Edward (1997), *A History of Psychiatry: From the Era of the Asylum to the Age of Prozac*, Wiley, New York-Chichester.
Shortt S.E.D. (1986), *Victorian Lunacy: Richard M. Bucke and the Practice of Late Nineteenth Century Psychiatry*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
Showalter Elaine (1985), *The Female Malady: Women, Madness and English Culture, 1830-1980*, Virago, London.
Side Karina (1954), *Christopher Smart's Heresy*, «MLN», 69: 316-319.

Sigworth O.F. (1965), *William Collins*, Twayne Publishers, New York.
Skultans Vieda (1975), *Madness and Morals: Ideas on Insanity in the Nineteenth Century*, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.
— (1979), *English Madness: Ideas on Insanity, 1580-1890*, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.
Small Helen (1996), *Love's Madness: Medicine, the Novel, and Female Insanity, 1800-1865*, Clarendon, Oxford.
Smart Barry, ed. (1995), *Michel Foucault: Critical Assessments*, Routledge, London.
Snyder S.H. (2006), *Dopamine Receptor Excess and Mouse Madness*, «Neuron», 49, 4: 484-485, doi: 10.1016/j.neuron.2006.02.002.
Starr G.G. (2004), *Lyric Generations: Poetry and the Novel in the Long Eighteenth Century*, Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore.
Staub M.E. (2011), *Madness is Civilization: When the Diagnosis was Social, 1948 -1980*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
Stella Maria (1998), *La poesia inglese 1740-1800* (English poetry 1740-1800), in Franca Ruggieri (a cura di), *L'età di Johnson: La letteratura inglese del secondo Settecento* (The Age of Johnson: English Literature in the Second Half of the Eighteenth Century), Carocci, Roma: 189-236.
Stephen Leslie, ed. (1887), *Dictionary of National Biography*, vol. IX, Macmillan & Co, New York; Smith Elder & Co, London, <https://goo.gl/xfCHWu> (01/2016).
Stern Richard (2014), *Smart's Authority and the Eighteenth-century Mad-business*, in Anna Harpin and Juliet Foster (eds), *Performance, Madness and Psychiatry: Isolated Acts*, Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke: 19-41.
Stevenson Christine (1996), *Robert Hooke's Bethlem*, «Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians», 55: 254-275, doi: 10.2307/991148.
Stewart M.M. (1988), *William Collins, Samuel Johnson, and the Use of Biographical Details*, «Studies in English Literature 1500-1900», 28, 3: 471-483, doi: 10.2307/450597.
Still Arthur and Irving Velody, eds (1992), *Rewriting the History of Madness: Studies in Foucault's* Histoire de la folie, Routledge, London.
Suleiman S.R. (1988), *Mastery and Transference: The Significance of Dora*, in Clayton Koelb and Susan Noakes (eds), *The Comparative Perspective on Literature: Approaches to Theory and Practice*, Cornell University Press, Ithaca: 213-223.
Sutton John (2013), *Soul and Body in Seventeenth-century British Philosophy*, in Peter Anstey (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of British Philosophy in the Seventeenth Century*, Oxford University Press, Oxford: 285-307.
Suzuki Akihito (1992), *Mind and Its Disease in Enlightenment British Medicine*, Ph.D. Thesis, University College London, London, <http://search.proquest.com/docview/301479489?accountid=15928> (01/2016).
Szasz Thomas (1960), *The Myth of Mental Illness*, «The American Psychologist», 15: 113-118, <http://goo.gl/OL9QTa> (01/2016).
— (2007), *Coercion as Cure: A Critical History of Psychiatry*, Transaction Publishers, New Brunswick.

Talbot Ann (2010), *«The Great Ocean of Knowledge»: The Influence of Travel Literature on the Work of John Locke*, Brill, Leiden-Boston.
Tempera Mariangela (1999), *Feasting with Centaurs: Titus Andronicus from Stage to Text*, CLUEB, Bologna.

Thain Marion, ed. (2013), *The Lyric Poem: Formations and Transformations*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Thiher Allen (1999), *Revels in Madness: Insanity in Medicine and Literature*, University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor.

Thomas W.K. and W.U. Ober (1989), *A Mind for Ever Voyaging: Wordsworth at Work Portraying Newton and Science*, University of Alberta Press, Edmonton.

Thomas W.M. (1858), *Memoir of Collins*, in William Collins, *The Poetical Works of William Collins*, ed. by W.M. Thomas, Bell and Daldy, London: ix-lxiv, <https://goo.gl/lZdxuY> (01/2016).

Thrale Piozzi H.L. (1794), *British Synonymy: or an Attempt at Regulating the Choice of Words in Familiar Conversation*, vol. II, printed for G.G. and John Robinson, London.

— (1951 [1942]), *Thraliana: The Diary of Mrs. Hester Lynch Thrale (later Mrs. Piozzi) 1776-1809*, vol. II, ed. by K.C. Balderston, Clarendon Press, Oxford.

Todd Dennis (1995), *Miscreations of the Self in Eighteenth-century England. Imagining Monsters: Miscreations of the Self in Eighteenth-century England*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Torrey Fuller Edwin (2007), *The Invisible Plague: The Rise of Mental Illness from 1750 to the Present*, Rutgers University Press, New Brunswick.

Trautmann Joanne, ed. (1981), *Healing Arts in Dialogue: Medicine and Literature*, Southern Illinois University Press, Carbondale.

Turner Mark (1996), *The Literary Mind*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Turner R.P. *et al.* (1995), *Religious or Spiritual Problem. A Culturally Sensitive Diagnostic Category in the DSM-IV*, «The Journal of Nervous and Mental Disorder», 183, 7: 435-444.

Turner W.J., ed. (2010), *Madness in Medieval Law and Custom*, Brill, Leiden.

Unsworth Clive (1993), *Law and Lunacy in Psychiatry's 'Golden Age'*, «Oxford Journal of Legal Studies», 13, 4: 479-507, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/764546> (01/2016).

Ussher J.M. (2005), *Unravelling Women's Madness: Beyond Positivism and Constructivism and Towards a Material-Discursive-Intrapsychic Approach*, in Wendy Chan, D.E. Chunn and Robert Menzies (eds), *Women, Madness and the Law: A Feminist Reader*, GlassHouse, London: 19-41.

Vittone Gaetano (2005), *Vita e qualità della vita: saggio su Mandeville* (Life and quality of life: essay on Mandeville), Rubbettino Editore, Soveria Mannelli.

Volpone Annalisa (2016), *William Blake's Last Prophetic Books and Contemporary Brain Science*, in Ilaria Natali and Annalisa Volpone (eds), *Symptoms of Disorder: Reading Madness in British Literature 1744-1845*, Cambria Press, Amherst: 67-94.

Walker J.M. (1980), Jubilate Agno *as Psalm*, «Studies in English Literature 1500-1900», 20, 3: 449-459, doi: 10.2307/450290.

Wall Cynthia (2006), *The Prose of Things: Transformations of Description in the Eighteenth Century*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Walsh Marcus (2013), *Eighteenth-century High Lyric: William Collins and Christopher Smart*, in Marion Thain (ed.), *The Lyric Poem: Formations and Transformations*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge: 112-132.

Watson J.R. (2012), *Eighteenth-century Hymn Writers*, in Rebecca Lemon *et al.*, *The Blackwell Companion to the Bible in English Literature*, Wiley-Blackwell, Oxford: 329-344.

Wear Andrew, ed. (1992), *Medicine in Society: Historical Essays*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
— (1992), *Introduction*, in Id. (ed.), *Medicine in Society: Historical Essays*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge: 1-14.
— (2000), *Knowledge and Practice in English Medicine 1550-1680*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
Weinbrot H.D. (1990), *William Collins and the Mid-century Ode: Poetry, Patriotism and the Influence of Context*, in H.D. Weinbrot and Martin Price, *Context, Influence and Mid-Eighteenth Century Poetry*, University of California, Los Angeles: 3-39.
— (1995), *Northrop Frye and the Literature of Process Reconsidered*, in C.H. Hay (ed.), *The Past as Prologue: Essays to Celebrate the Twenty-fifth Anniversary of ASECS*, AMS Press, New York: 185-204.
Weinbrot H.D. and Martin Price (1990), *Context, Influence and Mid-Eighteenth Century Poetry*, University of California, Los Angeles.
Weineck Silke-Maria (2002), *The Abyss Above: Philosophy and Poetic Madness in Plato, Hölderlin, and Nietzsche*, State University of New York Press, Albany.
Whalley Peter (1756), *Preface*, in Ben Jonson, *The Works of Ben. Jonson*, vol. I, printed for Daniel Midwinter *et al.*, London: i-xxi.
Whitaker Harry *et al.*, eds (2007), *Brain, Mind and Medicine: Neuroscience in the 18th Century*, Springer, New York.
White D.E. (2000), *Romantic Returns: Superstition, Imagination, History*, Stanford University Press, Stanford.
White Gilbert (1781), *Memoirs of the Life of William Collins, the Poet*, in Sylvanus Urban (ed.), *The Gentleman's Magazine and Historical Chronicle*, vol. LI, printed by John Nichols *et al.*, London: 11-12, <https://goo.gl/OtakJC> (01/2016).
Wilcox Helen, ed. (1996), *Women and Literature in Britain, 1500-1700*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
Wild Min (2008), *Christopher Smart and Satire: «Mary Midnight» and the Midwife*, Ashgate, Aldershot.
— and Noel Chevalier, eds (2013), *Reading Christopher Smart in the Twenty-first Century*, Bucknell University Press, Lewisburg.
Williamson Karina (1979), *Smart's Principia: Science and Anti-Science in Jubilate Agno*, «The Review of English Studies», 30, 120: 409-422, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/514641> (01/2016).
— (1980a), *Introduction*, in Karina Williamson (ed.), *The Poetical Works of Christopher Smart:* Jubilate Agno, vol. I, Clarendon Press, Oxford: xxii-xxiv, doi: 10.1093/actrade/9780198118695.book.1.
— (1980b), *Appendix: Smart and the Hutchinsonians*, in Karina Williamson (ed.), *The Poetical Works of Christopher Smart:* Jubilate Agno, vol. I, Clarendon Press, Oxford: 131-132, doi: 10.1093/actrade/9780198118695.book.1.
Williamson M.L. (1990), *Raising their Voices: British Women Writers, 1650-1750*, Wayne State University Press, Detroit.
Wilmot John, Earl of Rochester (1800), *An Allusion to the Tenth Satire of the First Book of Horace*, in Samuel Johnson, *The Works of the Poets of Great Britain and Ireland*, vol. II, printed for Andrew Miller, London: 16.
Wilson J.H. (1976), *Court Satires of the Restoration*, Ohio State University Press, Columbus.
Wilson Mona (1939), *My Poor Friend Smart*, «English», 2, 11: 299-304.

Wilson Penelope (2012), *Women Writers and the Classics*, in David Hopkins and Charles Martindale (eds), *The Oxford History of Classical Reception in English Literature, 1660-1790*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Wing J.K. (1978), *Reasoning about Madness*, Oxford University Press, Oxford-New York.

Woodhouse A.S.P. (1965), *The Poetry of Collins Reconsidered*, in F.W. Hilles and Harold Bloom (eds), *From Sensibility to Romanticism*, Oxford University Press, Oxford-New York.

Woodman R.G., ed. (2005), *Sanity, Madness, Transformation: The Psyche in Romanticism*, University of Toronto Press, Toronto.

Wright Gillian (2013), *Producing Women's Poetry, 1600-1730: Text and Paratext, Manuscript and Print*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge-New York.

Wright Thomas (1892), *The Life of William Cowper*, T. Fisher Unwin, London.

Yardley Lucy [ed.] (1997), *Material Discourses of Health and Illness*, Routledge, London-New York.

Young D.P. (1966), *Something of Great Constancy: The Art of 'A Midsummer Night's Dream'*, Yale University Press, New Haven-London.

Youngquist Paul (1989), *Madness and Blake's Myth*, Pennsylvania State University Press, University Park.

Zacchi Romana (2006), *Libertà di espressione e potere in Inghilterra nell'età moderna* (Power and freedom of speech in modern England), in Massimiliano Morini and Romana Zacchi (a cura di), *Forme della censura* (Forms of censorship), Liguori, Napoli: 11-28.

Zajonc Arthur (1995), *Catching the Light: The Entwined History of Light and Mind*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Žižek Slavoj (2012), *Less than Nothing: Hegel and the Shadow of Dialectical Materialism*, Verso, London-New York.

INDEX OF NAMES

Adair J.M. 168-169, 211
Adams Hazard 189n., 225
Addison Joseph 98-99, 99n., 203, 211
Aikin John 28, 175, 211
Akenside Mark 103, 112, 118, 211
Alexander Peter 213
Algeo John 245
Allderidge P.H. 23, 27, 53n., 225
Allen Graham 12, 225
Allen Thomas 48, 50, 52-58, 64, 82, 197, 203
Almond P.C. 52n., 225
Anderson F.E. 141, 225
Andreoli Vittorino 214
Andrews Jonathan 22, 23, 27-28, 37, 41, 43, 55, 88, 147, 170, 225
Anstey Peter 248
Aquinas Thomas (Aquino Tommaso di) 135, 211
Archilochus 57
Arieno M.A. 21n., 24, 226
Aristides of Miletus 121
Aristotle 9, 76, 98, 154, 211
Armstrong John 94
Arnold Catharine 25, 38, 43, 226
Arnold Richard 191, 226
Arnold Thomas 17, 25, 26n., 193, 211
Arthur P.L. 115, 226
Ashfield Andrew 219
Atwood Margaret vii, 206, 212
Axelsson Karl 104, 226

Backscheider P.R. 71, 89, 203, 226
Bacon Francis 16, 77, 189, 209, 212
Baglivi Giorgio 206, 212
Baird J.D. 165, 177, 185n., 215, 226
Baker John 13, 93, 94, 127, 226
Baker Thomas 85, 86
Bakhtin Mikhail 163n., 226
Balderston K.C 249
Balfour Ian 112, 137, 226
Ball John 110, 212
Ballif Michelle 238
Baly M.E. 24, 226
Bandiera Laura 75n., 167n., 226
Barash Carol 226
Barash Moshe 179, 226
Barbalet Jack 171, 226
Barbauld A.L. 121n.
Barbour Reid 227
Barclay Alexander 50, 213
Barker-Benfield G. J. 123, 227
Barnard John 235
Barnard Philip 138, 238
Baronti Marchiò Roberto 234
Barresi John 239
Barry Jonathan 225, 227
Barry Kevin 124, 125, 227
Barthes Roland 12, 34, 227
Bartlett Peter 38, 227
Bass Alan 29, 30n., 31, 231
Bassiri Nima 168, 227
Battie William 4, 19-20, 25, 101, 121n., 142, 147, 161-162, 170-171, 174, 176-177, 188-189, 195, 199, 208, 212
Bauman Richard 140, 227
Baumgartner J.N. 8, 227
Bayne David 123
Bean Philip 7n, 227

I. Natali, *«Remov'd from human eyes»: Madness and Poetry 1676-1774*, ISBN (online) 978-88-6453-319-3
ISSN (online) 2420-8361,

Beard J.P. 20n., 227
Beatty H.R. 19, 38n., 87, 168-169, 227
Beaumont John 130n., 212
Belloni Luigi 219
Bennett James 126n., 228
Bentall R.P. 7, 227
Berkeley George 87, 93, 102, 155, 161n., 197n., 212
Bermel Albert 220
Bernaerts Lars 9, 227
Bertelsen Lance 139, 227
Bevington David 61, 218, 227
Bewley Thomas 54n., 227
Bezrucka Yvonne 44n., 227
Biele Joelle 139n, 142n., 227
Bigliazzi Silvia 30n., 227
Bingham Nathaniel 208, 212
Bini Benedetta 169n., 227
Binni Francesco 180n., 228
Blackmore Richard 3, 44, 51-52, 57, 83-84, 86, 88, 94, 96, 99, 163, 170, 187, 195, 212
Blair Hugh 104-105, 204n., 212
Blake William 189n.
Blanchot Maurice 33, 228
Blaydes S.B. 142, 228
Blondel J.A. 102, 212
Bloom Harold 112, 137, 157-158, 228, 240, 250
Bloxam J.R. 46-47, 228
Boccaccio Giovanni 121
Boerhaave Herman 19n., 52, 161-162, 168, 208, 213
Bogue David 126, 228
Bolla Peter de 219
Bond W.H. 140n., 141-142, 223, 228
Bonnet Charles 154, 213
Bonuzzi Luciano 214
Boswell James 109, 143, 228
Both Ioana 5, 242
Bouchard D.F. 32, 34, 233
Bowles W.L. 221
Boyer Abel 54n., 213
Boyle Robert 145, 156, 213
Boyne Roy 30, 228
Brackett Virginia 69, 228
Bradford Richard 203, 228
Bradley Richard 153, 213
Brady Nicholas 140
Branch Lori 140n., 143, 228
Brant Sebastian 50, 213
Brault Pascale-Anne 231
Brent J.T. 50, 213
Brett L.R. 225
Brewster Scott 29, 228
Briggs C.L. 140, 227
Brissenden Alan 222
Brooke Henry 169
Brown Marshall 111n., 228
Brown Thomas 42n., 213
Brown T.E. 37, 228
Brown W.P. 235
Browne Joseph 87, 213
Browne Richard 124n., 213
Browne Thomas 51, 54, 87, 152, 196, 213
Bruner J.S. 31n., 228
Brunström Conrad 166n., 180, 186, 228
Buckingham. *See Villiers George*
Buickerood James 99n., 228
Bullough Geoffrey 228
Burgess Joshua 9, 213
Burke Peter 38
Burns J.K. 8, 227
Burton Robert 3, 9, 17, 62, 72, 76, 87, 89, 94-95, 97-98, 174, 193-194, 213
Burwick Frederick 36, 228
Butler Martin 218
Butler Samuel 44, 61, 62n., 204, 214
Bynum W.F. 22, 225, 244, 228
Byrd Max 30, 42, 44n., 69, 169, 174, 206n., 229
Byron G.G. 42n., 214
Bysshe Edward 63, 214

Calvi Lisanna 56, 229
Campbell Robert 222
Campbell Thomas 111, 214
Camus Marianne 35, 229
Canfield J.D. 82, 229
Canziani Tatiana 229, 241
Carcasse James. *See Carkesse James*
Carkesse James 3, 11, 14, 17, 21, 23, 36, 38, 40, 41-65, 67-68, 73-74, 82, 84, 88, 90, 92-93, 96, 115, 143-144, 147, 150, 166, 191-192, 195-209, 214

Carlyle Alexander 108, 127
Carroll David 34, 229
Carver P.L. 133n., 229
Carwardine Probert W.G. 141
Carwardine Thomas 141
Cervantes Miguel de 121
Chambers Ephraim 78, 101, 214, 218
Chan Wendy 229, 249
Chantler Ashley 229-230
Chappell W.M. 55n., 220
Cheselden William 122, 214
Chevalier Noel 155, 229, 235, 250
Cheyne George 4, 25-26, 79, 85, 93-94, 120, 123-124, 156, 168, 170, 187, 214
Chiarugi Vincenzo 20, 214
Chunn D.E. 229, 249
Cibber C.G. 43
Cicero M.T. 9, 124
Ciocca Rossella 51n., 229
Clare John 37
Clark Hilary 36, 167, 174n., 229
Claudel Philippe vii
Cleary Scott 229
Clegg Jeanne 102n., 229
Clifford J.L. 229, 230
Cobbett William 25, 214
Cockfield Geoff 226
Cohen David 9, 234
Colborne Catherine 7n., 229
Colburn Glen 229, 234
Coleridge S.T. 134, 214, 225
Collins Martha 125n., 180, 229
Collins William 3, 11, 14, 37, 39, 40, 100, 101-136, 137, 158, 166, 169, 180, 195-209, 214, 216, 238, 241, 246, 249
Cook D.L. 139, 230
Cooper A.A. (Earl of Shaftesbury) 106, 116, 118, 131, 215
Cooper David 33, 230
Cooper J.M. 221
Cooter Roger 102n., 233
Copenhaver B.P. 152, 230
Coppock Vicki 26, 230
Corona Daniela 230
Coronato Rocco 5, 194n., 230
Costa Dennis 230
Cottingham John 29n., 195, 215
Cotton Nathaniel 173, 175, 199
Covel John 50
Cowper William 3, 11, 14, 36, 39, 40, 73, 141, 165-192, 195-209, 215
Cox J.M. 188, 215
Cox Philip 167n., 230
Cragg G.R. 146, 230
Craighead W.E. 10n., 230
Creach J.F.D. 196, 230
Creech Thomas 217
Crichton Alexander 175
Crisafulli L.M. 167n., 226, 230
Crouch Humphrey 55, 215
Cruden Alexander 25, 42, 45
Culpeper Nicholas 68, 215
Cunningham J.S. 215
Curran Stuart 103, 230
Curry Neil 230

Daniel Samuel 133
Daston Lorraine 230, 243
Davies Michael 172n., 229, 230
Davis Gayle 7n., 230
Davis Herbert 221
Dawson Virginia 154, 230
De Nooy Juliana 12, 230
De Young Mary 207, 230
Dearnley Moira 230
Defoe Daniel 25
Delacoste Jean 213
Del Sapio Garbero Maria 151, 152n., 230
Deleuze Gilles 9n., 230
DeMaria Robert 245
Democritus 11, 89-91
Democritus Junior (pseud.). *See Robert Burton*

Dennis John 106, 215
Dent R.W. 78, 231
Dente Carla 5, 62n., 231
DePorte M.V. 33-34, 45, 51n., 52, 69, 214, 231
Derham William 152, 215
Derrida Jacques 12, 29-33, 163, 231
Descartes Rene 16, 29-30, 194-195, 215

Detweiler Robert 207, 231
Devlin Christopher 143n., 231
Dewhurst Kenneth 223
Di Blasio Francesca 13n., 231
Di Michele Laura 229, 231
Dickens Charles 35, 123n.
Dickinson Emily 190
Digby Ann 37, 231
Dillon Jacqui 7n., 245
Dodsley Robert 107, 215
Donaldson Ian 218
Donne John 205n.
Doody Margaret 140n., 231
Dorsch T.S. 124, 217
Dove John 126, 215
Drake Nathan 107, 231
Drant Thomas 217
Dryden John 57, 59, 122, 125, 129, 204, 215
Dugaw Dianne 203, 231
Dumit Joseph 10, 231
Dwyer Ellen 37n., 231
Dyce Alexander 107, 108n., 110-111, 180, 198, 214, 231, 241

Eagle Christopher 232, 239
Easton Fraser 161n., 232
Effen Justus van 74n.
Elfenbein Andrew 168n., 232
Elliott R.C. 58, 232
Ellis D'Alessandro J.M. 85n., 216, 232
Engstrom E.J. 232
Epictetus 86
Eribon Didier 232
Erskine-Hill Howard 232, 238

Faas Ekbert 175n., 232
Fairer David 119, 126, 232
Falconer Blas 227, 232
Falconer Rachel 229
Faraday Michael 123n.
Farrar Thaddeus Janice 126-127, 132-133, 232
Fatio de Duiller Nicolas 156
Faubert Michelle 4, 15, 29, 36, 69, 171, 175, 205, 232, 236
Fawcett Benjamin 195, 216
Feder Lillian 36, 44, 72n., 137, 181, 191, 232
Felman Shoshana 8, 15, 28, 30n., 33, 179n., 232
Fennell Phil 11n., 232
Ferrari Roberta 51n., 232
Ficino Marsilio 78
Finch Anne 3, 11, 14, 39-40, 65, 67-101, 105, 110, 120, 125, 144, 148, 150, 166, 187, 195-209, 216, 240
Finch Casey 111, 232
Finch Charles 69
Finch Heneage 69
Fisher Philip 123, 232
Fisher-Homberger Esther 168, 232
Fissell Mary 102, 233
Fitz-Adam Adam (pseud.). *See Edward Moore*
Flather Amanda 73n., 233
Fletcher John 60-61, 153, 216
Florio Parrinello Francesco 233
Floyer John 54, 216
Fludernik Monika 202n., 233
Force Stead William 140n., 141-142, 223
Ford John 60, 216
Foster Juliet 235, 248
Foucault Michel 3-4, 8, 12, 20-23, 29-34, 41-43, 52, 68n., 74-75, 113, 163n., 188, 193, 199, 201-202, 207-208, 233
Fraser Tytler Alexander 108
Fraser A.C. 212
Free W.N. 186, 233
Freedman Robert 9, 233
Froud John 135, 216
Frye Northrop 137, 233
Fulford Tim 187n., 233
Furdell E.L. 65, 233
Fusini Costanza 242, 245

Gach John 237
Galen 16-17, 121n., 189, 194
Galilei Galileo 16
Garland Thompson Rosemarie 247
Garvin P.L. 241
Gass W.H. 214
Gassendi (Pierre Gassend) 19n.
Gear Gillian 23n., 238, 241
Geekie Jim 7, 31, 234

Genette Gerard 12
Gevirtz Karen 238, 242
Gibbons Brian 156, 234
Gilbert Sandra 190n., 234
Gildon Charles 70, 103, 216
Gillingham Susan 140n, 234
Gillis William 213
Gilman Sander 10, 44n., 234
Gilpin Richard 69, 216
Glasgow Rupert 57, 234
Gliserman Kopans Dana 27, 61n., 74, 80, 84, 234
Goddard Elizabeth 133n.
Goddard Michael 7n., 234
Goethe Johann Wolfgang von 159
Goffman Erwin 10n., 234
Goldberg Ann 20, 234
Goldsmith Oliver 169, 256
Gomory Tomi 9, 234
Goodey C.F. 73n., 234
Gora Thomas 132n., 238
Gordon W. 77n., 216
Gould Gibson Rebecca 71, 234
Gowland Angus 76, 234
Gozzi Francesco 145n., 234
Gray Thomas 117, 121n., 125, 146, 216
Greenblatt Stephen 213
Greene D.J. 139, 155n., 234
Greenfeld Liah 7n., 234
Greer Germaine 70
Grego Kim 229, 241
Gregori Flavio 44n., 234
Gregory George 219
Greville C.C.F. 167, 234
Grierson Herbert 111, 234
Griffin Dustin 111n., 123n., 127, 166n., 203, 235
Grigson Geoffrey 147, 235
Griswold C.L. 171, 235
Gross C.G. 153, 235
Gross G.S. 23, 235
Grundy Isobel 235
Guarini G.B. 81
Gubar Susan 190n., 234
Guest Harriet 139, 235
Guimón José 7n., 235

Hale Matthew 61, 216
Hale Richard 193
Halio J.L. 222
Hall John 104n., 219
Hall Thomas 144-145
Haller Albrecht von 217
Hamilton J.T. 36, 235
Hammond James 134
Hammond Paul 50, 235
Hancock Stephen 208, 235
Hankinson R.J. 17n., 235
Hanson Susan 33, 228
Hardy Thomas 123n.
Harms Ernst 27, 235
Harpin Anna 235, 248
Harrison B.H. 235, 237, 239
Hart Richard 227
Hartley David 19, 100-101, 122, 123, 217
Hartman G.H. 146n., 235
Harvey Gideon 45, 217
Harvey William 16
Hawes Clement 34, 58, 73, 125n., 137, 139, 140n., 141, 143, 145-146, 151, 164, 232, 235, 240
Hawkins P.S. 140n., 235
Hay C.H. 250
Hay M.G. 51, 88, 93, 123, 235
Hayes William 126n., 128
Hayley William 141, 165n., 173, 215
Hazen A.T. 218
Hazlitt William 167, 235
Heighes Simon 126, 236
Heinrichs R.W. 7n., 236
Hellegers Desiree 71, 95, 236
Heller Deborah 113, 166n., 236
Henighan Tom 104n., 236
Herbert George 205n.
Hertel Ralph 243
Hess Scott 167, 236
Heyd Michael 156-157, 194n., 236
Hicks R.D. 211
Highmore Nathaniel 87
Hilles F.W. 250
Himberg Kay 90, 236
Hinnant C.H. 68-71, 82, 89, 93n., 97, 204, 216, 236, 240
Hippocrates 11, 16, 18, 89-91, 189
Hobbes Thomas 19, 99, 144, 217

Hodgkin Katharine 4, 8, 35, 98, 172, 236
Home John 107, 108n., 129
Hooke Robert 16, 152, 209, 217
Holbrook Jackson 214
Holland Peter 222
Hopkins David 250
Hopps Gavin 236, 242, 247
Hopton John 26n., 230
Horace [Quintus Horatius Flaccus] 104, 124, 139, 160, 166n., 217
Howard Richard 12, 20n., 34, 227, 233
Hubert Jane 7n., 236
Hubert S.J. 7n., 236
Huet M.H. 102, 236
Hughes Merritt 220
Hume David 118, 123, 144, 161, 175, 217
Hunter R.A. 18, 51n., 173, 188n., 207, 212, 217,
Hutchings Bill 183, 236
Hutchinson D.S. 221
Hutchinson John 155

Iamartino Giovanni 229, 241
Iannaccaro Giuliana 5, 49, 236
Ingleby David 10n., 236
Ingram Allan 4, 13, 14-15, 29, 42, 44-45, 95n., 109, 201, 204-205, 217, 226, 236, 238
Innocenti Loretta 160n., 237, 247
Irlam Shaun 103, 237
Isler Hansruedi 19n., 237
Iswolsky Helene 226

Jackson Ken 30, 237
Jackson S.W. 18, 237
Jacob Giles 57, 217
Jagger Nicholas 47, 237
Janiak Andrew 220
Jardine Alice 132n., 238
Johnson A.L. 234
Johnson Samuel 10, 75n., 105, 106, 107, 109, 111-113, 143, 169n., 180, 204n., 217, 250
Johnson Thomas 221
Johnston Arthur 117, 121n., 216
Jones A.R. 225
Jones Colin 34, 225, 227, 237
Jones John 153, 218
Jones Vivien 231, 237
Jonson Ben 61, 218, 250
Jordan Sarah 185, 237
Josephs K.B. 35, 237
Jung Sandro 112n., 115, 117n., 128, 129n., 237

Kaplan Cora 72n., 237
Katritzky M.A. 50, 237
Kaysersberg J.G. von 50, 218
Keach William 214
Keats John 167n.
Keener F.M. 234, 237, 242
Keiser Jess 100, 237
Keith Jennifer 71n., 168n., 238
Keller R.C. 7n., 238
Kellner Hans 104n., 238
Kennedy Deborah 82, 238
Kepler Johannes 16
Keymer Tom 140n., 238
Khalfa Jean 20n., 233
Kim Jeong-Oh 71, 238
King James 215
King Steve 23, 238, 241
Kippis Andrew 111, 218
Kirk Stuart 9, 234
Klein Lawrence 106n., 145, 238
Klibansky Raymond 13n., 75, 78n., 91, 189, 197, 238
Koelb Clayton 248
Koertge Noretta 238
Kopp Laura 246
Korshin Paul 242
Kosh Starkman Miriam 223
Kourany J.A. 43, 238
Kristeva Julia 12, 132n., 238
Kromm Jane 68, 238
Kyd Thomas 60, 218

La Fontaine Jean de 89-91, 203, 218
La Hire Philippe de 157, 218
La Roche Michel de 74, 218
Lacoue-Labarthe Philippe 138, 238
Lafrance Marc 8, 238
Laing R.D. 10n., 238
Laizeau Gilles 220

Lamb Charles 37
Langhorne John 106, 108, 111, 214, 238
Laub Dori 232
Laurens Andre du 18
Lavington George 9, 218
Lawlor Clark 13n., 16, 68, 91, 93, 238
Le Roy J.B. 27
Le Sage. *See Lesage*
Leake John 83n., 218
Lederer David 7n., 239
Lee Francis 156
Lee Nathaniel 37, 42, 45, 60, 62, 218
Leedham-Green Elisabeth 240
Leibniz G.W. von 155
Lemnius Levinus 72, 218
Lemon Rebecca 249
Lesage Alain-René 121
Leslie Charles 42, 102, 218
Lester Cheryl 138, 238
Levine George 244
Levine J.A. 63, 239
Lewis Jayne 89, 239
Liebert H.W. 218
Lilienfeld S.O. 10, 239
Linnaeus Carl 163, 218
Locher Jacob 50, 213
Locke John 19, 41n., 99-101, 115-116, 118-119, 121-122, 159-161, 176, 195, 201, 218
Loeb L.E. 161n., 239
LoLordo Antonia 159n., 239
Longinus Dionysus 92, 104, 124, 219
Lorsch S.E. 234, 237, 242
Lowth Robert 140, 219
Lucking David 192n., 239
Lund M.A. 87, 239
Lynch Bernard 94, 219

Macalpine Ida 18, 51n., 173, 188n., 207, 212, 217
MacDonald Michael 16, 20-23, 37, 239
Mackenzie Henry 108n., 169
Mackenzie M.M. 193, 239
Mackinnon Dolly 7n., 229
Malebranche Nicolas 43, 219
Malpighi Marcello 16, 19n., 154, 219
Mandel B.J. 172, 239
Mandeville Bernard 84-85, 95, 117, 170, 219
Manning Francis 82n., 219
Maplet John 153, 219
Marchand L.A. 214
Marchetti Leo 145n., 239
Marino Lori 10, 239
Marks Herbert 139, 239
Marlowe Christopher 192
Marrapodi Michele 239
Marsh Christopher 140n., 239
Marshall Ashley 57, 239
Marshall Madeleine 182, 189, 239
Marshall W.G. 101, 166, 239
Marston John 60, 219
Martin Martin 130, 219
Martin P.W. 35, 239
Martin Raymond 239
Martindale Charles 250
Martyn John 213, 218
Marucci Franco 237, 247
Massinger Philip 60, 219
Matthew H.C.G. 235
Maubray John 99, 219
Maudsley Henry 9, 219
May Todd 33, 240
Mayne Zachary 99n.
McCabe R.A. 232, 238
McGlynn Paul 151, 240
McGovern Barbara 69-70, 72n., 76, 93n., 216, 240
McGovern Constance 176n., 240
McKenzie D.F. 235
McKeon Michael 115, 240
McKitterick David 163, 240
McNay Lois 75, 240
McNeel David 87, 240
Mead Richard 17, 20, 123, 193, 220
Meek Heather 95, 240
Mein Charles 99n.
Melehy Hassan 30n., 240
Mellor Anne 105, 240
Menely Tobias 166n., 240
Menzies Robert 229, 249
Mermin Dorothy 71, 240
Messenger Ann 70, 240
Meyer Spacks Patricia 126n., 139n., 140n., 165, 177, 240

Micale M.S. 22n., 38, 240
Middleton Thomas 61, 220
Midnight Mary (pseud. Christopher Smart) 146, 156, 222
Midriff John (pseud., identity unknown) 94n., 220
Mihles Samuel 112, 144, 220
Miller C.R. 15, 240
Miller Eric 146, 240
Milton John 76, 77n., 110-112, 166, 183, 220
Minh-ha T.T. 192, 241
Mitford John 108, 216, 241
Molière 60, 220
Molyneux William 121
Monro John 19-20, 121n., 170-171, 174, 176, 177n., 179, 189, 199-220
Moore Edward 163, 220
Mora George 214
Moran J.E. 37, 241
Moran M.G. 238
More Henry 99, 106, 220
Morini Massimiliano 241, 251
Moritz Karl 175
Morris Corbyn 113
Moss H.G. 137, 241
Mossom Robert 42, 220
Mounsey Chris 139n., 142n., 167, 237, 241
Moyle Gary 173, 241
Mukařovský Jan 202, 241
Mullini Roberta 5, 35n., 38n., 62n., 78n., 241
Mulvey-Roberts Marie 147, 241
Murphy F.E.D. 241
Murphy Jonathan 8, 20n., 21, 29, 31-32, 41-42, 52, 68n., 75, 188, 199, 233
Murry J.M. 111, 241
Musgrove S. 111, 241
Musser J.F. Jr 166, 241

Naas Michael 231
Nancy Jean-Luc 138, 238
Narain Mona 238, 242
Neely C.T. 35, 242
Nelson H.F. 176, 242
Nettle Daniel 9, 242
Newbery John 155
Newey Vincent 191, 242
Newton Isaac 117, 140, 155-159, 161, 209, 220
Newton John 39, 165, 177
Newton Richard 206
Nietzsche F.W. 12, 31
Nigri Lucia 61n., 242
Noakes Susan 248
Nocera Carmela 237, 242
Nokes James 63, 73
North M.L. 46, 242
Norton D.F. 217
Norton M.J. 217
Nussbaum F.A. 172n., 242

O'Farrell Clare 33, 242
Oates Titus 64
Ober W.U. 115, 248
Ober W.B. 15, 107, 110-111, 142-143, 242
Ogden Thomas 8, 242
Ogilvie R.M. 135, 242
Ollman Nadine 76, 242
Otway Thomas 133, 134
Oyebode Femi 11n., 242

Paci F.R. 106n., 149n., 155, 223, 242
Pagnini Marcello 112n., 243
Paley M.D. 117n., 141, 243
Paley William 177, 221
Pallotti Donatella 5, 43, 172, 182n., 243
Panofsky Erwin 13, 75, 78n., 91, 189, 197, 238
Paré Ambrose 84, 221
Parey Ambrose. *See Paré Ambrose*
Pargeter William 170n., 176, 221
Parisot Eric 72n., 103n., 243
Park Katharine 230, 243
Parkinson John 79, 221
Parry-Jones W.L. 23n., 24, 243
Patton Paul 230
Paulson Ronald 113-114, 243
Pearson Jaqueline 75, 243
Pedlar Valerie 35, 243
Pepys Samuel 48, 221
Perfect William 25, 26n., 221

Perrucci Robert 9, 243
Persico Gemma 169n., 237, 242-243
Peterson J.M. 21, 243
Petrarch [Petrarca Francesco] 49
Petrina Alessandra 5, 49, 236
Pfister Manfred 5, 206, 236, 243
Phippen James 86, 221
Pickren W.E. 170, 243
Pickstone J.V. 26, 243
Pietropoli Cecilia 167n., 226, 230
Pinel Philippe 20
Pinnick C.L. 238
Pirie Gordon 89, 218
Pitcairn Archibald 17-18, 87, 221
Plato 4, 10, 13, 76, 105, 117, 193, 221
Platter Felix 18
Pliny the Elder 163n.
Plot Robert 153, 221
Pocock J.G.A. 105, 243
Polaszek Andrew 218
Pope Alexander 44, 74, 92, 113, 120, 125, 173, 204, 221
Pordage Samuel 224
Portale Rosario 237, 242
Porter Roy 10, 14, 16, 20-23, 27, 34, 37, 43-45, 55n., 61, 74, 110-111, 147, 214, 225, 233, 237, 240, 243-244
Potter George 142-143, 147
Potter Paul 89n., 244
Powell Rosalind 140n., 155n., 244
Pratt S.J. 108, 111, 221, 244
Price Martin 250
Profeti M.G. 244
Ptolemy Soter 128
Pugliatti Paola 5, 38, 44n., 54n., 237, 243-245, 247
Punter David 228
Purcell John 84, 94, 221
Pye James 125

Quinney Laura 194, 245

Radcliffe D.H. 111, 245
Radden Jennifer 8, 30, 38n., 98, 245
Ragsdale John 107, 245
Ralph Laura 176, 242
Ravenscroft Edward 60, 222
Ray John 153, 222
Read John 7, 31, 234
Redfield Jamison Kay 40n., 245
Reed E.S. 194n., 245
Reed Isaac 107
Regan Shaun 244, 245
Reid Thomas 175
Reiss Benjamin 7n., 245
Renevey Denis 229
Reynolds Joshua 175, 222
Reynolds L.A. 78, 245
Reynolds Myra 216
Richardson Alan 4, 36, 245
Richardson John 161, 222
Richardson Samuel 87, 169
Rieger B.M. 37, 245
Riem Antonella 35n., 245
Riffaterre M.C. 202, 245
Rizzardi Biancamaria 242, 245
Robertson Randy 42, 245
Robinson J.E. 61n., 245
Robinson Nicholas 52, 94, 101, 123, 222
Rocca Julius 168n., 245
Rochester. *See Wilmot John*
Rogers G.A.J. 217
Rogers K.M. 94-95, 216, 245
Romaine Suzanne 163n., 245
Ross I.C. 223
Ross Trevor 105, 246
Rossi Giacomo 81n.
Rossi Sergio 246
Rota Felicina 246
Roudiez Leon 132n., 238
Roudinesco Élisabeth 246
Rousseau George 14, 74, 246
Rowley William 61, 220
Rozemond Marleen 194, 246
Rufini Sergio 205n., 246
Ruggieri Franca 5, 169n., 227, 246, 248
Rumbold Valerie 72, 246
Rush Benjamin 207, 222
Ruston Sharon 28n., 246
Rutherford Alexandra 170n., 243
Ryskamp Charles 73, 108, 113n., 121n., 122, 127-128, 130n., 132n.-134n., 165, 167n., 177, 185n., 191, 215, 226, 246

Sade Marquis de 37
Saggini Francesca 96, 246
Salkeld Duncan 36, 246
Salmon William 68, 84, 222
Sambrook James 224
Saraçgil Ayşe 5, 242
Sawyer Paul 78, 245
Saxl Fritz 13, 75, 78n., 91, 189, 197, 238
Schlutz A.M. 195, 246
Schmidt Jeremy 68, 76, 246
Schwartz J.A. 154, 246
Scofield C.I. 59n., 222
Scott Andrew 61, 246
Scull A.T. 8n., 9, 14, 20-22, 25-26, 37-38, 63, 179, 246
Search Edward (pseud.). *See Tucker Abraham*
Segre Cesare 14n.-15n., 163n., 247
Semonin Paul 27, 247
Sena J.F. 94-95, 247
Seneca L.A. 11, 86, 222
Serpieri Alessandro 243-245
Seward William 128, 247
Sewell George 125
Shafer Robert 92, 247
Shaftesbury. *See Cooper A.A.*
Shakespeare William 48, 50, 59n., 60, 77-78, 120, 153, 192n., 203, 205n., 222
Shaw Philip 229-230
Shaw Peter 212
Shears Jonathon 111, 247
Sheldon Gilbert 47
Shepherd Michael 22, 225, 232, 244
Sheppard Fleetwood 59
Sherbo Arthur 139n., 143, 147, 247
Sheridan Frances 169
Sheridan-Smith A.M. 113, 233
Short Thomas 77-78, 222
Shorter Edward 22, 26n., 247
Shortt S.E.D. 21, 247
Showalter Elaine 21n., 72, 247
Side Karina 139, 247
Sigworth O.F. 110, 247
Sim Stuart 13n.
Skultans Vieda 21n.-22n., 247
Small Helen 35, 98n., 207-208, 248
Smart Christopher 3, 11, 14, 34, 37, 39, 40, 73-74, 136-164, 166, 171, 182-183, 195-209, 222, 228, 242
Smith Adam 170-171, 174-175, 223
Smith J.C. 111, 234
Smith William 17, 176, 223
Smith William 219
Smollett Tobias 169
Snaith Anna 225
Snape Andrew 179, 223
Snyder S.H. 9, 248
Southey Robert 37, 73n.
Spencer M.G. 219
Spenser Edmund 110-111
Spurzheim J.G. 189
Stabler Jane 236, 242, 247
Stafford Richard 41
Starr G.G. 111, 248
Staub M.E. 7n., 248
Stead W.F. 140n., 141-142, 223
Steevens George 153, 222
Stella Maria 166, 248
Stephen Leslie 47, 248
Stern Richard 140n., 162, 248
Sterne Laurence 33, 75n., 145, 145n., 223
Stevenson Christine 43, 248
Stewart M.M. 109, 248
Stewart Stanley 227
Still Arthur 244, 247, 248
Stockdale Percival 224
Storey, T.A. 9, 223
Stukeley William 70, 95, 223
Suleiman S.R. 29, 248
Sutton John 194, 248
Suzuki Akihito 30, 162, 176, 248
Swammerdam Jan 154, 223
Swan John 223
Swift Jonathan 33-34, 44-45, 58, 75n., 113, 140, 163, 204, 223
Sydenham Thomas 17-18, 19, 62, 77-78, 85, 94, 168, 206, 223
Szasz Thomas 8n.-9n., 248

Talbot Ann 115, 248
Tarantino Angela 5, 242
Targoff Ramie 213
Tate Nahum 60, 140
Tchernichova Viktoria 242, 245

Techo Nicholas del 51, 223
Tempera Mariangela 59n., 248
Terry Richard 13n.
Thain Marion 248-249
Theocritus 135
Thiher Allen 12, 17, 30, 202, 248
Thomas W.K. 115n., 248
Thomas W.M. 109, 214
Thomson Alexander 169, 224
Thomson James 140, 224
Thrale Piozzi H.L. 143-145, 249
Tissot August 217
Todd Dennis 102, 249
Todd Janet 182, 189, 239
Toft Mary 102
Torrey E.F. 25, 249
Townshend Thomas Jr. 25
Trautmann Joanne 241, 249
Treacher Andrew 236
Trotter Thomas 168, 224
Trusler John 82, 224
Trye Mary 86n., 224
Tryon Thomas 193-194, 224
Tucker Abraham 159
Tuke William 20, 170
Turner Mark 31, 249
Turner R.P. 11, 249
Turner W.J. 7, 249

Unsworth Clive 26n., 249
Ussher J.M. 35, 249
Urban Sylvanus 250

Van Effen Justus 74n.
Van Helmont J.B. 17
Velody Irving 244, 247-248
Vickers Brian 212
Villiers George (Duke of Buckingham) 59, 177
Vittone Gaetano 117, 249
Volpone Annalisa 5, 242, 249

Walker J.M. 139n., 249
Walker Keith 215
Wall Cynthia 140n., 249
Wallace Edwin 237
Walsh Marcus 119, 158, 249
Wanley Nathaniel 102, 224
Ward Ned 42
Warton Joseph 103, 107-109, 112, 224
Warton Thomas 103, 107, 109-110, 112
Watson J. R. 204, 249
Watts Isaac 99, 140, 224
Wear Andrew 17, 22, 170n., 173, 244, 249
Webber Teresa 240
Webster John 44, 65, 224
Weinbrot H.D. 139, 203n., 250
Weineck Silke-Maria 13, 250
Wendorf Richard 108, 113n., 121n., 122, 127-128, 130n., 132n.-134n., 215, 246
Wesley John 146
Wetherall-Dickson Leigh 13n.
Whalley Peter 120, 250
Wheatley H.B. 221
Whitaker Harry 245, 250
White D.E. 129, 250
White Gilbert 110, 250
Whitwell Wilson Philip 234
Whytt Robert 4, 18-19, 123, 168-169, 224
Wilcox Helen 243, 250
Wild Min 146, 229, 235, 250
Williams Harold 223
Williamson Karina 138-139, 141-142, 149, 155-156, 223, 250
Williamson M.L. 72n., 250
Willis Francis 207
Willis Thomas 3, 17-19, 51-53, 68, 74, 84, 87-88, 100n., 168, 173, 189, 193-194, 224
Wilmot John (Earl of Rochester) 59, 60, 204, 250
Wilson J.H. 59, 250
Wilson Mona 141, 250
Wilson Penelope 203, 250
Wing Betsy 232
Wing J.K. 14, 250
Woodhouse A.S.P. 111n.-112n., 250
Woodman R.G. 36, 251
Woolf Virginia 39, 225
Wooll John 224
Wordsworth William 28, 114n.-115n., 123n., 225
Wortley Montagu Mary 85, 225

Wright David 38, 227
Wright Gillian 71n., 88
Wright Peter 236
Wright Thomas 185n., 251

Yardley Lucy 170n., 251
Young D.P. 78n., 251
Young Edward 75n., 103, 112, 225
Youngquist Paul 110-111, 189n., 251

Zacchi Romana 5, 42, 241, 251
Zajonc Arthur 159, 251
Zangwill O.L. 232
Žižek Slavoj 30n., 251

DIPARTIMENTO DI LINGUE, LETTERATURE E STUDI INTERCULTURALI
COORDINAMENTO EDITORIALE DI
BIBLIOTECA DI STUDI DI FILOLOGIA MODERNA: COLLANA, RIVISTE E LABORATORIO

Opere pubblicate

I titoli qui elencati sono stati proposti alla Firenze University Press dal Coordinamento editoriale del Dipartimento di Lingue, Letterature e Studi Interculturali e prodotti dal suo Laboratorio editoriale Open Access

Volumi ad accesso aperto
(<http://www.fupress.com/comitatoscientifico/biblioteca-di-studi-di-filologia-moderna/23>)

Stefania Pavan, *Lezioni di poesia. Iosif Brodskij e la cultura classica: il mito, la letteratura, la filosofia*, 2006 (Biblioteca di Studi di Filologia Moderna; 1)

Rita Svandrlik (a cura di), *Elfriede Jelinek. Una prosa altra, un altro teatro*, 2008 (Biblioteca di Studi di Filologia Moderna; 2)

Ornella De Zordo (a cura di), *Saggi di anglistica e americanistica. Temi e prospettive di ricerca*, 2008 (Strumenti per la didattica e la ricerca; 66)

Fiorenzo Fantaccini, *W. B. Yeats e la cultura italiana*, 2009 (Biblioteca di Studi di Filologia Moderna; 3)

Arianna Antonielli, *William Blake e William Butler Yeats. Sistemi simbolici e costruzioni poetiche*, 2009 (Biblioteca di Studi di Filologia Moderna; 4)

Marco Di Manno, *Tra sensi e spirito. La concezione della musica e la rappresentazione del musicista nella letteratura tedesca alle soglie del Romanticismo*, 2009 (Biblioteca di Studi di Filologia Moderna; 5)

Maria Chiara Mocali, *Testo. Dialogo. Traduzione. Per una analisi del tedesco tra codici e varietà*, 2009 (Biblioteca di Studi di Filologia Moderna; 6)

Ornella De Zordo (a cura di), *Saggi di anglistica e americanistica. Ricerche in corso*, 2009 (Strumenti per la didattica e la ricerca; 95)

Stefania Pavan (a cura di), *Gli anni Sessanta a Leningrado. Luci e ombre di una* Belle Époque, 2009 (Biblioteca di Studi di Filologia Moderna; 7)

Roberta Carnevale, *Il corpo nell'opera di Georg Büchner. Büchner e i filosofi materialisti dell'Illuminismo francese*, 2009 (Biblioteca di Studi di Filologia Moderna; 8)

Mario Materassi, *Go Southwest, Old Man. Note di un viaggio letterario, e non*, 2009 (Biblioteca di Studi di Filologia Moderna; 9)

Ornella De Zordo, Fiorenzo Fantaccini, *altri canoni / canoni altri. pluralismo e studi letterari*, 2011 (Biblioteca di Studi di Filologia Moderna; 10)

Claudia Vitale, *Das literarische Gesicht im Werk Heinrich von Kleists und Franz Kafkas*, 2011 (Biblioteca di Studi di Filologia Moderna; 11)

Mattia Di Taranto, *L'arte del libro in Germania fra Otto e Novecento: Editoria bibliofilica, arti figurative e avanguardia letteraria negli anni della* Jahrhundertwende, 2011 (Biblioteca di Studi di Filologia Moderna; 12)

Vania Fattorini (a cura di), *Caroline Schlegel-Schelling: «Ero seduta qui a scrivere»*. Lettere, 2012 (Biblioteca di Studi di Filologia Moderna; 13)

Anne Tamm, *Scalar Verb Classes. Scalarity, Thematic Roles, and Arguments in the Estonian Aspectual Lexicon*, 2012 (Biblioteca di Studi di Filologia Moderna; 14)

Beatrice Töttössy (a cura di), *Fonti di Weltliteratur. Ungheria*, 2012 (Strumenti per la didattica e la ricerca; 143)

Beatrice Töttössy, *Ungheria 1945-2002. La dimensione letteraria*, 2012 (Biblioteca di Studi di Filologia Moderna; 15)

Diana Battisti, *Estetica della dissonanza e filosofia del doppio: Carlo Dossi e Jean Paul*, 2012 (Biblioteca di Studi di Filologia Moderna; 16)

Fiorenzo Fantaccini, Ornella De Zordo (a cura di), *Saggi di anglistica e americanistica. Percorsi di ricerca*, 2012 (Strumenti per la didattica e la ricerca; 144)

Martha L. Canfield (a cura di), *Perù frontiera del mondo. Eielson e Vargas Llosa: dalle radici all'impegno cosmopolita = Perù frontera del mundo. Eielson y Vargas Llosa: de las raíces al compromiso cosmopolita*, 2013 (Biblioteca di Studi di Filologia Moderna; 17)

Gaetano Prampolini, Annamaria Pinazzi (eds), *The Shade of the Saguaro / La sombra del saguaro: essays on the Literary Cultures of the American Southwest / Ensayos sobre las culturas literarias del suroeste norteamericano*, 2013 (Biblioteca di Studi di Filologia Moderna; 18)

Ioana Both, Ayşe Saraçgil, Angela Tarantino (a cura di), *Storia, identità e canoni letterari*, 2013 (Strumenti per la didattica e la ricerca; 152)

Valentina Vannucci, *Letture anticanoniche della biofiction, dentro e fuori la metafinzione*, 2014 (Biblioteca di Studi di Filologia Moderna; 19)

Serena Alcione, *Wackenroder e Reichardt. Musica e letteratura nel primo Romanticismo tedesco*, 2014 (Biblioteca di Studi di Filologia Moderna; 20)

Lorenzo Orlandini, The relentless body. *L'impossibile elisione del corpo in Samuel Beckett e la* noluntas *schopenhaueriana*, 2014 (Biblioteca di Studi di Filologia Moderna; 21)

Carolina Gepponi, *Un carteggio di Margherita Guidacci*, 2014 (Biblioteca di Studi di Filologia Moderna; 22)

Valentina Milli, *«Truth is an odd number». La narrativa di Flann O'Brien e il fantastico*, 2014 (Biblioteca di Studi di Filologia Moderna; 23)

Diego Salvadori, *Il giardino riflesso. L'erbario di Luigi Meneghello*, 2015 (Biblioteca di Studi di Filologia Moderna; 24)

Sabrina Ballestracci, Serena Grazzini (a cura di), *Punti di vista - Punti di contatto. Studi di letteratura e linguistica tedesca*, 2015 (Biblioteca di Studi di Filologia Moderna; 25)

Massimo Ciaravolo, Sara Culeddu, Andrea Meregalli, Camilla Storskog (a cura di), *Forme di narrazione autobiografica nelle letterature scandinave.* Forms of Autobiographical Narration in Scandinavian Literature, 2015 (Biblioteca di Studi di Filologia Moderna; 26)

Ioana Both, Ayşe Saraçgil, Angela Tarantino (a cura di), *Innesti e ibridazione tra spazi culturali*, 2015 (Strumenti per la didattica e la ricerca; 170)

Lena Dal Pozzo (ed.), *New information subjects in L2 acquisition: evidence from Italian and Finnish,* 2015 (Biblioteca di Studi di Filologia Moderna; 27)

Sara Lombardi (a cura di), *Lettere di Margherita Guidacci a Mladen Machiedo*, 2015 (Biblioteca di Studi di Filologia Moderna; 28)

Giuliano Lozzi, *Margarete Susman e i saggi sul femminile*, 2015 (Biblioteca di Studi di Filologia Moderna; 29)

Riviste ad accesso aperto
(<http://www.fupress.com/riviste>)

«Journal of Early Modern Studies», ISSN: 2279-7149

«LEA – Lingue e Letterature d'Oriente e d'Occidente», ISSN: 1824-484X

«Quaderni di Linguistica e Studi Orientali / Working Papers in Linguistics and Oriental Studies», ISSN: 2421-7220

«Studi Irlandesi. A Journal of Irish Studies», ISSN: 2239-3978