An eighteenth-century origin of "world literature"

Famously, the concept "world literature" (or, more properly, "Weltliteratur") began its career when, in 1827, Wolfgang von Goethe announced "the epoch of world literature."[i] What sparked Goethe's somewhat grandiloquent comment? And what did he mean by it?

He had been reading a recent translation of a Chinese novel—*Yujiao li* or *Iu-kiao-li ou Les Deux cousins* as it was called in the French version that he knew— and when his secretary Johann Eckermann remarked that that must have been a strange experience for him, Goethe demurred, insisting that the novel's characters "denken, handeln und empfinden fast ebenso wie wir, und man fühlt sich sehr bald als ihresgleichen…"[ii] For Goethe here, the epoch of world literature named the moment when literature about people whose minds and manners were like our own could potentially come from anywhere.[iii]

For all that, the translation from the Chinese that prompted Goethe's reflections had its own history. *Yujiao li* had first appeared in Europe about sixty years earlier, not in French but in English, in an edition assembled by Thomas Percy, a then obscure Anglican clergyman. It is this book's context that I wish to explore in this essay, and I will do so to argue that Percy's work needs to be understood in the light of social and intellectual forces that at first sight seem remote from it. In particular, it was enabled by shifts in and discussions about, religion's relation to literature and philosophy whose ultimate stake was the established church's social function.[iv] This is to say that "world literature" at one of its key moments of origin was a specifically Anglican concern.

***

By the time he died in 1811 Thomas Percy was Bishop of Dromore and a famous European man of letters. That was a result of his many efforts as editor and compiler of orature and literature from around the globe. The Chinese novel that Goethe read, and which appeared anonymously in English in 1761 under the title *Hau Kiou Choaan, or the Pleasing History* was

Percy's first book in this mode. Percy himself knew no Chinese: *Hau Kiou Choaan*'s first three volumes were heavily edited versions of an earlier translation by an East Indian company employee which Percy had come across by chance in manuscript form, and he had himself translated the last volume from a Portugese ms.[v] The book was not an immediate commercial success, but the next year Percy went on to publish two further volumes of China-related materials as *Miscellaneous pieces relating to the Chinese*. That year he also published a volume consisting of stories about widows from various cultures, including China. These publications were followed by translations of old poetry from the Icelandic, including a version of the *Edda*, as well as by his own translation of the *Song of Solomon* from the Hebrew. He projected further volumes that collected Islamic, native American, North African, Welsh, Spanish, Peruvian, Latin, Saxon and South Asian prose and verse.[vi] But his reputation was secured in 1765 by the enormously successful *Reliques of Ancient Poetry*, a collection of old and new English ballads which scholars have often supposed to help prepare the ground for that shift of literary sensibility that was more fully realized thirty or so years later in Wordsworth and Coleridge's *Lyrical Ballads*.[vii] In short: Percy's oeuvre not only assembled a basic world literature archive and in the same breath gave an impetus to what would become known as European romanticism.

Two features of Percy's editorial practices are especially notable. The first is that he was not mainly concerned with distinguishing between what was old and what was new among the works he put into circulation. His central interests were not primarily philological even if he himself commanded considerable philological skills. *Hau Kiou Choaan*, for instance, was not an ancient canonical Chinese fiction but a seventeenth-century *caizi jiaren* (talent and beauty) novel, a popular and condescended-to genre which had probably originally been translated into English as language-learning exercise. It was a marriage-plot novel with some surprising similarities to (as well as marked differences from) Samuel Richardson's best-seller, *Pamela*. Similarly, some of the ballads collected in *Reliques of Ancient Poetry* were modern, and Percy,

who was himself a poet, had revised most of the old ones to meet contemporary polite expectations.[viii] In short, Percy's compilations paid less attention to his texts' provenance and authenticity than to their literary qualities as such. It was this too that enabled Percy's oeuvre to extend across the division that structures world literature today, i.e. the division between world literature as an ancient heritage (which would cover the *Edda* or the *Song of Solomon* and is today embraced by David Damrosch) and world literature as a global system (which would cover *Hau Kiou Choaan* and is today theorized by Pascale Casanova).

Percy's compilations do not express cultural nationalism either. This differentiates them from certain other eighteenth-century contributions to emergent world literature.[ix] Thus James Macpherson's supposed translations from the Ossian's Gaelic, which appeared more or less simultaneously with Percy's early publications, were, if only obliquely, connected to desires and nostalgias for a Scottish identity. Certainly their spirit was to be appropriated by romantic nationalisms.[x] But Percy seems to have been more or less indifferent to any wider cultural or social meanings that might be adduced to his translations and compilations, although, as time went by, some of his readers were not.

How are we to account for this *literary*—rather than philological or nationalist— emergence of world literature? One reason is commercial. *Hau Kiou Choaan* was an attempt to cash in on the fashion for *Chinoiserie* which was itself a function of an increase in trade between China and Britain, and, more particularly, an increase in British tea consumption. Indeed Percy was actively involved in London's money-orientated publishing industry, as is indicated by his contributing a biography of his friend, the Grub Street doyen, Oliver Goldsmith to a posthumous edition of Goldsmith's poetry, even after he became a bishop.[xi]

Another motive for Percy's literary work, which lies slightly askew his commercial sense, was that his publications allowed him to accrue prestige and attract patronage in the arduous business of building a career in the church. His English version of Paul Henri Mallet's

Monuments de la mythologie et de la posies des Celtes, which he published under the title *Northern Antiquities*, was, for instance, dedicated to the Duke of Northumberland, and in his dedicatory letter Percy remarks that the volume might especially interest this member of the old aristocratic Percy family who "derived their origins from one of the Northern Chiefs."[xii] This is one of those moments when Percy was not indifferent to his work's contemporary social uses.

But commerce and patronage do not adequately account for the most important context within which Percy conducted his literary career—namely, the structure of Anglican intellectual life.

Percy was what we might call a literary parson, that is to say a man who held Anglican office but who spent most of his time producing secular literature for the marketplace. As such, he was member both of a particular group and of a particular historical conjuncture: after all, most Anglican parsons did not write secular literature and never had, even if, as I'd conjecture, literary parsons were more prominent in the period between about 1730 and 1800 than before or after. And one important reason why literary parsons flourished in the period was that they were supported and legitimated by a set of specific and limited principles that veered from received Anglican tradition. They were not, for instance, simply another moment in a long Anglican Latitudinarian or "moderate" lineage, as David Sorkin has recently argued of their leader William Warburton.[xiii] They are best understood as a new and distinct—if transitory—intellectual formation.

The enabling conditions for Percy's work were articulated by an innovative circle whom David Hume first named "Warburtonians."[xiv] Although I shall continue to use that name here, it is useful to extend the concept of the "literary parson" beyond the tight group to which it best applies. The core Warburtonians included Warburton himself, Richard Hurd, and John Brown, who shared an innovative intellectual programme and who, as a result, acquired significant cultural and ecclesiastical authority in the 1750s and 1760s. However, this group of

friends were associated with, if they sometimes disputed with, a wider circle of parsons the looser intellectual, literary and scholarly interests, of whom the most notable were William Mason and the Warton brothers, Joseph and Thomas. Percy belonged to the next generation but, like his colleague Richard Farmer, knew himself to be working in Warburton and Hurd's wake, and he solicited their and their associates' support. (He was close to Thomas Warton, in particular, with whom he swapped manuscripts.) Thus for instance, Percy's edition of *Hau Kiou Choaan* drew on Hurd's remarks on the Chinese drama which had been attached to Hurd's edition of Horace's *Epistola ad Augustum* (1751), and which Percy reprinted in his *Miscellaneous Pieces pertaining to the Chinese.*[xv] *Miscellaneous Pieces'* preface also engages somewhat fawningly with Warburton, whose account of the progress from picture writing to the alphabet in *Divine Legation of Moses* Percy there accepts.

These networks are less relevant to us than the Warburtonian's intellectual and religious positions, which, however, were defined as much by their choice of antagonists as by their positive programmes.

The Warburtonians were, first, opposed to the deism that had appeared in England after 1688, and in particular to the writings of John Toland, Anthony Collins and Matthew Tindall, as well as to their heirs, of whom David Hume was then the most notable.[xvi] But there is a catch here, since, although the Warburtonians were adamantly critical of deism as a nursery of irreligion, they also absorbed certain of its methods and arguments, and at least one member of their wider network, Conyers Middleton, the author of a celebrated biography of *Cicero* (1741), was all but a deist himself.

Thus, for instance, William Warburton's *Divine Legation* (1737-1741), the group's most often acknowledged intellectual accomplishment, accepted key deist arguments. As Dimitri Levitin has recently made it possible for us to see, however, these arguments drew on older humanist debates over the relationship between pagan and Christian traditions, and were

not essentially deist at all.[xvii] *The Divine Legation* based its thesis on two humanist/deist propositions, namely, 1) that religion was an essential instrument of government, so that priests and kings often concealed their own scepticism from the people. In other words, religion was originally esoteric and accomodationist; and 2) that before Christ, the Jews had no conception of rewards and punishments in the afterlife.[xviii] But Warburton ingeniously turned these arguments, which, as we are about to see, became key to the group's program as a whole, into a defence of Anglicanism. Warburton's was, as he put it, an "internal," or immanent critique of deism.[xix]

More profoundly, the group accepted that Christianity could not just be grounded on, and defended by, reason, which Warburton was capable as dismissing as a "mere abstract notion."[xx] For them, Christianity did not just differ from other religions in that it was based on God's true revelations to man, more to the point, they took reason's limited use for apologetics seriously in practice. This meant that they abandoned those rationalist, philosophical arguments for Christianity that had long been used by scholasticism and were currently being made by pathbreaking Anglican theologians such as Joseph Butler or by natural theologians of the type then associated with the Boyle lectures. In particular they rejected the idea that Chrisitanity was a "republication of the religion of nature" as Matthew Tindall had put it in the title his *Christianity is as old as Creation: or, the gospel as a Republication of the Religion of Nature* (1730).[xxi] For the Warburtonians, Christianity was to be approached historically and humanistically, not metaphysically or theologically. They believed that while Christianity's special power of salvation was revealed by Christ, it also engaged the wider social functions of religion as such, namely to sanction and police civil society. It was as a religion, but *not* as a divine revelation, that Christianity belonged to history, and needed to be thought about historically and functionally.

For the Warburtonians, however, religion was also literary. Their argument went like this: good social order could not be produced just aesthetically, benevolently and immanently, it needed the sanction of supernatural punishment and reward. Hence non-Christian societies require leaders and geniuses (such as Homer or David) to use the rhetorics of critique, threat, prophecy and providential favour backed by appeals to gods and semi-divine heroes—by appeals to religious figures—to preserve good order, whether these leaders or bards themselves believed their own stories or not. For John Brown, in particular, such bards were more effective in a republican Commonwealth than in a despotic state.[xxii] On the other hand, chivalric stories and Eastern romances with their quasi-religious force expressed an imaginative power in the service of "gothic" or "feudal" hierarchies: thus Thomas Warton argued that Milton's sensitivity to the divine had been sparked by romance reading in his youth.[xxiii] In a humanist spirit that pointed in the same direction, the Warburtonians also argued that Christianity as a religion was not classical literature's enemy but its vehicle, so that in a famous charge, vicars could be forcefully recommended to support the classics by a Warburtonian associate, John Jortin.[xxiv] But, as the Warburtonians saw it, literature currently was under threat: like religion it was at risk of being abandoned to what John Brown called "more libertine and relaxed Principles."[xxv]

If literature was a tool by which, at least in the old days religion could carry out its social task, it also registered powerful and divinely given human passions and longings, at least when uncorrupted by luxury and commerce. Literature was functional, but not *merely* functional. As John Brown put it in general terms: poetry (like music) began in "such Passions and Principles of Action, as are *common* to the whole *Race* of *Man*" and thus can be "most effectually investigated…by viewing Man in his *savage* or *uncultivated* state" since—and this is the key point— they were today no longer "great and important Subjects relative to the public State."[xxvi] The inherited archive of such declamations "relative to the public State" was open to

recovery and celebration in the modern world by scholarly parsons, who in the process began to establish "world literature."

The Warburtonian's second important antagonist was civility itself as this had been promoted by Shaftesbury in his *Characteristics* (1711). As we have seen, they did not accept that secular means could by themselves produce an ordered and polite society. Thus Shaftesbury's promotion of ridicule, wit, beauty, conversation and an innate moral sense in the interests of polish and moral reform seemed to them to accede to the age's actual irreligion and loss of virtue. This was the thrust of John Brown's first book, an explicit critique of Shaftesbury, which Warburton claimed that he had helped write.[xxvii] Once more we need to be careful here however: members of the group continued to promulgate work produced in Shaftesbury's aftermath. Both Hurd and Percy, for instance, worked on editions of Joseph Addison, and it is not as though they rejected a version of the improvement thesis by which savage cultures gradually acquired more polish and humanity. But this argument was hedged, since for them, that process involved crippling losses too. In taking that line they were, if somewhat ambivalently, continuing and redirecting the late-seventeenth-century Ancients versus Moderns debate, on the side of the Ancients, that is, of the sixteenth- and seventeenth-century humanism.[xxviii]

The Warburtonians' third main antagonist did not shape their work as directly. In line with Anglican orthodoxy, they rejected those forms of Christianity that permitted direct communication between God and the faithful, whether through the medium of the Spirit or of the Word.[xxix] They were anti-evangelical and anti-Presbyterian. The reason for these rejections was that they were committed to the Church as a quasi-autonomous, internally hierarchical institution of State, this being, of course, the ecclesiastical structure that secured their livings. As they saw it and as Warburton had argued early in his career in his very successful *Alliance between Church and State* (1736), the Anglican church was also the institution that, in

contemporary Britain, secured social order.[xxx] As such, it was the institution which continued to carry out religion's wider civil functions in the terms that provided the model for their *literary* understanding of religion as a tool of state.

This grid of negations—reason, contemporary civility and evangelicalism—left little room within which the Warburtonians might establish a positive and conventionally Anglican, intellectual program. That, I'd suggest, was both why they became secular men of letters and why their literary archive did not reveal either Shaftesbury's and sentimentalism's human nature or human nature as the scholastics had imagined it. It revealed instead an expressive, passionate moral anthropology that stood ready and in need not just of leadership and inspiration, but, implicitly, of Christian revelation.

In one direction, their interest in that archive led them to editorial work of the kind that made Percy's name.

In another direction, it led them into literary criticism. Thus both Warburton's long reading of Virgil's *Aeneid* in the first volume of *Divine Legation* and John Brown's counter-reading of Homer in his *Poetry and Music* were committed to demonstrating that, in the past, great literature was concerned, openly or not, with arts of government and its relationship to the gods. This is true even if Brown, like Thomas Warton before him, dismisses not only Warburton (and Joseph Scaliger's) preference for Virgil over Homer, but attacks Thomas Blackwell for claiming in his pioneering book that Homer was a polite poet.[xxxi] In this instance, Brown was re-evaluating Homer's primitivism to strengthen the Warburtonian literary program against Warburton himself.

In a third direction, it led the Warburtonians into creative writing. Percy, for instance was the author of ballads, including his successful *The Hermit of Warkworth* (1771), while John Brown and William Mason were both poets and dramatists: Brown's play, *Barbarossa* was a Drury Lane hit in 1754. Much of their creative writing drew on old literary forms—sonnets,

ballads, or Mason's case, the choric structure of ancient Greek tragedy. Even so, these poems

and plays could become a cause of anxiety to them as clergymen—when Percy became a

Bishop, for instance, he renounced his earlier literary efforts.[xxxii]

In a fourth direction, the Warburtonian's programme of negation led them towards a

particular understanding of literature. To repeat: for them, Christianity was based on the

revelation of the grace that might enable salvation. This revelation was fundamentally

indifferent to particular customs, rationalities and social structures (although, as Warburton

argued, God had providentially housed it among the Jews). Nonetheless Christianity as a

religion was an instance of an human institution without which civil society itself could not be

established. As I have argued, it was this placing of a Christian revelation indifferent to society

and reason within an institutional form possessing essential human and civil functions, that

legitimated and shaped these Anglican priests' *secular* literary interests. But, more specifically, it

also led them to an understanding of literature which emphasized form over content.

Admittedly the Warburtonians accepted what we today would call historicism or

culturalism. Yet, for them, while literary works expressed the contexts out of which they

appeared, literature was not *merely* embedded in its time and place just because it was

expressive of human nature and essential to human society. Hence, for instance, the

Warburtonians did not share the hermeneutic popularized in Robert Wood's *Essays on Homer*

(1769) by which a writer could be understood just in terms of his "original imitation" (or

representation) of a particular society and a particular place.[xxxiii] More tellingly still, despite

Warburton's influential re-invention of the notion that romances spread from the East, literary

history was not to be conceived of as a pattern of influences, imitations and transmissions, but

as a sequence of repeated forms. Human needs and human nature continually produced the *same*

kinds of literary plots and figures and rhythms in different times and places. That was the thrust

of Hurd's important essay on imitation (a section of which Brown reprinted in his *Chinese*

Miscellanies volume) which argued that the plots of Chinese drama conformed to the (Aristotelian) rules that ordered Greek drama. John Brown made similar arguments but, because he was mainly interested in poetry and song, he emphasized rhythm, harmony and melody. And here we reach the crux of our case since I want to insist that, even though (as far as I am aware) Percy nowhere makes this explicit, this version of formalism justified his publication of *Hau Kiou Choaan* as an Anglican vicar. It was a marriage plot novel with a moral, and indeed governmental, message, as were Richardson's *Pamela* and many English novels written in Richardson's wake by authors who had never heard of *Hau Kiou Choaan*. This coincidence showed how literary forms or genres were repeated not imitated. And it showed how the "marriage-plot novel" as we have come to call this genre, characters from different societies and different values could think, act and feel in ways we could all enter into, as Goethe put it.

We are returning to this talk's beginning and Goethe's announcement of the era of world literature. Today we know that that declaration was premature. A global literary system would only develop slowly, and arguably remains undeveloped still. My account of the Warburtonians has attempted to help us understand how it was that Goethe made his premature announcement by suggesting that he was reacting to a text which had first come into European print by a virtue of a local and shortlived Anglican literary program which was not widely shared. (Not, for instance, by the translator of the French version of *Hau Kiou Choaan* that Goethe in fact read.) Certainly Warburtonian literary theory could not energize world-literature's development. But, that granted, might placing Goethe in a Warburtonian context allow us, nonetheless, to revision his famous utterance? Might we now interpret his prophecy as an unconscious re-enactment? Was he, probably despite himself, presenting himself in the persona of a Warburtonian prophetic bard, one who had himself held governmental

(bureaucratic) office, in order to announce and enact a new development in literature and

society's universal and human history?

[i] Johann Peter Eckermann, *Gespräche mit Goethe in den letzeten Jahren seines Lebens,* Munich: Beck 1984, p. 184.

[ii] The novel was translated by the academic sinologist Jean-Pierre Abel-Remusat and published in 1826 in French as *Iu-kiao-li ou Les Deux cousins*.

[iii] For more context on Goethe's use of the term "Weltliteratur" (which was, however, already in circulation) see Daniel Purdy, "Goethe, Rémusat and the Chinese novel: Translation and Circulation of World Literature," in *German Literature as World Literature,* ed. Thomas Beeby. London: Bloomsbury 2014: 43-60

[iv] On the fashion for things Chinese in the period see Eugenia Zuroski Jenkins, *A Taste for China: English Subjectivity and the Prehistory of Orientalism*, Oxford: Oxford University Press 2013.

[v] For a detailed account of *Hau Kiou Choaan*'s publication, see, J. Watt, "Thomas Percy, China and the Gothic," *The Eighteenth* Century, 48/2 (2007): 95-109.

[vi] See Bertram H. Davis, *Thomas Percy: a scholar-critic in the Age of Johnson*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press 1989, pps. 92-93.

[vii] See, for instance, Maureen McLane, "Ballads and Bards: British Romantic Orality," *Modern Philology,* 98.3 (2001): 423-443.

[viii] Percy's tendency to polish his ballads came under attack by Joseph Ritson in the 1780s, a sign of another shift of literary values.

[ix] See, for instance, J.H. Pittock, *The Ascendency of Taste: the achievement of Thomas and Joseph Warton,* London: Routledge 1973: pps. 29-33.

[x] See Susan Manning, "Ossian, Scott, and Nineteenth-Century Scottish Literary Nationalism," *Studies in Scottish Literature*, 17 (1982): 39-54.

[xi] It is worth noting that Percy's publication of *Hau Choaan Kiou* may have been partly inspired by Goldsmith's *Citizen of the World* (1760-1) which is narrated by a Chinese scholar who travels to England, and whose de-familiarizing descriptions of England have both satiric and cosmopolitan force.

[xii] *Northern Antiquities: or a Description of the Manner, Custom, Religion and Laws of the Ancient Danes*, 2 vols. London: T. Carnan and Co, 1770: 1: p. A2(2).

[xiii] David Sorkin, *The Religious Enlightenment: Protestants, Jews and Catholics from London to Vienna*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008, pps. 25-65.

[xiv] David Hume, *The Life of David Hume, Esq. Written by Himself*, London: W. Strahan and T. Cadell 1777, p. 15.

[xv] Richard Hurd, "A Discourse concerning Poetical Imitation," in *Epistola ad Augustum. With an English Commentary and Notes. To which is Added a Discourse concerning Poetical Imitation*, London 1751: 109-207.

[xvi] Warburton attacks Collins in *The Divine Legation of Moses demonstrated in Nine Books*, *Fourth Edition, Corrected and Enlarged,* London: A Millar and J. and R. Tonson 1765. 9 vols: I: pps. xxvi-xxxiv. In 1757, he and Hurd collaborated in a polemic against Hume's *Essay on the Natural History of Religion*. See Richard Hurd, *Remarks on Mr. David Hume's Natural History of Religion, addressed to the Rev. Dr. Warburton*, London: T. Cadell 1777.

[xvii] See Levitin, *Ancient Wisdom in the Age of the New Science: Histories of Philosophy in England, c. 1640-1700*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 2015.

[xviii] As both Levitin and David Sorkin have pointed out, Warburton's arguments were much indebted to the work of the seventeenth-century Anglican humanist scholar, John Spencer, who argued for an "accomodationist hermeneutic". See Levitin, *Ancient Wisdom in the Age of the New Science*, p. 229 and Sorkin, *The Religious Enlightenment*, pps. 47-48.

[xix] William Warburton, *The Divine Legation of Moses,* I: 54.

[xx] William Warburton, *The Divine Legation of Moses,* I: 95.

[xxi] It is telling, however, that in his 1761 charge to his diocese in which Warburton recommends the "best method of studying Theology" to his clergy does make concessions to natural religion. But this charge was neither finished nor published in his lifetime. See "A Charge to the Clergy of the Diocese of Gloucester, 1761," in *The Works of the Right Reverend William Warburton, D.D. Bishop of Gloucester. A New Edition,* ed. Richard Hurd. London, T. Cadell and W. Davies 1811. 12 vols: 9: p. 371.

[xxii] John Brown, *A Dissertation on the Rise, Union, and Power, the Progressions, Separations, and Corruptions of Poetry and Music*, London: L. Davis and C. Reymers. 1763, p. 94.

[xxiii] Thomas Warton, *Observations on the Fairy Queen of Spenser*, 2nd ed. London: R and J. Dodsley 1762, 2 vols. II, p. 33. This case about the meaning of romance for Hurd in particular is clearly made by Jonathan Kramnick in his remarks on Hurd's *Letters on Chivalry and Romance.* See Jonathan Brody Kramnick, *Making the English Canon: Print Capitalism and the Cultural Past, 1700-1770*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1998: p. 175 ff.

[xxiv] See John Jortin, "Christianity: the Preserver and Supporter of Literature," in *Sermons on Different Subjects*, London: Benjamin White 1771. 7 vols. 7: pps. 153-172. Warburton and Hurd fell out with Jortin but he belongs to the looser group of literary parsons I am thinking about here.

[xxv] John Brown, *A Dissertation on the Rise, Union, and Power, the Progressions, Separations, and Corruptions of Poetry and Music*, London: L. Davis and C. Reymers. 1763, p. 45.

[xxvi] John Brown, *A Dissertation on Poetry and Music*, pps. 26 and 44.

[xxvii] See William Darby Templeman, "Warburton and Brown Continue the Battle over Ridicule," *Huntington Library Quarterly,* 17/1 (1953): 17-36.

[xxviii] In thinking about the Warburtonians' relation to that debate and to English humanism generally, Sir William Temple's essays "Of Heroic Virtue" and "Of Poetry" (as edited by Jonathan Swift) would appear to be especially important since they were widely circulated and adumbrate elements of the Warburtonian program.

[xxix] Thomas Warton presents a vehement attack on Puritanism for instance in *Observations on the Fairy Queen of Spenser*, II: p. 236.

[xxx] See, for instance, Stephen Taylor, "William Warburton and the *Alliance of Church and State*," *Journal of Ecclessiastical History* , 43/2 (1992): 271-286.

[xxxi] Brown, *Poetry and Music*, pps: 81-82. And Thomas Warton, *Observations on the Fairy Queen of Spenser*, I: 95.

[xxxii] He resisted responding to Ritson's attacks on him for that reason. See Davis, *Thomas Percy,* 280-281.

[xxxiii] Robert Wood, *An Essay on the Genius and Writings of Homer with a Comparative View of the Ancient and Present State of the Troade*, London: T. Payne 1775, p. 89.