

**Joseph Hone**

**Pope's Lost Epic:  
*Alcander, Prince of Rhodes and the Politics of Exile***

Alexander Pope began writing *Alcander, Prince of Rhodes* in 1701, at the tender age of twelve. His first and only attempt at epic poetry until the *Brutus* three decades later, *Alcander* was an important milestone in Pope's early career. Over the next three years he wrote four books of a thousand lines apiece, before abandoning the work late in 1703 to refocus his energies on the *Pastorals*. Fondly looking back from 1739 on his youthful epic, Pope commented: "I had flung all my learning into it, as indeed Milton has done, too much, in his *Paradise Lost*."<sup>1</sup> The story was all of Pope's own invention. But the style, he acknowledged, was highly derivative: "There was Milton's style in one part, and Cowley's in another, here the Style of Spenser imitated and there of Statius, here Homer and Virgil, and there Ovid and Claudian."<sup>2</sup> We will turn to the significance of some of those names in due course. *Alcander* was an ambitious undertaking for such a young poet, even one as boyishly grandiose as Pope, and consequently should be a key text for our understanding of his poetic apprenticeship.

And yet *Alcander* rarely if ever features in discussions of Pope's early career. Maynard Mack simply glosses the poem as "the darling composition of his youth."<sup>3</sup> George Sherburn mentions it only in passing, citing Pope's later reflections on the work, and John M. Aden not at all.<sup>4</sup> "Alexander Pope never composed an original epic poem," asserts Henry Power, repeating a common critical misconception.<sup>5</sup> There is, though,

good reason for what might otherwise appear to be straightforward neglect: no text of *Alcander* is extant. The poem was never printed and Pope destroyed the only known manuscript before February 1717. Besides a handful of couplets Pope reworked for use in later poems, *Alcander* is lost. Why, then, should we devote our attention to a vanished early work? The simple answer is that we cannot very well afford not to. A great deal is at stake. Recent scholarship has made abundantly clear that Pope's salad days were politically formative. Pat Rogers in particular has demonstrated the degree of influence that figures such as the poet and Jacobite conspirator George Granville, Baron Lansdowne, exerted over the young Pope, as well as unreconstructed royalist types such as Sir William Trumbull, who was not so innocent of Jacobite politics as many have assumed.<sup>6</sup> To understand the Pope who produced poems such as *Windsor-Forest* (1713), Rogers has argued, we first need to appreciate the significances of those early personal connections and experiences. Crucially for our present purpose, Pope wrote *Alcander* at a critical juncture: soon after he returned from Thomas Deane's Catholic school at Marylebone to his new family home at Binfield near Windsor, but likely before his sustained involvement with Granville and that circle—certainly before he met the ageing William Walsh, Samuel Garth, and other poetic mentors. In order to understand the young poet's evolving attitude on various literary and political issues, it is imperative that we reconstruct to the best of our ability his lost foray into epic. Once we do, we will see that the young poet was already gravitating towards the stance of Granville and his allies around the time he first moved to Binfield.

How are we to go about this? Speculation is not entirely germane territory for the scrupulous literary historian. Sound historical scholarship rests above all on the availability of evidence. "Good historical practice," Robert D. Hume reminds, "requires

us to be blunt in admitting what we lack.”<sup>7</sup> So what are we do when confronted with a text that no longer exists? How are we to go about discussing it in a manner that avoids where possible irresponsible guesswork? I have tremendous respect for the sort of contextual historicism practised and theorized by Hume, but here our options are limited. We cannot move forward without a little conjecture. The only alternative is to give up and ignore the whole episode—and that, as I have already stated, is no alternative at all. Based on all the surviving textual and contextual evidence, then, what do we think *Alcander* contained? To negotiate this critical impasse, we need to marry sceptical analysis of the facts with educated and thoughtful speculation. This is not a new approach for literary studies *per se*. Historians of the early modern stage, for instance, regularly have to grapple with the hundreds of lost plays that were staged in Elizabethan and Jacobean London.<sup>8</sup> Obviously plays are a very different beast to epic poetry: they leave traces in theatrical company ledgers, the records of the Master of Revels, and, if printed, in the Stationers’ Register and booksellers’ inventories and catalogues. All we have in the case of *Alcander* are a dozen or so couplets that Pope later recycled, a handful of anecdotes about the poem, and correspondence pertaining to the manuscript’s destruction by fire. There are, though, sufficient clues to suggest its content. I believe that it is possible to recover, with a fair degree of probability, the literary and political motives behind this adolescent attempt at epic poetry.

## I

What was *Alcander* about? A basic question, perhaps, but difficult to answer with any degree of certainty. We get a teasing first glimpse of *Alcander* in 1716, in a draft of the

preface for Pope's 1717 *Works*: "I confess there was a time when I was in love with myself, and my first productions were the children of self-love upon innocence. I had made an Epic Poem, and Panegyrics on all the Princes in Europe, and thought myself the greatest genius that ever was. I can't but regret those delightful visions of my childhood, which, like the fine colours we see when our eyes are shut, are vanished for ever."<sup>9</sup> Those early poems, including the "Epic" *Alcander*, were conspicuously absent from the *Works*. Most of our evidence about the lost text comes from the Oxford historian and literary scholar Joseph Spence, who recorded for posterity his many conversations with Pope. In May 1730 Spence wrote that Pope composed "Part of an epic poem (Deucalion was the hero) when about twelve. The scene of it lies at Rhodes and some of the neighbouring islands, and the poem opened under water, with a description of the court of Neptune." Deucalion, Pope explained to Spence, "was a second Deucalion—not the husband of Pyrrha". In March 1743 Pope elaborated: "The epic poem which I began a little after I was twelve was Alcander, Prince of Rhodes, and there was an underwater scene in the first book—'twas in the Archipelago. I wrote four books toward it, of about a thousand verses each, and had the copy by me till I burned it by the advice of the Bishop of Rochester, a little before he went abroad." "My epic poem," Pope continued, "was about two years in hand (from [my] thirteenth into fifteenth [year]). Alcander was a prince, driven from his throne by Deucalion, father of Minos, and some other princes. It was better planned than Blackmore's Prince Arthur, but as slavish an imitation of the ancients. Alcander showed all the virtue of suffering, like Ulysses, and of courage, like Aeneas or Achilles. Apollo as the patron of Rhodes was his great defender, and Cybele as the patroness of Deucalion and Crete his great enemy. She raises a storm against him in the first book as Juno does against Aeneas, and

he is cast away and swims ashore just as Ulysses does to the island of Phaecia.”<sup>10</sup> On 5 August 1730, Pope told his great friend Jonathan Richardson that “within 2 or 3 Years” of 1701 he “wrote 4 Books of an Epic Poem, in Imitation of the Ancients, whose Scene was laid as high as the Trojan War.”<sup>11</sup>

There is lots of information here, some of it contradictory. Pope was notoriously hazy with dates. The precise year that he abandoned the poem varies from 1703 to 1704; but he consistently gives 1701, the year he moved from school to Binfield, as the beginning of composition. Likewise, at times Pope appears to suggest that *Alcander* was a completed poem; at others he clearly indicates that it remained unfinished. I agree with David Womersley that the evidence points towards Pope laying *Alcander* aside to concentrate on his *Pastorals*, probably at the instigation of his new poetic mentor, William Walsh.<sup>12</sup> We can, though, extrapolate a few basic facts about the text. The narrative concerned Alcander, a prince of Rhodes, and his deposition by Deucalion and “some other princes”. Greek heroes named Alcander appear in both Homer’s and Virgil’s accounts of the Trojan War.<sup>13</sup> But they are minor figures and we learn nothing of their backgrounds. There are, to the best of my knowledge, no Rhodesian Alcanders in the classical canon. It appears, then, that this prince was a character of Pope’s invention. On the other hand, Deucalion is an established mythic figure. Yet, in describing him as the “father of Minos”, either Pope was confused or Spence misreported Pope’s words. Deucalion was in fact the son of Minos and Pasiphae, and Minos’s heir as king of Crete. But, again, we have no record of Deucalion invading Rhodes. In Homer’s *Iliad* it is Deucalion’s son, Idomeneus, who led the Cretan contingent at Troy. So the events narrated by Pope must have taken place a generation before those described by Homer. The bulk of the poem presumably involved Alcander’s travails and attempts to win back

his throne, aided by Apollo, the god of poetry.

Why did Pope settle on this apocryphal narrative? Other stories were available and more immediately suitable for epic poetry. In the 1730s, for instance, Pope began writing an epic poem on the British foundation myth, *Brutus*.<sup>14</sup> Why not earlier? Sir Richard Blackmore's *Prince Arthur* (1695), mentioned by Pope as one of his models for *Alcander*, took another national legend as its basis to legitimate the regime of William III. But if Pope had no obvious source for his narrative, the same cannot be said for epic poetry about exiled princes in general: the most obvious example to hand being John Dryden's 1697 translation of Virgil's *Aeneid*. Pope's earliest surviving letter, written to Wycherley in December 1704, expresses unreserved admiration for Dryden.<sup>15</sup> Pope later claimed to have snuck into Will's coffeehouse aged twelve to catch a glimpse of his hero.<sup>16</sup> Pope's esteem for Dryden was partly poetical, but surely also partly religious and political. Like Pope's father, Dryden maintained his Catholicism after the revolution and refused to swear the new oath of allegiance. His translations of Virgil were charged by enduring allegiance to the exiled Catholic king, James II. That is not to say Dryden transformed the *Aeneid* into a coherent Jacobite fable. Rather, he manipulated Virgil's language to bring the Latin poem into dialogue with recent political events. As Steven Zwicker has cogently argued, Dryden never simply identifies Aeneas with either James II or William III.<sup>17</sup> At one moment, Aeneas is manifestly the type of the exiled king, cast from his homeland. At another, though, he invades Italy and usurps the legitimate prince of the Rutuli, Turnus.

The opening verses pertaining to Aeneas's exile are especially pointed, and, for our present purpose, worth quoting in full:

Arms, and the man I sing, who, forced by Fate,  
 And haughty Juno's unrelenting hate,  
 Expelled and exiled, left the Trojan shore.  
 Long labours, both by sea and land, he bore,  
 And in the doubtful war, before he won  
 The Latian realm, and built the destined town;  
 His banished gods restored to rites divine,  
 And settled sure succession in his line,  
 From whence the race of Alban fathers come,  
 And the long glories of majestic Rome.<sup>18</sup>

None but the most blind Williamites could miss the resonance of those lines. Dryden's prophecy of a "settled sure succession" was pure invention, not in Virgil, and hence drew attention to the disputed throne of England. Likewise, the transformation of "inferretque deos" into "banished gods" was a specifically Catholic interpolation. Jacobite sympathies again come to the fore in book six, where, in the underworld, Aeneas learns the infernal punishment that awaits traitors:

Then they, who brothers' better claim disown,  
 Expel their parents, and usurp the throne;  
 Defraud their clients, and to lucre sold,  
 Sit brooding on unprofitable gold;  
 Who dare not give, and ev'n refuse to lend  
 To their poor kindred, or a wanting friend.  
 Vast is the throne of these; nor less the train  
 Of lustful youths, for foul adult'ry slain:  
 Hosts of deserters, who their honor sold,  
 And basely broke their faith for bribes of gold.<sup>19</sup>

Again, the lines find only partial justification in the Latin and allude openly and bitterly to William and Mary's coup in 1688. The final couplet, like the opening reference to the "banished gods" of Troy, was a comment on the fickle Catholics who renounced their faith after the revolution. In writing an original epic poem about another exiled prince

who showed “all the virtue of suffering, like Ulysses, and of courage, like Aeneas”, Pope surely had Dryden’s *Aeneis* in mind.

Of those other names on the list of poets whom Pope imitated, Claudian and Spenser were probably models for panegyric and Homer and Milton for epic diction.<sup>20</sup> Abraham Cowley and Statius supplied other salient models of exilic epic, as, in his own way, did Milton. Cowley’s unfinished epic poem *Davideis* (1656) narrates the story of David and Saul from 1 Samuel: an anointed prince forced from his rightful kingdom by an ungodly tyrant.<sup>21</sup> When selectively read and reinterpreted, such stories obviously became useful to adherents of the exiled Stuarts in the early eighteenth century, just as they had been to royalist refugees during the 1650s. Hence *Davideis* provided supporters of the Stuart cause with what Murray Pittock calls “a typology for Jacobite propaganda of exile”—that is, a form of proto-Jacobite rhetoric.<sup>22</sup> Statius’s *Thebaid* likewise furnished Pope with another epic about the politics of civil war and legitimate and illegitimate sovereignty. We know that Pope started translating the first book of the *Thebaid* by 1703 and was nearly finished in 1708, although the piece would not appear in print until the publication of Lintot’s *Miscellaneous Poems and Translations* in 1712. This timing suggests that the *Thebaid* translation arose in some way out of *Alcander*. As John M. Aden has lucidly demonstrated, the *Thebaid* translation is extremely topical.<sup>23</sup> Statius’s epic is a story of faction, usurpation, discord, tyranny, banishment, and folly. It would have been difficult for Pope’s contemporaries to miss the analogy to contemporary politics—especially, as Aden points out, ‘if it were pressed, as it was by Pope’.<sup>24</sup> Take the following lines:

Oh servile Land,  
Where exil’d Tyrants still by turns command!

Thou Sire of Gods and Men, Imperial *Jove*!  
 Is this th'Eternal Doom decreed above?  
 On thy own Offspring hast thou fix'd this Fate,  
 From the first Birth of our unhappy State;  
 When banish'd *Cadmus* wandering o'er the Main,  
 For lost *Europa* search'd the world in vain,  
 And fated in *Baotian* Fields to found  
 A rising Empire on a foreign Ground.<sup>25</sup>

Pope had clearly learnt from Dryden. The allegory of the translation—far from literal—is shifting and indirect: the tyrant ruler is an exile from his own homeland, but so too is the founding father Cadmus, ‘wandering o’er the Main’. How lightly *Alcander* bore such political allusions is ultimately unknowable. But by writing about an exiled rightful prince usurped by a tyrant king, Pope was working in an idiom closely associated with Jacobitism by the start of the eighteenth century.

## II

Narratives of royal exile were highly topical when Pope began writing *Alcander*. James II had died on 16 September 1701 in his makeshift court at St Germain. Louis XIV immediately proclaimed James’s son and Mary’s and Anne’s Catholic half-brother, James Francis Edward, as “James III”—a move that sparked outrage in England. 1701 had been a turbulent year for the protestant royal family too. Princess Anne’s last surviving child, William, Duke of Gloucester, had died in 1700, throwing the succession into limbo. Anne was now the last protestant Stuart. Thus parliament passed the Act of Settlement in 1701 to secure the protestant succession beyond Anne, in Electress Sophia of Hanover and the House of Brunswick. The Act of Settlement proved controversial. Although numerous polemical tracts were printed in favour of Hanover, many others

espoused the Jacobite cause, albeit necessarily in disguised terms. For instance, the prolific Rose tavern wit William Pittis, previously a protégé of Dryden, encouraged an active Jacobite stance in a topical verse fable of 1701, *a la* Roger L'Estrange:

Kings should be Kings, whatever Priest's their Guide,  
 And if the Fates decree that you must fall,  
 And Childless yield to Death's Imperious Call;  
 Oh! may these Realms the Next in Blood obey,  
 And let a *Lybian* Prince o're *Lybia* sway;  
 No Foreign Lion mount the Regal Throne,  
 To give us Statutes modell'd from his own.  
     Yonder there lies in the *Namæan* Wood,  
 A Graceful Cub, and sprung from Royal Blood,  
 Immediate in Descent, as some can prove,  
 Not Cousin by a third or fourth remove.<sup>26</sup>

Pittis was not known for his subtlety. Before long he was being pursued by the authorities on charges of seditious libel and writing Jacobite propaganda in 1704 and 1710—though, in truth, he did well to avoid the law until then.<sup>27</sup> The allegory of his position here barely requires explication: the “Graceful Cub” is self-evidently the exiled Pretender.

Like Pittis, the circle of George Granville, later Lord Lansdowne, was busy producing literature that covertly supported the Jacobite cause. The Granville circle was soon to prove important for Pope, although he probably did not meet Granville until 1704, when the elder statesman read the manuscript of the *Pastorals*. Pope's dealings with Granville have been well documented by Rogers, but bear briefly repeating here.<sup>28</sup> Granville began his poetic career as a disciple of Edmund Waller and remained quietly loyal to James II and his son after the revolution. After Anne's accession, he was elected as MP for Fowey and later Cornwall and quickly rose under the Harley administration.<sup>29</sup> In 1712, Granville's *Poems on Several Occasions* was published by Jacob Tonson and

he was raised to the title of Baron Lansdowne as part of Harley's attempts to force the peace bill through parliament. This was the context in which Pope dedicated *Windsor-Forest* to Granville, and later immortalized him in the *Epistle to Arbuthnot* (1735) as "Granville the polite."<sup>30</sup> Another early contact—unremarked by Rogers but worth mentioning—was Granville's younger cousin, the Jacobite poet, playwright, and historian Bevil Higgons. After the revolution, Higgons followed James II to St Germain, where his uncle Denis Granville was chaplain, and, upon his return to England in 1696, was arrested for suspected involvement in Sir John Fenwick's failed plot to assassinate William III.<sup>31</sup> Higgons and Pope were on cordial terms by 1717 at the very latest (and probably much earlier) when Higgons contributed to Pope's miscellany *Poems on Several Occasions*, including a poem addressing Pope as "my friend".<sup>32</sup> Also among Granville's circle were the female Jacobite poets Jane Barker and Anne Finch, and James Grahme and his son Henry, both of whom were prominent members of the Jacobite underworld and alleged papists. Like Higgons, Henry served for a time at St Germain in the 1690s.

Higgons's play *The Generous Conquerour*, performed at Drury Lane in December 1701, provided a focal point for that group around the same time Pope was beginning *Alcander*.<sup>33</sup> Higgons's story offered a barely coded commentary of the politics of succession in this moment. The play begins with Almerick, king of Lombardy by conquest, and Rodomond, the rightful Lombard prince and son of the deposed king Gondibert. The plot centres on a love triangle between two contenders for power, echoing the plot of Sir William Davenant's *avant-garde* epic set a generation earlier, *Gondibert* (1651).<sup>34</sup> Although Higgons streamlined the political allegory of the tale, which is rather confusing in Davenant, the love interest remains framed in a

distinctly political idiom. Rodomond speaks of his affection for the princess Armida in the language of hereditary right: “By Nature’s Laws, and common right I hold / As first Possessor, my *Armida*’s Heart.” Almerick, by contrast, is rejected by Armida as a “false Perfidious Prince”.<sup>35</sup> Eventually, in the final scene, Almerick acknowledges the legitimacy of Rodomond’s claim:

To Morrow’s Sun your Nuptials shall adorn,  
And see thee mounted on thy Father’s Throne,  
While I my Age in downy Quiet lull:  
By my Misfortunes, *Rodomond*, be wise,  
And chuse with Care to whom you give the Reins;  
In this one Point be to thy self so just,  
Reward the useful Villain, never trust.<sup>36</sup>

These lines almost read as a direct appeal to James Francis Edward—for the young prince to learn from the mistakes of his father—and were deemed “notoriously Factious” at the time.<sup>37</sup> But the finale was patent fantasy. Any prospect of the “conqueror” William peacefully surrendering his throne to James Francis Edward was now unthinkable—something that Higgons’s happy ending was designed to underscore. Granville wrote the prologue to Higgons’s play, and Henry Grahme and “M.P.” (perhaps Mary Pix) both contributed addresses to the printed edition, praising Higgons as Dryden *redivivus*, whose wit will “lash the Vices of a hardned Age.”<sup>38</sup> *The Generous Conquerour* was dedicated to John Sheffield, Earl of Mulgrave, whose “Frequent Appearance” at the play recommended him to Higgons as a patron.<sup>39</sup> A confidante of James II, Mulgrave’s defection to William had come late, and was, many suspected, half hearted. He was among the Tory lords who refused to declare William a “rightful and lawful king” in 1696, after the discovery of Fenwick’s plot, and, according to Gilbert

Burnet, opposed the Act of Settlement in 1701. When Mulgrave's works were printed posthumously under Pope's supervision in 1723, Walpole's government ordered that the leaves containing *An Account of the Revolution* and *A Feast of the Gods* be cancelled, presumably due to their Jacobite tendencies—a delicate issue in the wake of the foiled Atterbury plot. Although Higgons maintained “the Innocence of this Play” from political allegory, the author of *A Comparison Between the Two Stages* (1702) was not “perswaded the Author cou'd pursue such a Story without having in his eye the Affairs of his own Country” and that Higgons “cou'd not write any thing of this kind without being sensible of that application which wou'd be made of it; and it does not appear done by Chance but Choice.”<sup>40</sup>

One has to wonder whether Pope was aware of Granville and Higgons and their group's involvement in the Jacobite literary underground between 1701 and 1703. He certainly was by 1705, when he attributed some rabid anti-Williamite satires to Higgons: possibly drawing on manuscript provenance, possibly on his friendship with the author.<sup>41</sup> Presumably he knew about Granville's loyalties even earlier. We should note, though, that Pope was almost certainly not involved in subterranean activities as a teenager. Yet Pope's extant juvenilia reveal his alertness to the political issues at stake. Based on Pope's own marginalia to a 1705 edition of *Poems Relating to State Affairs*, David Nokes suggested, in my view convincingly, that the young poet wrote a satirical epigram on the death of Queen Mary in 1697.<sup>42</sup> The piece is very short—just two couplets—so may be quoted in full:

Behold, Dutch Prince, here lye th' unconquer'd Pair,  
 Who knew your Strength in Love, your Strength in War!  
 Unequal Match, to both no Conquest gains,  
 No Trophy of your Love or War remains.<sup>43</sup>

Certainly, this is amateur work; Pope later crossed out the final couplet, as though disowning it. Yet the verses do imply a genuine hostility to William and the revolution settlement from a very early age. Closer in time to *Alcander* is *To the Author of a Poem, Intituled Successio* (1702), a rejoinder to Elkanah Settle's *Eusebia Triumphans* (1702), a fulsome panegyric celebrating the Act of Settlement and the prospect of a Hanoverian succession. Settle would, of course, reappear as a source of dullness in *The Dunciads* (1728; 1729; 1743). As Aden and others have already observed, *Successio* anticipates the later satire in its portrayal of Settle as a modern Codrus and shared vocabulary with the later work:

Sure *Bavius* copy'd *Mævius* to the full,  
 And *Chærilus* taught *Codrus* to be dull;  
 Therefore, dear Friend, at my Advice give o'er  
 This needless Labour, and contend no more,  
 To prove a dull *Succession* to be true,  
 Since 'tis enough we find it so in You.<sup>44</sup>

Critical consensus holds that the poem is primarily significant as one of Pope's earliest extant satires and, because of its focus on "dullness", as a precursor to *The Dunciad*.<sup>45</sup> And yet the principal message of these lines is political rather than poetical. Settle's bad verse is the butt of Pope's satire, as it was in the 1720s, but his main target is Settle's aim: "To prove a dull *Succession* to be true". The Act of Settlement, not Settle, is the chief manifestation of dullness. These early sneers at Hanover—written while *Alcander* was still a work in progress—speak volumes about Pope's early politics. They suggest that Pope was drawing on the language of Jacobitism before he personally encountered Granville and his allies. We should not be surprized that he was drawn into Granville's

orbit when the opportunity arose in 1704.

### III

Surviving excerpts from *Alcander* are few and, for the most part, devoid of context. They can, though, tell us something about Pope's stylistic debts. Pope was obviously pleased with some lines, and reworked them into later poems. He told Spence that some couplets had been "inserted in some of my other poems, without any alteration."<sup>46</sup> "Whose honours with increase of ages grow; / As streams roll down enlarging as they flow" was incorporated into *An Essay on Criticism* as a comment on Homer, and "As man's meanders to the vital spring / Roll all their tides, then back their circles bring" repeated "word for word" in *The Dunciad* as a description of blood circulation.<sup>47</sup>

Most of the surviving lines, though, were saved because Pope later considered them ridiculous and included them as examples of feeble poetry in his *Peri Bathous: or, The Art of Sinking in Poetry* (1727). Drawing on personal conversations with Spence, Joseph Warton supplied footnotes in his 1797 edition of Pope marking out these duplicated passages: "Mr. Spence informed me that this passage, and many other ridiculous ones, in this treatise, were quoted from our poet's own earlier pieces, particularly his epic poem, called *Alcander*."<sup>48</sup> One of Pope's earliest biographers, Owen Ruffhead, likewise wrote that several lines from *Alcander* were "pleasantly produced for examples in the art of *sinking in poetry*, under the title of verses by an Anonymous."<sup>49</sup> Of course, we must be cautious of accepting such evidence at face value. Warton and Ruffhead did not make such claims in Pope's lifetime. But they did have access to his friends and manuscripts which have since been lost. For this reason

alone it may prove useful to accept their claims and entertain the prospect that these fragments are indeed from *Alcander*, as Spence and other early witnesses suggest. As a sample of hyperbole in *Peri Bathous*, for instance, Pope included the following lines supposedly from *Alcander*:

I'd call them Mountains, but can't call them so,  
 For fear to wrong them with a Name too low;  
 While the fair Vales beneath so humbly lie,  
 That even humble seems a Term too high.<sup>50</sup>

To be sure, as topographical description this is risible. More interesting and allusive, though, are lines that Pope recycled as an exemplar of metonymy:

Lac'd in her *Cosins* new appear'd the Bride,  
 A *Bubble-boy* and *Tompion* at her Side,  
 And with an Air divine her *Colmar* ply'd.  
 Then oh she cries, what Slaves I round me see?  
 Here a bright *Redcoat*, there a smart *Toupee*.<sup>51</sup>

These lines require some decoding. Most of the references are easy enough. “*Cosins*” was a famous manufacturer of corsetry in eighteenth-century London.<sup>52</sup> Likewise, a “*Bubble-boy*” was a tweezer box, a “*Colmar*” a fan, and “*Tompion*” the name of a prominent watchmaker. The lines anticipate the tone and subject matter of Belinda’s *toilet* in *The Rape of the Lock* (1712).

Pope’s description of the “bright *Redcoat*” as a “Slave” is less innocent, though. The term “*Redcoat*” originated in the civil wars as a name given to the soldiers of Cromwell’s New Model Army, who were attired in bright red uniforms.<sup>53</sup> Although red continued as the standard colour for British military uniforms after the Restoration—

because the dye was cheap—to call someone a redcoat still meant they were a militant republican. Thus, in his poem on Cromwell’s death in 1658, reprinted in the original *Poems on Affairs of State* miscellanies, Abraham Cowley denounced the Lord Protector as “a Rebel-Redcoat.”<sup>54</sup> In 1706 the Tory wit William King adjusted the term to condemn the duplicity of Whigs who conform occasionally: “The pious *Redcoat* most devoutly swears, / Drinks to the *Church*, but ticks on his *Arrears*.”<sup>55</sup> The High Church controversialist Charles Leslie even accused eighteenth-century Whigs of setting up “*Red-Coat-Saints*” in his periodical, *The Rehearsal*.<sup>56</sup> Why, then, would Pope invoke this term in *Alcander*? And why describe a redcoat as a slave, another word that Pope used with political sophistication?<sup>57</sup> Given the partisan framework in which these words were used at the time, Pope must surely have been attempting to make a political point. Although the broader context of the passage is lost, these words alone suggests that the epic poem spoke to contemporary politics.

Another salient passage was classified as an example of hyperbole in *Peri*

*Bathous*:

Behold a Scene of Misery and Woe!  
Here Argus soon might himself quite blind,  
Ev’n tho’ he had Briareus’ hundred Hands  
To wipe those hundred Eyes——<sup>58</sup>

Innocuous enough, *prima facie*. However, as the Twickenham editors observe, the lines echo an elegy on Charles I by the swashbuckling James Graham, first Marquess of Montrose, supposedly written “with the Point of his Sword on the Sands of Leith”:

Great, Good, and Just, could I but rate

My griefs, and thy too rigid fate,  
 I'd weep the world to such a strain  
 As it should deluge once again.  
 But since thy loud-tongued blood demands supplies  
 More from Briareus's hands, than Argus's eyes,  
 I'll sing thy obsequies with trumpet sounds,  
 And write thy epitaph with blood and wounds.<sup>59</sup>

Although Pope's phrasing is more compact, the conceit of Briareus wiping away Argus's tears is identical. Of course, such echoes were not always intended to be allusive, nor always deliberate.<sup>60</sup> But, once again, whether intentional or not, we see Pope drawing on the language of the English civil war and Stuart martyrology in his epic poem about royal exile. And, again, that language of mourning for a murdered king had a distinct political application in early eighteenth-century England.<sup>61</sup> In *Windsor-Forest* Pope dwells on Charles's execution and burial in an unmarked grave.<sup>62</sup> In Pope's panegyric, as elsewhere in Jacobite discourse, the Stuart martyr became an acceptable (and deniable) subject for Jacobite sentiment.<sup>63</sup> Such a gesture in *Alcander* would appear to confirm the poem's political aspirations. Even if the echo was without further meaning, though, it suggests that he was influenced from an early age by seventeenth-century royalist hagiography. Montrose's poem was reprinted as Stuart propaganda dozens of times in the 1670s and 1680s, decades of profound political crisis.<sup>64</sup> By the early eighteenth century, though, the elegy circulated primarily in manuscript, often in compilations of Tory and crypto-Jacobite verse.<sup>65</sup> Pope may have encountered the poem in a scribal format.

So far we have seen that *Alcander* was in all likelihood an intensely political poem. Pope's suggestive subject matter of royal exile and potential gestures to the civil war and murder of Charles I in surviving fragments of verse indicate that he was alert to

the political issues of the day. Moreover, shared aspects between Pope's juvenilia and the contemporaneous output of figures such as George Granville, Bevil Higgons, and William Pittis indicate that, at the time of composition, Pope was gravitating to a similar political stance. If not conclusive, the evidence is compelling. At this point, though, we lose sight of *Alcander* for another thirteen years, when Pope burned the manuscript. We must now turn to the textual history of Pope's lost epic and the contextual factors that contributed to its destruction.

#### IV

Why did Pope destroy the manuscript of *Alcander*? The prevailing consensus on this matter holds simply that Pope was embarrassed by his youthful efforts. Thus Sherburn writes, "Concerning many of his juvenilia Pope adopted the wise procedure of talking—and destroying."<sup>66</sup> "One may imagine the trumpet tones!" scoffs Mack, citing Spence's *Anecdotes*. He suggests that a "firm sense of his own limits" caused Pope to burn the manuscript.<sup>67</sup> What evidence we have suggests otherwise. Pope appears to have been proud of *Alcander*, although sensible to its imperfections: its "slavish" imitation of the ancients, for instance, and occasional lapses that led to couplets being included in *Peri Bathous*.<sup>68</sup> But he mentioned the poem often and fondly to his friends, as the volume and variety of Spence's and Richardson's comments make clear, and shared the text with trusted and interested readers. Pope destroyed the manuscript, but not, he told Spence, "without some regret".<sup>69</sup>

Pope tells us quite a bit about the destruction of *Alcander*. In 1739 he informed Spence that "The Bishop of Rochester, not many years ago, advised me to burn it. I saw

his advice was well grounded, and followed it.”<sup>70</sup> “’twas necessary to do so,” Pope continued, “because somebody hereafter might have printed it.” He corroborated this story in 1743: “I burned it by the advice of the Bishop of Rochester, a little before he went abroad.”<sup>71</sup> Again, Pope misremembers the date. Atterbury was not forced into exile until 1723, but wrote to Pope in February 1717 stating: “I am not sorry your *Alcander* is burnt; but had I known your intentions, I would have interceded for the first page and put it with your leave among my curiosities.”<sup>72</sup> This dates the burning of the *Alcander* manuscript to the winter of 1716-17.

Pope’s fear that *Alcander* would be printed in an unauthorized edition indicates that the poem was circulating in manuscript and had a readership beyond Binfield; Atterbury’s familiarity with the poem corroborates that. Equally, though, his confidence that burning the manuscript would effectively destroy the work suggests that the poem existed in a single copy. This accords with what we know about Pope’s early use of scribal publication—a practice that has been well documented by Margaret J. Ezell and Harold Love.<sup>73</sup> Pope wrote his poems in meticulous single manuscript copies, which he then circulated among a select group of readers. The most famous example is the *Pastorals* manuscript, which was read by, among others: Granville, Wycherley, Congreve, Walsh, and Jacob Tonson the Younger, who asked to publish the poem in his firm’s *Miscellany* of 1709.<sup>74</sup> The *Essay on Criticism* manuscript of 1709 and the *Windsor-Forest* manuscript of 1712 were likewise circulated among Pope’s patrons and potential patrons before being sent to the printer’s shop.<sup>75</sup> If Pope thought he could suppress *Alcander* by burning the manuscript, it seems likely that, although unfinished, the poem circulated in a similar fine copy. Atterbury’s desire to keep the front page as a “curiosity” might also suggest that it was illustrated or finely wrought, like those other

early manuscripts. It also confirms that there was only one copy.

Scholars have not made much of the fact that Atterbury, a prominent Jacobite, encouraged Pope to burn *Alcander*. Although he dabbled in philology, Atterbury was no literary connoisseur; so why did Pope take his advice?<sup>76</sup> The answer may lie in the historical moment that Pope burned the poem and in the fortunes of his friends and allies at the time. The Jacobites had launched their first coordinated strike against the new King George in September 1715.<sup>77</sup> James Francis Edward landed at Peterhead on 22 December to lead the Earl of Mar's army south. Although the rebellion collapsed early in 1716, the English authorities recognized that the Stuarts still had significant popular support and moved quickly to remove some of the ringleaders, among them many of Pope's friends and patrons. Henry St John, Viscount Bolingbroke, had already defected to St Germain before the uprising, as had Higgons.<sup>78</sup> Granville, though, was arrested on charges of high treason in September 1715. Although he was never brought to trial, Granville remained in the Tower until February 1717, by which time Pope had destroyed the manuscript of *Alcander*. Pope's boyhood friend, the Jacobite hothead Charles Wogan, was captured on 14 November 1715 at Preston and, if not for a daring escape from Newgate, would have been tried for high treason on 5 May 1716.<sup>79</sup> A huge reward of £500 was issued for his arrest. Pope's man in Grub Street and Samuel Johnson's future mentor, Richard Savage, had come under government surveillance and was eventually brought in by a spy called Robert Girling.<sup>80</sup> Pope later said that Atterbury advised him to destroy the manuscript just before he fled.<sup>81</sup> We know that date is wrong, but this half-remembered detail suggests that Pope linked the destruction of *Alcander* with the persecution of other Jacobites.

Treason laws prohibited writing or printing literature that supported James

Francis Edward's claim.<sup>82</sup> The legal risks posed to printers and publishers forced Jacobites to circulate their writings in manuscript and to cover their tracks. Much clandestine Jacobite literature was destroyed by authors and readers. In 1702, for instance, the nonjuror Thomas Smith sent some Jacobite poems to Samuel Pepys, himself accused of Jacobitism, accompanied by a message to burn the poems after a single reading.<sup>83</sup> At this point hypothesis becomes conjecture. I suspect that Atterbury warned Pope that his poem could potentially be viewed by the authorities as seditious. If sensitive readers were alert to the topical application of Higgon's play in 1701, surely the latent contemporary meanings of *Alcander* as a poem about an usurped prince trying to win back his throne were impossible to miss after 1715. Pope was certainly scared of being accused of Jacobitism in February 1716, after his literary opponents publicly attacked the first volume of his *Iliad* translation for being a Jacobite text; he thought it prudent to delay publishing the second volume until "the Martial Spirit of the Rebels is quite quell'd."<sup>84</sup> If there were any traces of Jacobite allegory in or a discernible Jacobite application to *Alcander*, the safest course of action was simply to burn the manuscript. Undoubtedly, Pope had other reasons too for destroying it. He was revising and editing his poems for the forthcoming *Works* before the end of 1716. He pointedly omitted those early rants against Hanover, such as his *To the Author of a Poem, Intituled Successio* and the satirical epigram against Mary. As James McLaverty has cogently argued, Pope designed the volume to portray him as a literary colossus.<sup>85</sup> But it also framed him as a political neutral; there was no space here for a juvenile and potentially tendentious epic poem. The political and literary landscapes had shifted. Pope needed to adjust his output and public profile to the times.

Ignoring the textual remains of *Alcander* and the contextual factors that

contributed to its composition and destruction has distorted our understanding of Pope's early career. Pope had chosen a suggestive subject for his epic—itsself an ambitious undertaking. Royal exile was a staple motif of cavalier poetry in the civil wars, and of Jacobite verse and drama in the later seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, as Pope was well aware. Between 1701 and 1703, when Pope was actively writing the epic, royal exile was of enhanced topical interest. Granville's circle, in particular, were writing about this issue at that time, as were other Jacobite poets. So while we do not have biographical information to suggest that Pope met Granville prior to 1704, the young poet was certainly working in his intellectual orbit at an earlier date. Although only fragments of the text survive, ample contextual and anecdotal evidence has enabled us to deduce that Pope's poem about an exiled prince could and would have been applied by contemporary readers to the English succession crisis. The intentionality of any potential application is, of course, impossible to prove beyond doubt. Yet we might judge, like the critic of Higgons's *The Generous Conquerour*, that "it does not appear done by Chance but Choice." Pope abandoned the epic in 1704 to pursue other projects, but the work continued to circulate in a single manuscript. Around the time of the Jacobite uprising in 1715, Francis Atterbury encountered the *Alcander* manuscript and soon after encouraged Pope to burn it, probably, I have suggested, because its pugnacious subject matter made the poem potentially seditious. *Alcander* indicates that Pope's engagement with epic poetry went beyond mock-heroic and translation. It also suggests that Pope was working in a political idiom at a much earlier date than we have hitherto realized.

- 
- 1 Sir Joseph Spence, *Observations, Anecdotes, and Characters of Books and Men: Collected From Conversation*, 2 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1966), 1:18.
  - 2 Ibid.
  - 3 Maynard Mack, *Alexander Pope: A Life* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985), 94.
  - 4 George Sherburn, *The Early Career of Alexander Pope* (New York: Russell & Russell, 1963), 83; John M. Aden, *Pope's Once and Future Kings: Satire and Politics in the Early Career* (Knoxville: The University of Tennessee Press, 1978).
  - 5 Henry Power, *Epic into Novel: Henry Fielding, Scriblerian Satire, and the Consumption of Classical Literature* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), 93.  
Power does later acknowledge that “Pope did turn eventually, and briefly, to original epic” in *Brutus*, but ignores *Alcander* (117).
  - 6 Pat Rogers, *Pope and the Destiny of the Stuarts: History, Politics, and Mythology in the Age of Queen Anne* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 67-91. See too Rogers, *The Symbolic Design of Windsor-Forest: Iconography, Pageant, and Prophecy in Pope's Early Work* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2004); Howard Erskine-Hill, *The Poetry of Opposition and Revolution: Dryden to Wordsworth* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1996). For a summary of the Jacobite debate, see Brean Hammond, “Ye Jacobites By Name”, *Eighteenth-Century Life* 33 (2009): 37-43.

- 
- 7 Robert D. Hume, *Reconstructing Contexts: The Aims and Principles of Archaeo-Historicism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), 118. See too his “The Aims and Limits of Historical Scholarship”, *The Review of English Studies* 53 (2002): 399-422; “The Aims and Pitfalls of ‘Historical Interpretation’”, *Philological Quarterly* 89 (2010): 353-82; “Texts Within Contexts: Notes Toward a Historical Method”, *Philological Quarterly* 71 (1992): 69-100.
  - 8 See *Lost Plays in Shakespeare’s England*, ed. David McInnis and Matthew Steggle (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014).
  - 9 Maynard Mack, “Pope’s 1717 Preface with a Transcription of the Manuscript Text”, in *Augustan Worlds: Essays in Honour of A. R. Humphreys*, ed. J. C. Hilson et al. (Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1978), 85-106.
  - 10 Spence, *Anecdotes*, 1:17-8.
  - 11 George Sherburn, “New Anecdotes About Alexander Pope”, *Notes & Queries* 203 (1958): 346.
  - 12 David Womersley, “Dulness and Pope”, *Proceedings of the British Academy* 131 (2004): 246-7.
  - 13 See *Iliad* 5:78 and *Aeneid* 9:766.
  - 14 On which, see Christine Gerrard, *The Patriot Opposition to Walpole: Politics, Poetry, and National Myth, 1725-1742* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994), 93-4; Donald T. Torchiana, “Brutus: Pope’s Last Hero”, *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, 61 (1962): 853-67; Friedrich Brie, “Pope’s *Brutus*”, *Anglia*, 63 (1939): 144-85; Edward D. Snyder, “Pope’s Blank Verse Epic”, *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, 18 (1919): 580-83.
  - 15 *The Correspondence of Alexander Pope*, ed. George Sherburn, 5 vols (Oxford:

- 
- Clarendon Press, 1956), 1:2.
- 16 Sherburn, "New Anecdotes", 347.
- 17 Steven N. Zwicker, *Politics and Language in Dryden's Poetry: The Arts of Disguise* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984), 177-203. See too David Bywaters, *Dryden in Revolutionary England* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991); Murray Pittock, *Poetry and Jacobite Politics in Eighteenth-Century Britain and Ireland* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 101-6; Thomas H. Fujimura, "Dryden's Virgil: Translation as Autobiography", *Studies in Philology* 80 (1983): 36-50; Steven N. Zwicker and David Bywaters, "Politics and Translation: The English Tacitus of 1698", *Huntington Library Quarterly* 52 (1989): 319-46; Kirk Combe, "Clandestine Protest Against William III in Dryden's Translations of Juvenal and Persius", *Modern Philology* 87 (1989), 36-50.
- 18 *The Works of John Dryden*, ed. H. T. Sedenborg et al., 20 vols (Berkeley: University of California, 1956-2000), 5:343.
- 19 *Ibid.*, 5:556.
- 20 It seems probably that Pope's "underwater scene" was based on Spenser, particularly *The Faerie Queene*, canto 4, stanzas 11 and 12.
- 21 For an important new reading of the *Davideis*, see Niall Allsopp, "Turncoat Poets in the English Revolution" (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Oxford, forthcoming).
- 22 Murray Pittock, *The Invention of Scotland: The Stuart Myth and the Scottish Identity, 1638 to the Present* (London: Routledge, 1991), 12. On Cowley in the eighteenth century, see Arthur H. Nethercot, "The Reputation of Abraham Cowley (1660-1800)", *PMLA* 38 (1923): 588-641.

- 
- 23 John M. Aden, “‘The Change of Sceptres and Impending Woe’: Political Allusion in Pope’s *Statius*”, *Philological Quarterly* 52 (1973): 728-38.
- 24 *Ibid.*, 729.
- 25 *The Twickenham Edition of the Poems of Alexander Pope*, ed. John Butt et al., 11 vols (London: Methuen, 1639-69), 1:420-1.
- 26 [William Pittis], *Chaucer’s Whims: Being Some Select Fables and Tales in Verse* (London, 1701), 2.
- 27 See Theodore F. M. Newton, “William Pittis and Queen Anne Journalism”, *Modern Philology* 33 (1936): 169-86 and 279-302; John McTague, “‘There is No Such Man as Isaac Bickerstaff’: Patridge, Pittis, and Jonathan Swift”, *Eighteenth-Century Life* 35 (2011): 83-101.
- 28 Rogers, *Destiny of the Stuarts*, 74-91. The only biography is Elizabeth Handasyde, *Granville the Polite: The Life of George Granville, Lord Lansdowne, 1666-1733* (London: Oxford University Press, 1933).
- 29 For Granville’s parliamentary career, see *The History of Parliament: The House of Commons 1690-1715*, ed. Eveline Cruickshanks et al., 5 vols (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 4:79-83.
- 30 Pope, *Twickenham Edition*, 4:105.
- 31 A reward of £2000 was issued for apprehending Higgons and his brother, Thomas Higgons: see *Calendar of Treasury Books: Preserved in the Public Records Office*, ed. William A. Shaw, 32 vols (London: HMSO, 1904-57), 11:106.
- 32 *Pope’s Own Miscellany: Bring a Reprint of Poems on Several Occasions, 1717*, ed. Norman Ault (London: Nonesuch Press, 1935), 81.
- 33 On the date, see Robert D. Hume, “A Revival of *The Way of the World* in December

- 
- 1701 or January 1702”, *Theatre Notebook* 36 (1971): 30-6.
- 34 On *Gondibert*, see Niall Allsopp, “‘Let None Our Lombard Author Rudely Blame For’s Righteous Paine’: An Annotated Copy of Sir William Davenant’s *Gondibert* (1651)”, *The Library* 16 (2015): 24-50; Colin Burrow, *Epic Romance: Homer to Milton* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993), 240-3.
- 35 Bevil Higgons, *The Generous Conquerour: or, The Timely Discovery. A Tragedy* (London, 1702), 50, 27.
- 36 *Ibid.*, 75; cf. *The English Muse: or, A Congratulatory Poem upon Her Majesty’s Accession to the Throne of England* (London, 1702), 8.
- 37 *A Comparison Between the Two Stages, with an Examen of The Generous Conqueror* (London, 1702), 125. Authorship has often been ascribed to Charles Gildon, but this attribution is unlikely: see Staring B. Wells, “An Eighteenth-Century Attribution”, *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 38 (1939): 233-46.
- 38 Higgons, *Generous Conquerour*, sig. A4<sup>f</sup>.
- 39 *Ibid.*, sig. A2<sup>f</sup>.
- 40 *Comparison Between the Two Stages*, 127-8. The critic draws a topical application from the text: on this mode of reading, see the famous essays: Alan Roper, “Drawing Parallels and Making Applications in Restoration Literature”, in *Politics as Reflected in Literature*, ed. Richard Ashcroft and Alan Roper (Los Angeles: William Andrews Clark Memorial Library, 1989), 29-65; John M. Wallace, “Dryden and History: A Problem in Allegorical Reading”, *English Literary History* 36 (1969): 265-90 and “‘Examples Are Best Precepts’: Readers and Meanings in Seventeenth-Century Poetry”, *Critical Inquiry* 1 (1974): 273-90.
- 41 London, British Library, C.28.e.15, 483-4. See W. J. Cameron, “Pope’s Annotations

- 
- of 'State Affairs' Poems", *Notes & Queries* 203 (1958): 291-4.
- 42 David Nokes, "Lisping in Political Numbers", *Notes & Queries* 24 (1977): 228-9.
- 43 *A New Collections of Poems Relating to State Affairs* (London, 1705), 534.
- 44 Pope, *Twickenham Edition*, 6:16.
- 45 Aden, *Pope's Once and Future Kings*, 57-8; Arthur E. Case, "The Model for Pope's Verses *To the Author of a Poem Intituled Successio*", *Modern Language Notes* 43 (1928): 321-2.
- 46 Spence, *Anecdotes*, 1:16.
- 47 Pope, *Twickenham Edition*, 6:21; Alexander Pope, *The Dunciad in Four Books*, ed. Valerie Rumbold (London: Longman, 2009), 227; Spence, *Anecdotes*, 1:16.
- 48 *The Works of Alexander Pope*, ed. Joseph Warton, 9 vols. (London, 1797), 6:207.
- 49 Owen Ruffhead, *The Life of Alexander Pope* (London, 1769), 27.
- 50 Pope, *Twickenham Edition*, 6:23
- 51 *Ibid.*, 6:22.
- 52 See Lady Mary Wortley Montagu, *Essays and Poems and Simplicity, A Comedy*, ed. Robert Halsband and Isobel Grundy (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1976), 196.
- 53 On the redcoat uniform, see Cecil C. P. Lawson, *A History of the Uniforms of the British Army*, 5 vols (London: Davies, 1940-67), 1:9-11.
- 54 Abraham Cowley, *The Visions and Prophecies Concerning England, Scotland, and Ireland* (London, 1660), 22.
- 55 William King, *The Swan Tripe-Club in Dublin: A Satyr* (London, 1706), 5.
- 56 *The Rehearsal*, 7 (16 September 1704).
- 57 See Howard Erskine-Hill, "Pope and Slavery", *Proceedings of the British Academy* 91 (1998): 27-53.

- 
- 58 Pope, *Twickenham Edition*, 6:22
- 59 *The Collected Poems on James Graham, First Marquis of Montrose*, ed. Robin Bell (Hitchin: Mandeville, 1990), 14.
- 60 On the problem of echo and allusion, see James Loxley, “Echoes as Evidence in the Poetry of Andrew Marvell”, *Studies in English Literature 1500-1900* 52 (2012), 165-85.
- 61 See Andrew Lacey, *The Cult of King Charles the Martyr* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2003); Thomas N. Corns, ed., *The Royal Image: Representations of Charles I* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999); Kevin Sharpe, “So Hard a Text? Images of Charles I, 1612-1700”, *Historical Journal* 43 (2000): 383-405; Pittock, *Poetry and Jacobite Politics*, 22-4.
- 62 Rogers, *Destiny of the Stuarts*, 97-100.
- 63 See Joseph Hone, “Pope and the Politics of Panegyric”, *The Review of English Studies* 66 (2015): 106-23.
- 64 For instance: David Lloyd, *Memoires of the Lives, Actions, Sufferings and Deaths of Those That Suffered for the Protestant Religion and Allegiance to Their Sovereign* (London, 1668); William Howell, *Medulla Historiae Anglicanae: Being a Comprehensive History of the Lives and Reigns of the Monarchs of England* (London, 1679); *England’s Black Tribunal: Being the Characters of King Charles the First, and the Nobility that Suffer’d For Him* (London, 1680); R. B., *Delights for the Ingenious* (London, 1684); *The Works of Mr. John Cleveland* (London, 1687).
- 65 See, for instance, London, British Library, MSS Add. 37719, fol. 182<sup>v</sup>; Lansd. 682, fol. 108; Lansd. 852, fol. 48<sup>v</sup>. New Haven, Beinecke Library MSS b.137, 199; c.189, 58; fb.143, 5. Leeds, Brotherton Library, MS Lt 44, 191.

- 
- 66 Sherburn, *Early Career*, 83.
- 67 Mack, *Pope*, 94.
- 68 Spence, *Anecdotes*, 1:17.
- 69 Ibid., 18.
- 70 Ibid.
- 71 Ibid., 17.
- 72 Pope, *Correspondence*, 1:467.
- 73 Margaret J. Ezell, *Social Authorship and the Advent of Print* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999); Harold Love, *Scribal Publication in Seventeenth-Century England* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993).
- 74 The *Pastorals* manuscript is reproduced and transcribed in *The Last and Greatest Art: Some Unpublished Poetical Manuscripts of Alexander Pope*, ed. Maynard Mack (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1984), 22-69. On the earliest manuscript evidence of the *Pastorals*, see Howard Erskine-Hill, "Alexander Pope at Fifteen: A New Manuscript", *The Review of English Studies* 17 (1966), 268-77. Based on paleographical evidence, Stephen Bernard has established that it was Jacob Tonson the Younger, not his uncle (the more famous Jacob Tonson the Elder), who encouraged Pope to publish: see *The Literary Correspondences of the Tonsons*, ed. Stephen Bernard (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), 157.
- 75 See Robert M. Schmitz, *Pope's Essay on Criticism, 1709: A Study of the Bodleian Manuscript* (St. Louis: Washington University Press, 1962) and *Pope's Windsor-Forest, 1712: A Study of the Washington University Holograph* (St Louis: Washington University Press, 1952).
- 76 Atterbury acknowledged his philistinism: see, for instance, Pope, *Correspondence*,

---

1:378 and 2:78.

- 77 On the 1715 rebellion, see Daniel Szechi, *1715: The Great Jacobite Rebellion* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2006).
- 78 On Higgons's role in Jacobite intelligence, see *Calendar of the Stuart Papers Belonging to His Majesty the King, Preserved at Windsor Castle*, Historical Manuscript Commission, 7 vols (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1902), 1:378.
- 79 Wogan informed Swift in 1733 that "Mr. Pope and I lived in perfect union and familiarity for two or three Summers before he entered upon the stage of the world" and that he "had the honour" of bringing Pope "up to London, from our retreat in the forest of Windsor, to dress a la mode, and introduce at Will's Coffee House": *The Correspondence of Jonathan Swift, D.D.*, ed. David Woolley, 5 vols (Oxford: Lang, 1999-2014), 3:591. For Wogan's escape, see *The Secret History of the Rebels in Newgate* (London, 1717). The only biography is John M. Flood, *The Life of Chevalier Charles Wogan: An Irish Solider of Fortune* (Dublin: Talbot, 1922).
- 80 Girling's intelligence report is London, National Archives, SP 35/7/78.
- 81 Spence, *Anecdotes*, 1:17. On Atterbury's plot, see Eveline Cruickshanks and Howard Erskine-Hill, *The Atterbury Plot* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2004).
- 82 See Neil Guthrie, *The Material Culture of the Jacobites* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 18-40; Murray Pittock, *Material Culture and Sedition, 1688-1760: Treacherous Objects, Secret Places* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), 5-11; Ian Higgins, "Censorship, Libel and Self-Censorship", in *Jonathan Swift and the Eighteenth-Century Book*, ed. Paddy Bullard and James McLaverty (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 179-98.
- 83 *Private Correspondence and Miscellaneous Papers of Samuel Pepys, 1679-1703*, ed.

---

J. R. Tanner, 2 vols (London: Bell, 1926), 2:262. On Pepys's Jacobitism, see Clare Tomalin, *Samuel Pepys: The Unequalled Self* (London: Viking, 2002), 353-60.

84 Pope, *Correspondence*, 1:332. See John Oldmixon, *The Catholick Poet: or, Protestant Barnaby's Sorrowful Lamentation* (London, 1716).

85 See James McLaverty, *Pope, Print, and Meaning* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 46-81.