

## **Distribution Agreement**

In presenting this thesis or dissertation as a partial fulfillment of the requirements for an advanced degree from Emory University and its agents the non-exclusive license to archive, make accessible, and display my thesis or dissertation in whole or in part in all forms of media, now or hereafter known, including display on the world wide web. I understand that I may select some access restrictions as part of the online submission of this thesis or dissertation. I retain all ownership rights to the copyright of the thesis or dissertation. I also retain the right to use in future works (such as articles or books) all or part of the thesis or dissertation.

Signature:

---

Lauren Holt Matthews

---

Date

“Lyric Relations: Poetic Intersubjectivity in the Long Eighteenth Century”

By

Lauren Holt Matthews  
Doctor of Philosophy

English

---

Paul Kelleher  
Advisor

---

Misty Anderson  
Committee Member

---

Martine Watson Brownley  
Committee Member

---

Richard Rambuss  
Committee Member

Accepted:

---

Lisa A. Tedesco, Ph.D.  
Dean of the James T. Laney School of Graduate Studies

---

Date

“Lyric Relations: Poetic Intersubjectivity in the Long Eighteenth Century”

By

Lauren Holt Matthews  
B.A., Hendrix College, 2003  
M.A., University of Tennessee, 2005

Advisor: Paul Kelleher, Ph.D.

An abstract of  
A dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the  
James T. Laney School of Graduate Studies of Emory University  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy  
in English  
2012

## Abstract

“Lyric Relations: Poetic Intersubjectivity in the Long Eighteenth Century”  
By Lauren Holt Matthews

“Lyric Relations” considers three distinct moments in the long eighteenth century that critics find puzzling: the amorous lyrics of the Restoration, the verse paraphrases of Psalms, and the congregational hymns that developed in the first half of the eighteenth century. Taken singularly, these instances are fascinating and pose no insurmountable problems for scholars of the period. They simply seem to stand apart from the drama and fiction for which the period is better known, flashes of peculiar lyricality in an age of prose and heroic couplets. When we consider poets like John Wilmot, the Earl of Rochester; Elizabeth Singer Rowe; and Isaac Watts alongside one another, however, a new picture of lyricality emerges: a conception of the mode structured by representations of the self and the other rather than by the poem’s length or subject matter, by how these lyrics work rather than by how they look, a view of lyricism that acknowledges the ever shifting relationships between reader, poet, and lyric and the ways that we as readers negotiate these subject positions. I refer to this type of highly interactive engagement as lyric intersubjectivity.

From our scholarly perspective, we can consider distinct lyric moments together and explore relationships that poets like Rochester, Rowe, Watts, and others may not have acknowledged or wanted to acknowledge but that reveal a shared lyric dynamic that we do not see if we consider these moments of lyricality thematically or topically. Only after reconsidering the characteristics of the lyric mode do we discover that these three moments actually represent a constellation of eighteenth-century lyricality that is integral to the broader web of British lyricism. While poets from each of these moments in the period obviously worked under different cultural circumstances and had individual goals for and impulses guiding their verse, their poetic endeavors are connected through their reliance upon lyric intersubjectivity. “Lyric Relations” places them into conversation with one another, illuminating the surprising shared structural characteristics that reestablish the vitality of the lyric tradition within the long eighteenth century.

“Lyric Relations: Poetic Intersubjectivity in the Long Eighteenth Century”

By

Lauren Holt Matthews  
B.A., Hendrix College, 2003  
M.A., University of Tennessee, 2005

Advisor: Paul Kelleher, Ph.D.

A dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the  
James T. Laney School of Graduate Studies of Emory University  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy  
in English  
2012

## Acknowledgments

For my family, my friends, my committee, my colleagues,  
whose supremely generous and unfailing support and understanding  
made this possible.

Thank you all.

## Table of Contents

Chapter One	
“Their footsteps are scarcely to be traced” .....	1
Chapter Two	
“Thou shalt in me survey thy self reflected”: Amorous Intersubjectivity in Philips, Rochester, and Behn.....	43
Chapter Three	
Savior, Self, and Soul: Psalm Translations and the “Personal Lyric” .....	88
Chapter Four	
“Let us our voices raise”: Congregational Singing and Intersubjectivity.....	148
Bibliography.....	204

## **Chapter One** **“Their footsteps are scarcely to be traced”**

The long eighteenth century at first glance appears to be an unhappy time for lyric poets. Overshadowed by other poetic modes and other non-poetic genres, the lyric in the long eighteenth century no longer enjoyed the distinction of being one of the dominant modes of literary production. In spite of its relative lack of esteem with poets and critics like Alexander Pope and his fellow Scriblerians, a specifically lyrical mode of relationality persists throughout the poetry of the period and reconnects it to the broader English lyric tradition. How can such disparate poetic voices as those of Aphra Behn, John Wilmot, the Earl of Rochester, Joseph Addison, Alexander Pope, Elizabeth Singer Rowe, Isaac Watts, and Charles Wesley come together to form a meaningful picture of lyrical poetry in the long eighteenth century? Each of them, at various moments in their poetic canons, initiates a form of poetic engagement that is distinctively lyrical.

I refer to this method of engagement as lyric intersubjectivity, and it is one of the key attributes that binds together the tradition in the years between the early modern and Romantic periods. In the Restoration and eighteenth century, lyric intersubjectivity distinguishes poems that most scholars would readily characterize as lyrics; however, flashes of this textual dynamic also recur throughout poems that seem to set themselves apart from the tradition. Tracing this key current of lyric energy and probing the formal, temporal, and topical margins of seventeenth- and eighteenth-century lyricity reconstructs a neglected narrative of the lyric mode and illuminates the place of the long eighteenth century in the broader tradition of the lyric.



Put most simply, we relate to speakers, poets, and other subjects within poems that evoke this sort of intersubjectivity in a way that echoes how we relate to and interact with other individuals. The externalist schools of psychological and sociological theorists argue that through interactions with other individuals, we learn to think of and to consider ourselves as objects subject to interpretation by others.<sup>1</sup> The self, accordingly, is an external construction that resides at the intersections of our own first-person interpretations of self and of our intuited third-person perspective of self that we learn to construct through interaction with other individuals. Our notion of the self emerges where our self-perception meets our assumptions about what others think of us; in other words, our conception of self relies on our ability to negotiate and hold in equipoise multiple subject positions.

Lyric poetry in the long eighteenth century, I will argue, relies on this same ability. Further, the fact that lyric intersubjectivity is text-based means that as readers we have the time and the intellectual space and perspective to reflect on the intersubjective interactions that occur within the text as well as those that occur between ourselves and the subject positions available to us in and around the text. Further, evoking intersubjectivity within the textual realm means that we have more room for subjective “play”; the stakes of imagining the self from potentially threatening or destabilizing perspectives provided to us by lyric poets are much lower than they would be were we to move such interaction outside of the text. Though the parameters are clearly different than when we encounter

---

<sup>1</sup> Among the externalists Philippe Rochat builds upon in his *Others in Mind: Social Origins of Self-Consciousness* are Mead in his *Mind, Self, and Society*, Taylor in his *Sources of the Self*, Vygotsky in his *Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes*, and Wertsh in his *Voices of the Mind: Sociocultural Approach to Mediated Action*.

individuals intersubjectively outside of the text, lyric texts engage readers by representing and evoking intersubjective interaction and recreate for readers a subjective and self-reflexive negotiation that is second nature to us because it parallels the way we relate to both the external, social world and to our selves as objects within this world. By harnessing our related abilities both to negotiate a variety of shifting subject positions and to reflect upon the self as an object, Restoration and eighteenth century lyrics evoke intersubjectivity to parallel, to reinforce, and sometimes to destabilize the relational experiences described within the poem as well as those that occur between the poet, the text, and past, present, and future readers. Further, these lyrics offer us the opportunity to defamiliarize sociological reality, to experience the self as other, to disturb our notions of the self through the self-objectification necessary to explore the various subject positions available to us within and around the text.

This project brings together theories of cognitive and behavioral psychology and sociology and couples them with rhetorical and phenomenological concerns to recast the terms of critical conversation through which we engage formalist literary concerns. By setting voices like Erving Goffman's, George Herbert Mead's, and Philippe Rochat's into conversation with phenomenologists like Georges Poulet and Wolfgang Iser, new formalist critics like Heather Dubrow, and lyric theorists like Anne Carson and Helen Vendler, I will explore the ways in which this lyric intersubjectivity resounds through poetry in the period and focus on its rhetorical and affective impact in a wide variety of lyric texts. My framework builds upon the conception of erotic lyricity proposed by Carson, the spatial and architectural metaphors of

lyricality used by Dubrow, and the ventriloquistic lyric interiority posited by Vendler, Elder Olson, and Gabrielle Starr to explore the causes and mechanics of the relationality that drives our engagement with lyric poetry.<sup>2</sup>

Any attempt to specify, clarify, or narrow lyricality raises questions about received notions of what the label “lyric” entails. In practice, it is relatively easy to point to the Classical period and say “Sappho, Alcaeus, and Catullus wrote lyric poetry,” to turn to the Due- and Trecento and confidently consider Dante’s *La Vita Nuova* and Petrarch’s *Il Canzoniere* as inheritors of Orpheus, to trace the English lyric tradition from these sources through the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, to note how it flourishes in the Romantic period, and to chart its transatlantic leap to the pages of Bradstreet and Whitman and those who follow them. But even within these moments of certainty, few texts individually incorporate all or even most of the traits that scholars often associate with lyric verse.

---

<sup>2</sup> For more information on the lyric or lyricity generally, see Daniel Albright’s *Lyricality in English Literature* (1985), David Baker’s and Ann Townsend’s collection of essays entitled *Radiant Lyre: Essays on Lyric Poetry* (2007), Mutlu Konuk Blasing’s *Lyric Poetry: The Pain and Pleasure of Words* (2007), Marshall Brown’s “Negative Poetics: On Skepticism and the Lyric Voice” (2004), Jonathan Culler’s “Reading Lyric” (1985), Roland Greene’s *Post-Petrarchism: Origins of the Western Lyric Sequence* (1991), Chaviva Hosek’s and Patricia Parker’s collection *Lyric Poetry: Beyond New Criticism* (1985), Peter Huhn’s and Jens Kiefer’s *The Narratological Analysis of Lyric Poetry: Studies in English Poetry from the 16<sup>th</sup> through the 20<sup>th</sup> Century* (2005), Mark Jeffreys’s *New Definitions of Lyric: Theory, Technology, and Culture* (1998), C. Day Lewis’s classic *The Lyric Impulse* (1965), and Rosanna Warren’s *Fables of the Self: Studies in Lyric Poetry* (2008).

For further attention to the Early Modern lyric, see James Biester’s *Lyric Wonder: Rhetoric and Wit in Renaissance English Poetry* (1997), Jacob Blevins’s *Catullan Consciousness and the Early Modern Lyric in England: From Wyatt to Donne* (2004) and *Dialogism and Lyric Self-Fashioning: Bakhtin and the Voices of a Genre* (2008), and Jonathan F. S. Post’s *English Lyric Poetry: The Early Seventeenth Century* (1999).

On the lyric in the long eighteenth century, see Anna Cullhead’s *The Language of Passion: The Order of Poetics and the Construction of a Lyric Genre 1746-1806* (2002), Donald Davie’s *Augustan Lyric* (1974), Richard Feingold’s *Moralized Song: The Character of Augustan Lyricism* (1989), Norman McLean’s “From Action to Image: Theories of the Lyric in the Eighteenth Century” (1994), and Gabrielle Starr’s *Lyric Generations: Poetry and the Novel in the Long Eighteenth Century* (2004).

Lyricality is an unstable category. Consequently, lyric theory is fraught with challenges that critics respond to in various ways, usually by navigating three interrelated questions of scope: Can lyricality be considered and defined transhistorically, or, conversely, should we confine our studies of it to a more tightly focused chronological period? Should we attempt to craft a thorough catalog of lyrical elements that endeavors to encompass all the possible attributes of lyric verse, or should we selectively address and explore only particular lyric attributes? Finally, should we devise a taxonomic, qualitative, and systematic categorization of lyrical traits, or should we consider and represent lyricality more organically?

These problematic dimensions of lyric theory resound throughout the work of leading critics of the mode and continue to shape the nature of the field. Some scholars like M.H. Abrams, Vendler, Northrup Frye, and Williams attempt to construct qualitative, prescriptive definitions of the mode. Others, like Dubrow, Richard Feingold, and Starr, choose not to construct definitive lists of lyric characteristics; instead they discuss poetic attributes we commonly associate with the lyric tradition, though without claiming for these qualities any inherent lyricality. Consequently, we often encounter in studies such as theirs nebulous conceptions of lyricality reminiscent of Justice Potter Stewart's famous definition of pornography: it is difficult to classify fully, but we know it when we see it.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> In his opinion on the definition of hard-core pornography in *Jacobellis v. Ohio*, Justice Potter Stewart offered the following: "I shall not today attempt further to define the kinds of material I understand to be embraced within that shorthand description; and perhaps I could never succeed in intelligibly doing so. But I know it when I see it" (*Nico Jacobellis v. Ohio*. No. 378-184. Supreme Ct. of the US. 22 June 1964).

The appeal of each method should be clear, though both approaches come with their attendant drawbacks that substantially complicate scholarly engagement with the lyric *qua* lyric. Qualitative, prescriptive definitions of lyricality nearly always reduce the linguistic, rhetorical, and social complexity of many lyric poems to an unsatisfying combination of characteristics. While the attributes that comprise these sorts of definitions often appear in or apply to many lyric texts, they do not appear in or apply to all: lyric multiplicity thwarts such attempts at consolidation. Equally problematic, scholars who do not attempt to explicitly define lyricality risk perpetuating, at the very least, an abstract conception of the lyric mode that allows readers to imagine the lyric as they choose, enabling continuing misconceptions about the ways lyric verse modulates throughout our literary history. While the critics mentioned above certainly offer readers productive ways to consider lyric texts, we can circumvent the difficulties of applying them by expanding our conception of lyricality.

Qualitative definitions of the lyric mode are not difficult to find. The most readily available examples of these prescriptive definitions of lyricality reside in undergraduate textbooks. According to these sources, lyric poetry is variously “a brief, subjective poem strongly marked by imagination, melody, and emotion, and creating for the reader a single, unified impression,” “any fairly short, nonnarrative poem presenting a single speaker who expresses a state of mind or a process of thought and feeling” (qtd. in Williams 7), or “a brief imaginative and melodic poem characterized by the fervent but structured expression of the personal thoughts and emotions of a single, first-person speaker” (Murfin 276).

While these prescriptive definitions clearly are simpler and more reductive than we would like, handbooks and glossaries of literary terms abound

with formal definitions of the lyric that derive from more complex scholarly accounts of the mode. For example, some critics maintain the lyric's relationship to music and oral performance. C. Day Lewis claims "a lyric is a poem written for music—for an existing tune, or in collaboration with a composer, or in an idiom demanded by contemporary song-writers, or simply with music at the back of the poet's mind" (3). Donald Davie, in his anthology of Augustan lyrics, agrees with Lewis; he "trie[s] to take 'lyric' [...] to mean *a poem composed either to match an existing piece of music, or in the expectation and hope of a musical setting being contrived for it*" (4). According to these definitions, none of the poems we encounter in this project would be considered lyrics except the hymns in Chapter Four.

Other critics do not require that lyric poems be so closely connected to music. John Stuart Mill famously and rather quixotically refers to the lyric as "utterance overheard." For Northrop Frye, lyric is "the genre in which the poet [...] turns his back on his audience" (Frye 85). According to Elder Olson, lyricity is tied to interiority: "a lyric renders the events and activities of the mind [and] presents private thoughts and feelings unknown unless expressed [... It is] a single utterance, usually brief" (62, 64). In *The Art of Shakespeare's Sonnets*, Vendler argues that lyric poetry provides "aesthetically convincing representations of feelings felt and thoughts thought" (16). More recently, she claims "the lyric offers us the representation of a single voice, alone, recording and analyzing and formulating and changing its mind" (*Invisible Listeners* 1). According to these definitions and many others like them, a lyric poem, then, is a relatively short, seemingly private, melodic iteration of one speaker's

emotionally charged thoughts. None of these definitions, however, considers the affective power of the lyric as a definitive characteristic of the mode.

Qualitative, prescriptive definitions like these can help illuminate certain characteristics of lyric poetry and can raise significant questions about the mode. However, when we consider these definitions closely, we identify misconceptions embedded within them. Length cannot stand as a serious criterion. Williams, in *Prophetic Strain*, spends many pages documenting the development of the “greater lyric” of the Romantic period; Wordsworth’s *Ode: Intimations of Immortality from Recollections of Early Childhood*, after all, spans over two hundred lines.<sup>4</sup> Further, much of Milton’s comparatively shorter verse surely would not qualify as brief. Neither can a poem’s smoothness or melody characterize it as a lyric. Some of Donne’s most famous lyrics rely on their purposefully jangling lack of melodiousness to advance their rationally and carefully constructed claims. In “The Flea,” one of Donne’s most widely anthologized lyrics, we encounter both intentionally un-melodious metrics and prosody as well as a sharply analytical argument. While it does not exemplify the characteristics of prescriptive definitions of lyricity like those above, few critics would deny that “The Flea” is in fact a lyric poem. While some lyric poetry does “[turn] its back on [the] audience,” as Frye contends, other lyric texts, like Jonson’s “To My Book,” Donne’s “The Canonization,” and Petrarch’s Rima 1, address the reader directly. Finally, many lyric poems, like Milton’s “On the Morning of Christ’s Nativity” and Marvell’s “Horatian Ode,” narrate specific

---

<sup>4</sup> Williams describes in detail the characteristics she views as essential to the lyric mode. By focusing on lyric poetry in the eighteenth century, she hopes to identify the first stirrings of Romantic lyricism, rather than explore how lyricity found its way in a period where prose and irony were *de rigueur*.

events rather than confine their attention to exploring the poets' private thoughts and feelings. Clearly quantification and prescriptive categorization rarely capture the complex intertextual debts and generic innovations in individual lyrics.

Though quantifications of lyric qualities can be helpful, especially when discussing lyricality generally, we also should consider alternative expressions of lyricality to build upon specific aspects of more prescriptive definitions of the mode. Instead of relying on definitions that catalog characteristics of what a lyric looks like, sounds like, or treats, we should try to understand the *function* of lyric texts. The founding myth of the lyric mode, the story of Orpheus and Eurydice, demonstrates that *lyric function*, rather than lyric form or topic, is its distinguishing characteristic. Exploring lyric from the perspective of its functionality can allow us to reconceptualize the scholarly narrative that has cast out a number of Restoration and eighteenth-century lyric voices and also has, in many ways, constrained our engagement with texts that do not seem to be superficially lyrical.<sup>5</sup> Reconsidering lyricality will enable us to retrace the at times subtle lyric imprint that persists throughout the Restoration and eighteenth century, to complicate the story of poetic development that we tell about the period, and to transform our understanding of the relationship between lyricality

---

<sup>5</sup> J. Paul Hunter's article, "Missing Years: On Casualties in English Literary History, Prior to Pope," argues compellingly for a revision of the scholarly narrative of literary development in the Restoration and eighteenth century: "Not since the eighteenth century itself has there been anything like an evenhanded attempt to look at the full variety of that era's poetry" (436). Consequently, he calls on scholars of Restoration and eighteenth-century poetry to reclaim poetry that has "fall[en] into the cracks between" the Ages of Dryden and Pope (435). He relies on Giles Jacob's *Poetical Register* and Samuel Johnson's *Lives of the Poets* to demonstrate the skewed version of the literary history of the early eighteenth century inherited in large part from Pope himself. Hunter notes, "during the leaderless nonperiod under discussion, tens of thousands of poems were published and, apparently, read with greater frequency than even accounts of news and public events" (438). Many of these poems fit into the missing lyrical tradition that critics like Starr insist does not exist.



in the long eighteenth century and the broader lyric tradition.<sup>6</sup> This project reimagines lyricality and, in so doing, reveals the lost history of the lyric in the long eighteenth century.

In the lyric mode's mythic beginnings, a poem was considered lyrical if it were set to music and performed orally. According to the ancient Greeks, a lyric poem could showcase one singer, as in the case of monodic lyrics, or it could display the talents of multiple singers, as in the case of choral lyrics (Jevons 111-112). The venues of these performances varied, as well: they were performed as part of a larger public function like a wedding as well as at public events like anthology readings (Dubrow 40). According to these conceptions of lyricity, lyric verse in its simplest form was oral poetry accompanied by music. This unembellished definition, however, belies the performative power of lyric utterances to transform, to animate, and to reveal. Since the mode's inception, its practitioners harnessed these lyric capabilities to address a number of different topics, ranging from overtly public issues like war, politics, and policy to intensely private ones such as love, religion, and mourning. Further, lyric poets from disparate periods regularly interweave these seemingly contrasting topics within individual poems, resulting in powerful and compelling verse that, in even its earliest examples, does not conform to twentieth- and twenty-first century definitions of lyricity.

---

<sup>6</sup> Starr does not trace the lyric through the Restoration and the eighteenth century, because, she claims, "many if not most of the greatest literary figures of the century – Dryden, Swift, Fielding, Richardson, Johnson, Austen, Burney – either did not write lyric poems or wrote only few" (1).

Readers often register the compelling power of lyric poetry as an instinctive intellectual, emotional, or abstract impression. One of our inherited cultural myths, the legend of Orpheus, depicts these abstract concepts concretely and provides a poetic picture of intersubjectivity that, I will argue in the chapters to come, distinguishes lyric poetry and helps bind the poetic traditions of the long eighteenth century to the broader lyric tradition. Reactions to the power of Orpheus's lyrics within *The Metamorphoses* parallel and demonstrate within a fictive setting the reader's experience of engaging lyric verse. The story of Orpheus's doomed journey to the underworld to retrieve the lost Eurydice is well known, and its influence on later lyric poets and critics of lyric poetry is well documented. Poets rehearse this tale of lyric power again and again: Spenser, in Canto 10 of the *Faerie Queene*, Milton in "Il Penseroso," Dryden in "A Song for St. Cecilia's Day, 1687," Pope in his St. Cecilia's Day Ode and others, Samuel Johnson in a number of his poems, Wordsworth, Shelley, Keats – this list could go on and on. In these allusive moments, poets almost always invoke, and in invoking attempt recreate and harness for themselves, the power of Orpheus's words.

The latent intensity of Orpheus's lyric utterances first appears upon his descent through the Spartan gates to rescue Eurydice after her untimely death on their wedding day. Through melodious rhetoric – Ovid renders Orpheus's lyric performance in the form of a very logical and humble petition – and the suasive force of his lyrics, Orpheus convinces Persephone and Hades to release Eurydice. Ovid's description of Orpheus's words and, more importantly, their power to move his 'til then inexorable audience, focuses our attention on their lyric impact:

These words, accompanied on the plucked strings,  
 so moved the bloodless spirits that they wept;  
 Tantalus did not seek the receding water,  
 and on his wheel lay Ixion, astounded;  
 the birds let go the liver, and the daughters  
 of Danaüs were resting by their urns,  
 while you, oh Sisyphus, sat on your stone.

Then, for the first time ever, overcome  
 by the effects of song, the Furies wept,  
 nor could Persephone reject his prayer,  
 nor he who rules the underworld deny him [... .] (Ovid X.53-63)

The scene is worth revisiting: Orpheus's "words, accompanied on the plucked strings" "astounded" and overcame his auditors, who, "for the first time ever," relinquished their hold on a soul (X.53, 56, 60). However, the persuasive power of Orpheus's lyric performances extends beyond convincing pagan gods and their single-minded victims (X.53, 56).

In the eleventh book of his *Metamorphoses*, Ovid explains that Orpheus's lyrics also governed the movements of inanimate objects. As the narration of his death at the beginning of Book XI demonstrates, "as Orpheus compelled the trees / and beasts to follow him with suchlike songs, / [he] made the very stones skip in his wake" (XI.1-3). This idyllic scene is interrupted by a furious mob of scorned Thracian women, who cast stones and lances at "the vocalizing mouth of Apollo's seer," intent on silencing Orpheus forever (XI.11).<sup>7</sup> His performance thwarts their violent attempts on his life: one woman's lance "struck without wounding, being wreathed in leaves"; another's stone "was overwhelmed / by [his] words and music joined in harmony, / and, as though begging pardon for its mad daring, / fell at the poet's feet" (X.53, XI.12, 14-17).

---

<sup>7</sup> This moment of synecdoche is revealing: in aiming at his "vocalizing mouth," we can safely assume that the words issuing from his mouth were the true threat to the Thracian women. This short description locates as the source of the lyric's power the word, the text.

However, the power of Orpheus's lyric performance ultimately fails to protect him:

[...] mad fury was in charge,  
 but even so, their weapons would have been  
 made mild by the enchantment of his song,  
 had not the shrill clamor of Phrygian flutes,  
 the breaking tones of horns, the frenzied drums,  
 and the Bacchantes' applause and ululations  
 together overwhelmed his lyre's music;  
 when Orpheus could no longer be heard,  
 the stones were reddened with a poet's blood. (XI.19-27)

Orpheus's power lasted until he could no longer be heard; once his voice was overshadowed by the sheer volume – aural and material – of the “Phrygian flutes” and the ecstatic communal frenzy of the Dionysian Maenads, the power of his words to compel Gods and spirits, animals and trees, rocks and spears vanished. Their triumph, however, is momentary; not even being torn limb from limb silences Apollo's seer, nor does it permanently overthrow the power of his lyric utterances: “his head / and lyre, as they glide down your stream, / O Hebrus, now (miraculously!) mourn; / the lifeless tongue moans on along with it, / the moaning riverbanks respond in turn” (XI.69-74). Instead of rendering Orpheus mute and impotent, the Maenads' violent transgression against lyric verse serves to ensure its continuation: “Now head and lyre are borne down to the sea / beyond their native stream, until they reach / the coast of Lesbos, near Methymna's walls,” where they endow Sappho and the lyric poets on the Isle of Lesbos with their expressive and persuasive powers (XI.75-77).

Ovid's synecdochic rendering of Orpheus – “the vocalizing mouth of Apollo's seer” whose lifeless tongue continues his mournful song – brings into strong relief the enthralling force lyric verse has on readers. The stories established to explain its power indicate just how unique and compelling a

communicative medium lyric poetry is. Through its ability to engage and compel its audience, lyric verse is able to convey messages subtly yet emphatically. The Orpheus myth illustrates and explains this. Orpheus's lyrics move rocks and trees to obey him; further, in ways Ovid claims no one had accomplished before, Orpheus's lyric utterances move people, too, or at least mythic entities. As long as Orpheus's voice could be heard, the power of his voice was undeniable. To demonstrate the power that lyric poetry and the lyric poet have to move readers, Ovid literalizes lyric's figurative compulsive force through the Orpheus myth.

Even within this founding myth of lyricity, however, we learn very little about characteristics of lyric verse. We can see its rhetorical and persuasive force; we discover its ability to compel its audiences. And we know that Orpheus achieves these ends using only his words and his lyre. What the disparate poets listed above – Spenser, Milton, Dryden, Pope, Wordsworth, Keats, Shelley – seem to crave when they invoke Orpheus is not a specific iteration of formal lyricity but the *function* of Orphic poetry and its impact on readers: they covet its power to engage, to compel, to move. The specific words that Orpheus utters seem not to matter; neither does the precise musicality of Orpheus's lyre. When these poets invoke Orpheus, they mean to invoke the relational power of his verse.

As Ovid tells the story, Orpheus's lyric inheritor – literally, his lyre and head float down to the Isle of Lesbos – is Sappho. She represents the literary and textual turn in lyricity, shifting from the reported orality of the Orphic lyric to a text-based, linguistic mode of lyric exchange. Sappho manipulates the compulsive force of the Orphic oral lyric to translate that vitality into a more

subtle textual and psychological form. Sappho's extant lyrics underscore the mode's unique ability to compel audiences. The surviving fragments indicate that Sappho, like Orpheus, attempted to harness the mode's ability to evoke intimate psychological interaction with her readers. In her lyrics, Sappho focuses largely on amorous subjects; jealousy, love, regret, and desire saturate her remaining canon. Through its exploration of these topics, Sappho's verse rehearses this lyric dynamic and extends its reach beyond the oral and physical compulsion Orpheus practiced and into the textual realm; this shift adapts the compelling relationality described in and evoked by her lyrics so that its power could engage readers for millennia.

Through poems like the so-called Jealousy fragment, Sappho demonstrates this transformation of lyric power:

He seems to me equal to gods that man  
 whoever he is who opposite you  
 sits and listens close  
 to your sweet speaking  
 and lovely laughing--oh it  
 puts the heart in my chest on wings  
 for when I look at you, even a moment, no speaking  
 is left in me

no: tongue breaks and thin  
 fire is racing under skin  
 and in eyes no sight and drumming  
 fills ears

and cold sweat holds me and shaking  
 grips me all, greener than grass  
 I am and dead--or almost  
 I seem to me. (qtd. in Carson "Decreation" 188-9)

Unlike Orpheus, Sappho does not harness the compulsive power of the lyric mode to move readers to *do* anything. Instead, she evokes a psychological experience. A force similar to that Orpheus used to move his audience works

upon readers psychologically, compelling identification with numerous individuals both within the text – the “he,” the “me,” and the “you” – and outside of it – between Sappho and her readers ancient, early modern, modern, and contemporary. In this fragment, through our identification with the speaker, Sappho moves us between subject positions and thereby suggests how permeable subjective boundaries are within lyric poetry.

Our natural position as readers in the above fragment is that of a voyeur: we envision and watch the scene as described by the poet. As Sappho shifts to describe the feelings of the speaker from line 6 on, her evocative description pulls us into the speaker’s subject position, at once outside, voyeuristically looking in, and inside, experiencing the sensations Sappho so compellingly describes. Once we are inside the moment of the poem, we almost cannot help but occupy all other available subject positions in turn. The second person pronoun calls out to us across the millennia, seemingly foreseeing this specific moment of readerly engagement. We must be Sappho’s “you.” But we must also be the man of line one, “equal to gods,” listening close and closely. Intersubjectivity is the driving force of this lyric.

This intersubjectivity is the textual inheritance of Orpheus’s mythologized influence over his audience. Through it, we can reconceive of the way lyrics function. Lyric power is a result of readerly engagement with the poet and with the various subject positions the poet makes available to us in the text. It is through these classical sources, among others, that the ancient lyric tradition most directly influences the English lyric tradition. Many English poets craft versions of Sapphic remnants. Sir Philip Sidney includes a version of fragment 31 in his 1593 *Arcadia*, and Donne’s “Sappho to Philaenis” appears in 1633 (Jay

33, 85-6). Donne's poem, especially, demonstrates the continued influence not only of Sapphic subject matter but also of the intersubjectivity that distinguishes lyric verse. Though her influence is clearly present in the early modern period, the increase both in versions of her fragments and in the critical attention paid to her verse indicates that her influence picks up in the long eighteenth century. Thomas Creech, William Bowles, Anne Finch, Ambrose Philips, John Addison, George Jeffreys, Francis Fawkes, and E. Burnaby Greene all reproduce English adaptations of Sapphic fragments. Alexander Radcliffe, Nicholas Rowe, Alexander Pope, Mark Akenside, Tobias Smollett (in *Roderick Random*), Elizabeth Moody, George Dyer, and Mary Robinson each take up where Donne left off and craft poems based on Sappho's verse.<sup>8</sup> However, the amorous lyric tradition was not the only one inherited by the English practitioners of the mode. Many seventeenth- and eighteenth-century poets harness the lyric to engage martial, political, or other public issues. Wyatt, Spenser, Raleigh, Sidney, Shakespeare, Donne, Herrick, Lovelace, Marvell, Milton, Dryden, and Rochester all wrote politically or publicly focused lyric poems. English poets who wrote in the lyric mode often followed in the footsteps of ancient lyricists by tuning the suasive and compulsive powers of their metaphorical lyres to engage widely ranging subject matter.

Unsurprisingly, these Classical literary traditions perceptibly impact early modern English poets' and critics' conceptions of lyricity. Like Ovid, early English critics are reluctant to prescribe a set of particular characteristics to lyric

---

<sup>8</sup> For more information on the intriguing and surprising ways that Sappho modulates through English verse, see Jay and Lewis, *Sappho Through English Poetry* (1996).



texts; they do, however, each affirm lyric poetry's uncanny ability to compel its readers. This debt to Greek and Latin lyric traditions is clear in George Puttenham's *The Arte of English Poesie*, first published in 1589. In it, he subdivides the poetic types by form and subject matter: "As the matter of poesie is diverse, so was the form of their poems and the manner of writing, for all of them wrote not in one sort, even as all of them wrote not upon one matter. Neither was every poet alike cunning in all as in some one kind of poesie, nor uttered with like felicity. But wherein anyone most excelled, thereof he took a surname, as to be called a poet heroic, lyric, elegiac, epigrammatist, or otherwise" (Whigham 115). Puttenham rarely discusses lyrical poetry or lyric poets as such, though he does provide one short explanation of the mode: "Others who more delighted to write songs or ballads of pleasure, to be sung with the voice, and to the harp, lute, or cithern, and such other musical instruments, they were called melodious poets (*melici*), or by a more common name lyric poets, of which sort was Pindar, Anacreon, and Callimachus with others among the Greeks, Horace and Catullus among the Latins" (Whigham 115). Lyric verse can praise deities and political leaders ("In What Form of the Poesie the God of the Gentiles was Praised"), censure and rebuke political leaders ("In What Form of Poesie the Evil and Outrageous Behaviours of Princes was Reprehended"), woo ("Of the Shepherds or Pastorall Poetry Called Eclogue"), and lament. The somewhat unmethodical discussions of lyricity that occur throughout the remainder of *The Arte* reflect the mode's variety but also implicitly underscore its persuasive ability: lyrics not only mourn and praise; they also rebuke, censure, and woo.

Philip Sidney, like Puttenham, takes up lyricity in his *Defense of Poesie* (1595). And like Puttenham, Sidney shies away from qualitative definitions of lyricity. Of course Sidney's best-known claim in this text concerns his assertions about the value of verse and verse making to English society. The purpose of poetry, Sidney claims, is "to teach and delight" and to "borrow nothing of what is, hath been, or shall be; but range, only reined with learned discretion, into the divine consideration of what may be and should be. [...] And imitate both to delight and teach, and delight to move men to take that goodness in hand, which without delight they would fly as from a stranger; and teach to make them know that goodness whereunto they are moved" (10). For Sidney, all fit and proper poetry has the potential to inspire good in its readers, focusing our attention onto the didactic power of lyric texts and, in so doing, implying their important public function.

When Sidney focuses on lyric poetry and addresses precisely how lyric verse performs the didactic function he suggests all poetry should strive for, Sidney concentrates his attention on the mode's ability to compel readers through heightened identification with the subject or feeling evoked by the poet. Sidney describes lyric's ability to move listeners to patriotic action and devotion (29), its capacity to woo and court (52), and its power to fill up both audience and lyric poet with religious fervor (52). Time and again, as he specifies the various uses of lyric poetry, Sidney addresses a characteristic of the mode that lyric poets demonstrated for centuries and that Puttenham noted before him; it is clear to Sidney that poems fall within the lyric tradition not because they take up one subject or another or because they demonstrate certain specific formal

characteristics but because of their unique ability to engage and compel their readers.

In the years following the Restoration, critical conversations about lyricality became more systematic, empirical, and descriptive. Dryden's criticism showcases this shift better than any other scholarship of the period. He focuses on specific attributes he observes in lyrics he deems successful without concentrating on the topical choices lyric poets made. Dryden valued very highly the lyrical output of the most talented of his contemporaries. Though he admits that the previous literary generation might surpass his own in their dramatic output, contemporary poets, both lyric and epic, outshine early modern lyric poets: "if we yield to [early modern writers] in [dramatic] poesy, we more than surpass them in all the other; for in the epic or lyric way, it will be hard for them to show us one such amongst them, as we have many now living or who lately were" (*Essay of Dramatic Poesy* 41). He delineates the particular attributes of later seventeenth-century lyric verse he finds so admirable and compelling: "[Early modern poets] can produce nothing so courtly writ, or which expresses so much the conversation of a gentleman, as Sir John Suckling; nothing so even, sweet, and flowing as Mr. Waller; nothing so majestic, so correct as Sir John Denham; nothing so elevated, so copious, and full of spirit, as Mr. Cowley" (41). According to Dryden, these poets "first taught us to mould our thoughts into easy and significant words, to retrench the superfluities of expressions, and to make our rhyme so properly a part of the verse, that it should never mislead the sense, but itself be led and governed by it" (41). Clearly Dryden values courtliness, evenness, sweetness, a flowing rhythm, majesty, correctness, elevation and spirit in his lyric verse. Some of these traits, like the flowing

rhythm and evenness, are formal. Others, like Cowley's spirit and Denham's majesty, however, gesture toward the sublimity that Dryden claims poetic geniuses like Juvenal are capable of evoking: the intersubjective transport of the soul of the reader through her engagement with the poem (*A Discourse on the Original and Progress of Satire* 51).

Like Dryden, Samuel Johnson perpetuates the critical trend toward a more empirical study of English literary achievement, though he continues to focus the bulk of our attention on the function of those specific lyric attributes, attributes that open up the lyric text and help evoke an intersubjective response. In his *Lives of the English Poets*, Johnson appraises the works of fifty-two of "the most eminent" of England's seventeenth- and eighteenth-century poets. In his characterization of lyrical verse, Johnson includes poems of "the higher species of lyric poetry" that treat their subject matter in an elevated, noble style ("Life of Congreve" *Lives of the Most Eminent English Poets* vol. III 65-74) as well as "lyric poems [...] of the light and airy kind, such as trip lightly and nimbly along, with the load of any weighty meaning" ("Life of Shenstone" *Lives of the Most Eminent English Poets* vol. IV 126-131).

Johnson also considers the lyric mode at some length in his *Rambler* 158, where he illuminates certain characteristics of the lyric mode that facilitate its unique propensity for engaging readers psychologically. "The imagination of the first authors of lyric poetry," Johnson explains, "was vehement and rapid, and their knowledge various and extensive" (198). These lyric poets "applied themselves to instruct, rather by short sentences and striking thoughts, than by regular argumentation" (198). These lyricists, "finding attention more successfully excited by sudden sallies and unexpected exclamations, than by the

more artful and placid beauties of methodical deduction, [...] loosed their genius to its own course, passed from one sentiment to another without expressing the intermediate ideas, and roved at large over the ideal world with such lightness and agility that their footsteps are scarcely to be traced" (198).

Johnson's insights into the function of lyric's power to engage and compel readers are rather astounding. Implicit in them is a system of binaries: the lyric mode stands on one side; on the other stands all literary output that relies on explicit argumentation, deduction, reason, or leaving no stone unturned – no matter how artful, beautiful, or subtle. The didactic goals of lyrics, Johnson explains, rely on a peculiar form of readerly engagement that they evoke through expansiveness, not in the sense of having an expansive scope or presenting an expansive view – quite the contrary – but expansiveness in the sense of providing space, space for the reader to fill with her own thoughts and feelings, the thoughts and feelings evoked and directed ever so subtly and delicately by the poet. Though the poet conducts the reader down the chosen path, in lyrics, the poet is much less with us, much less an overt presence, than in other literary forms. The spaces left in lyric poems as a result of the lyricist's passing "from one sentiment to another without expressing the intermediate ideas" and using "short sentences and striking thoughts" require the reader to fill in these gaps.

Lyric poets count on their readers to help make the meaning of the lyric text; they are partners, each considering the other in a delicate intersubjective relationship. Through this partnership, lyrics invite readers into the subjective experience they describe, rely on them to make their meaning, require that to do so readers must imaginatively go outside of themselves, envision themselves as inhabiting the various subject positions within and around the text, and see

themselves and their opinions within it as they trace the impressions left by the poet. To achieve its didactic goals, a lyric text must bring the reader into this experience of creating meaning, then, through the perspective on herself that the reader gains by inhabiting the subject positions within and around the text, allow the reader to reflect on herself and her thoughts, her feelings, and her beliefs that the lyric illuminates. Without the expansiveness that invites readers into the very center of the text, lyrics would lose their unique power to engage and compel readers. The magic of lyrics happens in the blanks, the spaces between, the voids in meaning.<sup>9</sup>

The type of engagement that lyrics evoke is difficult to discuss in a clear and specific manner because it is such an abstract concept. To surmount this difficulty, critics often attempt to render it into concrete terms by adopting various metaphors that describe it. Many scholars of lyricity, including Rainer Maria Rilke, Carson, and Elizabeth Hull, deploy an erotic metaphor in their considerations of this lyric phenomenon. In his *Letters to a Young Poet*, Rilke claims that the experience of a text “lies so unbelievably close to the sexual, close to its pain and its pleasure, that both phenomena are only different forms of the same longing and bliss” (27). In her discussion of ancient amorous lyrics, Carson notes a triangular erotic relationship between the speaker of the poem and the speaker’s beloved. The third position on that erotic triangle is a continually shifting version of the lover-speaker that is simultaneously the speaker’s flawed conception of him or herself and the beloved’s idealized version of the speaker.

---

<sup>9</sup> I suspect that the joint venture of meaning-making in lyric texts is at the center of the “ah-ha!” moment we often experience when we read lyric texts, a moment of reward that feels like we have discovered something essential, something bigger than the text, the poet, ourselves. This affective payoff, again I suspect, is one of the main reasons that readers keep coming back to lyric poetry.

According to Carson, “both possibilities are projected on a screen of what is actual and present by means of the poet’s tactic of triangulation. That godlike [idealized] self, never known before, now comes into focus and vanishes again in one quick shift of view. As the planes of vision jump, the actual self and the ideal self and the difference between them connect in one triangle momentarily. The connection is *eros*” (62). Carson extends this mode of relationality outside of the amorous lyric itself. She explains, “As readers we too are meant to feel this paradoxical pull of feelings [..., we too] are typically and repeatedly drawn into a conflicted emotional response which approximates that of the lover’s soul divided by desire” (84-5).

Of course the erotic metaphor is not the only one critics rely on to help clarify the way that lyrics engage their readers. In *The Challenges of Orpheus*, Heather Dubrow utilizes architectural terminology as her trope for the kind of subjective movement and multiplicity inherent in early modern lyrics. As she attempts to chart the complex relationships inherent in certain early modern lyrics, Dubrow envisions a glass high-rise building like Jean Nouvel’s Guthrie Theater in Minneapolis. Its glass-walled counterpart in Atlanta, Renzo Piano’s High Museum of Art, could easily stand in for Nouvel’s Guthrie Theater as well. When one gazes at these edifices, Dubrow explains, “it is impossible to tell what is inside and what is out, which reflections come from denizens and which from observers, and indeed, where the building should be said to begin and end” (55). Further, “using mirrors and glass [...] confound[s] boundaries between parts of the construction and between its audience and what they are observing. Subject is always becoming object, object always becoming subject[....] Spectators themselves becom[e] subjects and objects” (56). For Dubrow, this visual

metaphor helps elucidate the psychological interaction that occurs within lyric poems. By “recognizing that range of positions [, one] reveals the fluidity and variety of the relationship of listeners and readers to the text and its speaker” (56).

Dubrow, after Bakhtin and contrary to Helen Vendler, terms the available subject positions within and outside of the lyric poem heteroglossia (94). However, she does not wholly reject Vendler’s ventriloquistic model. She argues that the empathy and “identificatory voicing” Vendler claims are fundamental to lyrical poetry are in fact only one level of subjective positioning and interaction available to readers. Vendler characterizes lyric poetry as private and available for the reader to articulate as her own: “One is to utter them as one’s own words” (*The Art of Shakespeare’s Sonnets* 18). Of course Vendler is not alone in this argument. Anne Williams reiterates this contention in her discussion of the eighteenth century turn toward the longer “greater lyric” of the Romantic period. According to Williams, “the lyric is life shared; that is, the lyric may be distinguished from other modes by the unique angle of vision it permits its audience – from the inside rather than the outside of its characters” (14). Further, “the lyric perspective is akin to the one from which we all experience ‘reality’; the peculiarity of the lyric poem is that it allows us to assume the perspective of another individual consciousness” (14). Williams proposes this engagement as a defining characteristic of lyricity<sup>10</sup>: “the lyric mode exists in literature when the author induces the reader to know, from within, the virtual experience of a more

---

<sup>10</sup> Williams does not develop this conception of lyrical engagement further; because she does not, and in spite of the fact that our notions of lyric interaction differ markedly, her insistence upon the intense connection between reader and poet informs the conception of readerly engagement driving my project.



or less particularized consciousness. When this aim constitutes the predominant organizing principle of a poem, we say that the poem is a lyric" (15). In spite of Vendler's and Williams's convincing views of the way readers relate to lyric texts, the way we relate to subject positions available within the lyric seems more complicated than they suggest. The lyric requires more of the reader than the simple identification with the poet or speaker that the ventriloquistic model of relationality offers. Rather than empathically inhabiting one other static subject position as Vendler and Williams suggest, lyricity instead rests on the reader's ability to inhabit the positions of "multiple and shifting listeners" (Dubrow 57).

Vendler, Williams, Dubrow, and Carson each focus on the relationship between reader, poet, and lyric text. Each concludes that as readers of lyric poetry, we negotiate the various subject positions available to us in the poem. Vendler and Williams render this relationship more unidimensionally than does either Carson or Dubrow. Dubrow's discussion of multiple subject positions and readerly interaction with these positions ties in closely with Carson's discussion of the erotic interaction between poet, poem, and reader in *Eros the Bittersweet*. Though Carson ostensibly limits her discussion to amorous texts, her discussion of the rhetorical positioning – and its slippery ambiguity – in these texts seems related to the kinds of relationality Dubrow alludes to in *The Challenges of Orpheus* and that I find characteristic of the lyric mode. Dubrow's and Carson's models highlight characteristics of lyric engagement that imply that subjective movement, interaction, projection, and multiplicity should be considered the fundamental characteristics of the relationship between reader, poet, and lyric. I

refer to this type of highly interactive readerly engagement as lyric intersubjectivity.<sup>11</sup>

Lyric intersubjectivity mirrors social relationality. This textual phenomenon harnesses learned social behaviors to elicit certain affective responses in readers. The externalist school of psychologists and sociological theorists argue that through interactions with other individuals, we learn to think of and consider ourselves as interpretable objects. “The self is externalized in the relation to others” in the world outside of the mind; “the origins of selfhood are situated in the transaction of the individual with others” (Rochat 13). Cognitive theory, sociology, psychology, and the phenomenological and psychological dimensions of reader response criticism provide a vocabulary for discussing these kinds of interactions. According to Philippe Rochat, George Herbert Mead, and Erving Goffman, the self is “social in nature,” an external

---

<sup>11</sup> Gabrielle Starr, in *Lyric Generations: Poetry and the Novel in the Long Eighteenth Century*, explores the generic negotiations of interiority between the novel and the Romantic lyric in the eighteenth century. Starr and I share an interest in lyric subjectivity and in the importance of the reader’s reaction to the subjectivity represented in the texts of choice:

At issue [in the relationship between the lyric and the novel] is an affective program, an attempt to frame sense and make it not just understandable but shareable, to offer up personal experience as more than individual – as participatory. [In Donne, Herbert, and *Clarissa* we see] the power of the lyric, if not to overcome the disjunction of human subjects, at least to make sensible the lack – or loss – of mutuality. [Both lyric and novel maintain] an integrity of the subject, a record of the consciousness and its desire to reach outward. Subjectivity in these terms is an ideal construction that seeks the participation of others in an imaginative intimacy (a search for whose failures are as important as its successes). Response becomes as much a part of the lyric moment as the artifact or carefully worked object. (45-6)

Starr’s understanding of the give and take between lyric and the novel dovetails nicely with my study if one views the interplay between lyric and novelistic subjectivity as simply one dimension of the lyric’s development in the period rather than the single story of the lyric in the long eighteenth century. The tradition that Starr traces, however, overlooks the lyric in the Restoration and eighteenth century. In Starr’s view of the period, it is impossible to trace lyrical tendencies through the poetry of the long eighteenth century because its “greatest literary figures” produced little lyric verse (1). However, as the rest of this study demonstrates, some of the period’s “greatest literary figures” do in fact produce poetry that is part of the lyric tradition, even in poems assumed to be outside of it.

construction that resides at the intersections of our own first-person interpretations of self and of our intuited third-person perspective of self that we learn to construct through interaction with others (13-14). In other words, our notion of the self emerges where our self-perception meets our assumptions about what others think of us; our conception of self relies on our ability to negotiate and consider simultaneously multiple subject positions. "To be human is primarily to have the propensity to perceive and represent oneself through the eyes of others" (15). Our ability to function socially relies on this intersubjective relationality; in fact, our every interaction with other individuals, and even our ability to consider ourselves as individuals, bears the marks of our ability to conceptualize our relationships with others intersubjectively.

Interactions between reader, poet, and lyric often mirror this intersubjectivity that governs social exchanges. For Georges Poulet, in "Criticism and the Experience of Interiority," this intersubjective give-and-take characterizes the reader-author relationship: "I feel sure that as soon as I think something, that something becomes in some indefinable way my own. Whatever I think is a part of *my* mental world. And yet [as I read] here I am thinking a thought which manifestly belongs to another mental world, which is being thought in me just as though I did not exist" (44). Poulet continues, "Since every thought must have a subject to think it, this *thought* which is alien to me and yet in me, must also have in me a *subject* which is alien to me. It all happens, then, as though reading were the act by which a thought managed to bestow itself within me with a subject not myself" (44). Drawing the parallels to sociological and psychological intersubjectivity even more clearly, Poulet explains:

Whenever I read, I mentally pronounce an *I*, and yet the *I* which I pronounce is not myself. [...] For as soon as something is presented as *thought*, there has to be a thinking subject with whom, at least for the time being, I identify, forgetting myself, alienated from myself. [...] Another *I*, who has replaced my own, and who will continue to do so as long as I read. Reading is just that: a way of giving way not only to a host of alien words, images, ideas, but also to the very alien principle which utters them and shelters them. (44-5)

Poulet further considers the subjective give and take that occurs when readers encounter a text: "I begin to share the use of my consciousness with this being whom I have tried to define and who is the conscious subject ensconced at the heart of the work. He and I, we start having a common consciousness" (48).

Poulet here gestures toward the kind of intersubjective engagement that, as we will see, runs like a current through the poetry of the long eighteenth century.

Wolfgang Iser in "The Reading Process: A Phenomenological Approach" revises and expands Poulet's characterization of the reader-author relationship. Iser explains, "in thinking the thoughts of another, [the reader's] own individuality temporarily recedes into the background, since it is supplanted by these alien thoughts, which now become the theme on which [the reader's] attention is focused" (Tompkins 67). Further, he explains this intersubjectivity in slightly different terms. According to Iser, "as we read, there occurs an artificial division of our personality, because we take as a theme for ourselves something that we are not" (67):

Consequently when reading we operate on different levels. For although we may be thinking the thoughts of someone else, what we are will not disappear completely – it will merely remain a more or less powerful virtual force. Thus, in reading there are these two levels – the alien "me" and the real, virtual "me" – which are never completely cut off from each other. [...] Every text we read draws a different boundary within our personality, so that the virtual background (the real "me") will take on a different form. (67)

Iser locates within the mind of the reader the identification and ventriloquization that Rochat, Mead, and Goffman pinpoint within the mind of the individual negotiating society through the honed skill of intersubjectivity.

Lyric poems serve as microcosmic versions of this social intersubjective interaction, recreating for readers a self-reflexive negotiation that is second nature to us because it parallels the way we relate to both the external, social world and to our selves as objects within this world. Lyric poetry's unique ability to evoke intersubjectivity relates back to the characteristics about it that Johnson described, characteristics that lend it a sense of expansiveness. Perhaps, though, we ought to consider why lyrics as opposed to novels or plays can trigger this sort of engagement. At center, this issue comes back to the author.

To turn back to Johnson, and to skew ever so slightly his words, we do not relate to non-lyric texts intersubjectively because we can certainly trace the footsteps of the author of a novel, a short story, a play, or another mode of poetry. As we read lyrics, we do not have to imagine them situated inside a broader fictive world, as we almost certainly do prose fiction or plays. Consequently, the lyric seems less fictive, more earnest, and more immediate. When we are within the world of a play or a novel or a short story, we are always aware of our being in a fictive world. This awareness hampers intersubjectivity. We of course still relate to characters – we ventriloquize their voices – but the effect is not the same. Because the details of their world are so present, so three-dimensional – especially when we consider performed plays – and so predetermined, we tend to think of the subject positions we encounter in fictive prose or plays within *their* world rather than think of the perspective our engagement with them provides on our own, and when we do manage a level of

engagement approaching intersubjectivity, it is typically after some effort. Relatedly, we can engage lyric texts intersubjectively so easily because they seem private, while the overt constructedness of prose fiction or plays reminds us that they are very obviously public and crafted as public objects. Because of this, we engage with them differently. As overtly public texts, their constructedness, their value as entertainment, and their didacticism weigh heavily on our minds, typically preventing intersubjectivity. While length is not a prerequisite of lyricality, lyrics' relatively shorter length helps us perpetually suspend our acknowledgement that lyrics are private, spontaneous, and not fictive. This brevity, not just in word count but in explicitly presented meaning, enables us to maintain the fantasy – and it certainly is a fantasy – that lyrics are not public texts crafted purposefully by a poet to elicit specific reactions in us as readers. This fantasy, however, allows us to approach lyric texts differently than we might approach other forms of literature, with a willingness to earnestly bring ourselves to the lyric and join the poet in creating its meaning. While we certainly enjoy moments of intersubjective engagement with characters in novels, plays, and other non-lyric texts, only lyrics provide a space for and cause the sustained intersubjectivity that makes us complicit in the poet's didactic goals without our conscious knowledge.

While lyric intersubjectivity echoes social relationality, this is not to say that they are direct reflections of one another. In fact, bringing intersubjectivity into the textual realm expands its power to reveal aspects of ourselves as individuals and of our collective tendency to relate to one another intersubjectively; further, it provides insight into the ways that poets envisioned the self and its relationship to the other at various moments in our history.

Whether the poet hopes to proselytize readers by invited them to experience through her speakers what she considers to be an ideal relationship with God, or whether the poet hopes to convince his readers of the impracticability of the libertine lifestyle, the poet succeeds by evoking an intersubjective response in readers. Rather than exactly parallel social intersubjectivity, poets incorporate textual versions of this sort of interaction within their lyrics, and it is the inclusion of this interaction that makes lyrics so resonant.

Adding the literary to the psychological and sociological theories of Rochat, Mead, and Goffman allows us to examine intersubjective relationality outside of the fraught experiences of real world social encounters. Examining this psychological and sociological phenomenon textually complicates the intersubjectivity envisioned both by Iser and Poulet and by Mead, Rochat, and Goffman. Rochat's detailed characterization of an individual's interaction with others illuminates the fact that what Poulet and Iser see as a relatively easy shift between subject positions is in fact a complex combination of psychological moves. For the purposes of my interest in lyric relationality, Iser's "alien 'me'" is the self turned interpretable object; his "real, virtual 'me'" is the self as intersubjective interpreter (67). Rochat's model reminds us that intersubjective identification with an other relies on self-objectification. When you consider this dimension of lyric intersubjectivity, it becomes clear that, through mirroring the intersubjective relationality that drives social interaction, these texts can both reinforce and destabilize the relational structure by which we understand both our selves and others, consequently holding the power to bolster our conception of self, to disturb it, or paradoxically and more likely, to achieve some combination of these. Understood in these terms, lyric texts not only

demonstrate and evoke lyric intersubjectivity; they also, perhaps disturbingly, bring to our attention the subjective instability that underlies Rochat's conception of social relationality and Iser's and Poulet's notions of textual relationality.

Though Alexander Pope is better known for his endeavors within other poetic modes,<sup>12</sup> his "Eloisa to Abelard" illustrates many of the characteristics of lyric intersubjectivity that we will encounter and discuss more fully in later chapters. This lyric text demonstrates how intersubjectivity mediates amorous and spiritual relationships as well as its role in mediating our own self-image, revealing through Eloisa's pain the subjective consequences for the individual who cannot connect with an other intersubjectively. Further, this text highlights how lyric intersubjectivity – as a textual phenomenon rather than simply as a means of relating to other individuals in the world – offers a greater capacity for poets and readers, through our intersubjective interaction with the speaker and text, to express and understand themselves and the ways that they relate to the other.<sup>13</sup> By tracing the layers of intersubjectivity evoked through the text, we can better understand the complicated intersubjective maneuvering that readers undertake as they engage a lyric.

In "Eloisa to Abelard," we see, we feel the subjective consequences of supreme psychological isolation. In losing her means of relating to Abelard and

---

<sup>12</sup> In fact, Pope's poetic and very public derision of a number of lyric poets of the long eighteenth century, especially in *Peri Bathous* and *The Dunciad*, helped cast them out of the critical-literary narrative we tell about the period, as we will see in coming chapters.

<sup>13</sup> "Letters," or text, we are told "live, they speak, they breathe what love inspires, / Warm from the soul, and faithful to its fires, / The virgin's wish without her fear impart, / Excuse the blush, and pour out all the heart, / Speed the soft intercourse from soul to soul, / And waft a sigh from Indus to the Pole." (53-58). The notion of commingling souls, as we will see in Chapter Two is shorthand for intersubjectivity, and Pope clearly claims in these lines a greater power for text to evoke intersubjectivity than for "real world" encounters between individuals and for that intersubjective connection made via text to be stronger and more honest than in person.



in standing unable to connect intersubjectively with God, Eloisa loses her touchstone on her self-perception. Because she cannot attain or maintain her any level of intersubjectivity with an other, Eloisa feels unmoored from her former reality, separated from her former picture of herself. In the text, we seem to have unmediated access to Eloisa's isolation and the pain that accompanies it, pain at her separation from both Abelard and from God. The isolation she grieves is not physical but psychological, and when we consider that what she is missing is an intersubjective connection with someone outside of herself, we can see that her grief is as much or more for herself as it is for her lost lover or the God she cannot manage to devote herself to.

Eloisa sets the terms of her anguish from the first stanza:

In these deep solitudes and awful cells,  
Where heav'nly-pensive contemplation dwells,  
What means this tumult in a vestal's veins?  
Why rove my thoughts beyond this last retreat?  
Why feels my heart its long-forgotten heat?  
Yet, yet I love! – From Abelard it came,  
And Eloisa yet must kiss the name. (1-8)

She accepts her physical separation from Abelard, but the emotional, the psychological separation she feels is the cause of her turmoil. Because of it, her thoughts rove beyond the walls of her convent, her mind reaches out for the only connection she can yet have with Abelard, an intersubjective one (5). Though we do not know it at first reading but as we will discover as we move through Pope's couplets, what Eloisa longs for is an intersubjective connection – with God or with Abelard – and through this intersubjective connection, a renewed perspective from which she can reenvision her self.

Eloisa's attempts to reach outside of herself psychologically and imaginatively make up the bulk of the lyric. She begs for some information from

Abelard, some explanation of his own state so that she might understand his point of view and, through an intersubjective connection with him, correct her own perception of herself. Without any better information, she perceives him as cold and unmoved:

For thee the fates, severely kind, ordain  
 A cool suspense from pleasure and from pain;  
 Thy life a long, dead calm of fix'd repose;  
 No pulse that riots, and no blood that glows.  
 Still as the sea, ere winds were taught to blow,  
 Or moving spirit bade the waters flow;  
 Soft as the slumbers of a saint forgiv'n.  
 And mild as opening gleams of promis'd heav'n. (249-256)

Intersubjectively engaging with Abelard as she currently perceives him – callous, calm, and unconcerned – exacerbates her own anguish as it stands in such stark contrast to the way she envisions herself from the perspective of Abelard's cold detachment. This picture of herself, especially when compared to her imagination's rendering of Abelard's state of mind, torments her as much as, perhaps more than, her longing for him. Ideally, she would have continual communication with Abelard, revealing to her his state of mind and, provided it aligned with hers, enabling her to attain psychological fulfillment:

Oh happy state! when souls each other draw,  
 When love is liberty, and nature, law:  
 All then is full, possessing, and possess'd,  
 No craving void left aching in the breast:  
 Ev'n thought meets thought, ere from lips it part,  
 And each warm wish springs mutual from the heart.  
 This sure is bliss (if bliss on earth there be)  
 And once the lot of Abelard and me. (91-98)

This is a picture of ideal amorous intersubjectivity. Two minds in accord, mutually supportive of one another, each so attuned to the other that "thought meets thought" before it is ever spoken. In these moments of amorous intersubjective engagement with one another, as we will see in Chapter Two, the

subject feels stable, certain, and, because Eloisa sees herself from the perspective of her lover, she gains access to a view of herself that exaggerates her best qualities and overlooks or minimizes her worst. Cut off from Abelard, uncertain of his state of mind but certain it can no longer be the state of mind she describes in lines 91-98, Eloisa is cut off from the picture of herself she once enjoyed and is left with a picture of herself in anguish and torment. The only remedy she can imagine is forgetfulness:

No, fly me, fly me, far as pole from pole;  
 Rise Alps between us! and whole oceans roll!  
 Ah, come not, write not, think not once of me,  
 Nor share one pang of all I felt for thee.  
 Thy oaths I quit, thy memory resign;  
 Forget, renounce me, hate whate'er was mine.  
 Fair eyes, and tempting looks (which yet I view!)  
 Long lov'd, ador'd ideas, all adieu!  
 Divine oblivion of low-thoughted care!  
 Fresh blooming hope, gay daughter of the sky!  
 And faith, our early immortality!  
 Enter, each mild, each amicable guest;  
 Receive, and wrap me in eternal rest! (289-302)

As the previous selection implies and as is explicit from very early in the text, it is clear that, for Eloisa, amorous and divine intersubjectivity are intertwined and equally inaccessible to her. She describes her heart, "where mix'd with God's, [Abelard's] lov'd idea lies," "All is not Heav'n's while Abelard has part, / Still rebel nature holds half my heart" (12, 25-26). Eloisa acknowledges how much happier she would be – and how much more positive her perception of her self would be as a result of the image of the dutiful and content novice she would see via divine intersubjectivity – were she able to connect with God. But every such attempt is thwarted: "Yet then, to those dread altars as I drew / Not on the Cross my eyes were fix'd, but you; / Not grace, or

zeal, love only was my call, / And if I lose thy love, I lose my all" (115-199) and further:

I waste the matin lamp in sighs for thee,  
Thy image steals between my God and me,  
Thy voice I seem in ev'ry hymn to hear,  
With ev'ry bead I drop too soft a tear.  
When from the censer clouds of fragrance roll,  
And swelling organs lift the rising soul,  
One thought of thee puts all the pomp to flight;  
Priests, tapers, temples, swim before my sight:  
In seas of flame my plunging soul is drown'd,  
While altars blaze, and angels tremble round. (267-276)

Because she experienced psychological fulfillment through amorous intersubjectivity with Abelard, and because of the perspective on her self she has access to now through her necessarily inferred and perhaps wrong perception of Abelard's current state of mind, Eloisa's perception of her self is of an individual in anguish and completely isolated. And it is this perception of her self, represented by Abelard's place within her heart, that prevents her from accessing God intersubjectively as well.<sup>14</sup>

Of course, our perception of Eloisa relies on our own willingness to engage with her intersubjectively as well. When we read "Eloisa to Abelard," Pope draws us in, we experience the longing and loss of the two lovers by inhabiting the dejected spirit of our speaker, Eloisa; however, the intersubjectivity does not stop there. Pope weaves an entire web of subject positions both inside and outside of the lyric text that we can occupy. We

---

<sup>14</sup> Though situated within a world of its own, this world does not intrude on our experiences of Eloisa's pain. Further, though Pope's presence is clear in the constructedness of his poetry – its couplets remind us again and again that his is more highly wrought verse than most – Pope's metrical and structural control makes the constructedness fade into the background as Pope establishes the rhythm of the text and adds variation to it through enjambment and caesurae. Pope's presence remains at the level of syntax and meter until the last lines of the lyric, when it seems that Pope can no longer contain himself. He refers overtly to his presence at the end of the text; however, by this point in the text the intersubjectivity driving our interaction is complete.

identify with and map intuited feelings, expectations, and goals onto Abelard, Pope, and the poem's readers. We move between simultaneous subject positions available to us through the lyric text and do so through our learned ability to negotiate intersubjectivity.

As in our interactions with other individuals, the pattern of relationality in "Eloisa to Abelard," as with many lyric poems, is not linear; it is cyclical and circular. Our experiences with and in the available subject positions within lyric texts reflect back on the text itself and on our reading of it. We conceptualize ourselves as ourselves and as imagined versions of other available subject positions; these subjective shifts open up new perspectives on ourselves. This psychological move in turn requires that we also imagine ourselves as an other potentially interpretable, inhabitable subject. As readers, we become our own interpretable objects. Discomposing the relational *millefeuille* inherent in so many lyric poems reveals the complex affective and rhetorical impact imbedded in and enacted through these texts. Lyric intersubjectivity is responsible for the sense of intimacy and immediacy we typically find in definitions of lyricality, but it also turns on othering and objectifying the self, rendering the self as equally foreign as Eloisa, Abelard, Pope, and other readers. We not only engage lyric texts like "Eloisa to Abelard" intersubjectively; intersubjective engagement as I have represented it also requires interobjectivity.

By harnessing our related abilities both to negotiate multiple subject positions and to reflect upon the self as an object, poets in the long eighteenth century utilize lyric intersubjectivity to parallel, to reinforce, and to trouble for readers the relational experiences described within the poem and the systems of

values they reflect, their understandings of the periods in which the lyric was composed, and their understandings of their own reaction to what the lyric presents. A poem's lyrical intensity hinges upon the paradoxical tension that derives from the lyric's ability to force readers to inhabit at the same time multiple subject positions and to objectify the self as they objectify other subjectivities imagined in and through a text. The mode mirrors the seemingly incongruous relational acrobatics it requires of its readers: lyric poetry is both evocatively personal and communal; it feels intensely private and is at the same instance utterly public; it evokes at once a sense of forceful and concentrated intimacy and at the same time ensures distance. The intersubjectivity that underlies many lyrics provides a sense of requited and equal intimacy that affirms the self as it paradoxically relies on objectification and isolation. At times, its focus seems totally attuned to interior things, while it is acutely aware of its relationship to the world outside of itself. Often its end seems to be contemplation when it can urge action as well. These tensions register on the reader as she engages a lyrical poem, compelling her to try to resolve the apparent inconsistencies that capture her attention and invite her to engage the text intersubjectively.

To try to decipher the lyric's seemingly incongruous rhetorical positions, readers must themselves comprehend and occupy simultaneously the variety of possible subject positions the poet envisions in the text as well as those, like historic and modern readers and the poet, that the reader envisions outside of it. Rochat's depiction of social interaction demonstrates that not only do we engage with others intersubjectively but we also engage with them as a self-objectified others. In other words, we approach and engage with poets and other readers

with the awareness of their prior consideration of us as future readers, extending the interpretive cycle a few more revolutions. In this sense, lyric poetry requires its readers to be nimble, able to shift their subject positions to better understand and negotiate the multiple and at times contradictory characteristics of the lyric. The resolution of this tension lies not in unifying these various subject and object positions within the reader but in accepting their ambiguity, their shifting nature, “hold[ing] in equipoise [multiple] perspectives at once” (Carson 73). By crafting a relational structure built on intersubjectivity within their texts, lyric poets in the Restoration and long eighteenth century invite readers to join in the interactive experience they describe, depict, and evoke.

Incorporating psychological and sociological concepts into our conversation about the way lyric poetry engages readers and produces interactions between poet, reader, and text illuminates the inner workings of the relational and rhetorical structure of lyric texts. This framework provides another way to investigate the functionality of lyric poetry by considering the specific ways that readers engage lyric poems and drawing attention to the complex affective and rhetorical consequences bound up in the lyric mode. This intersubjectivity resides at the center of the conception of erotic lyricality proposed by Anne Carson, the spatial and architectural metaphors utilized by Heather Dubrow, and the models of interiority upon which critics like Helen Vendler hang their conceptions of the mode.

By tracing the permutations of lyric intersubjectivity through the long eighteenth century in the chapters to come, we will clarify and complicate our understanding of poetic practices within the period and recognize the complex continuity of the lyric tradition throughout period. Writers use lyric

intersubjectivity to engage various topics, topics that we expect to the subject of lyrics, like love and religion, as well as topics that we might not expect to be engaged through lyric poetry, like politics and philosophy. Each of the chapters that follow considers the trajectory and consequences of the use of lyric intersubjectivity in poems that touch on such topics. Chapter two, “‘Thou shalt in me survey thy self reflected’: Amorous Intersubjectivity in Philips, Rochester, and Behn,” explores the function of lyric intersubjectivity in Restoration and eighteenth-century amorous poetry. Eros-based metaphors clarify the relational structure of amorous lyrics; however, they do not explain the affective consequences of the text for the reader. Lyric intersubjectivity structures this multivalent readerly engagement. Investigating the complex function of this erotic relationality emphasizes that these amorous poems are more than textual solicitations and reveals the depth of their rhetorical goals. Eighteenth-century textual psalm translations and congregational hymns ground chapters three and four, “Savior, Self, and Soul: Psalm Translations and the ‘Personal Lyric’” and “‘Let us our voices raise’: Congregational Singing and Intersubjectivity,” respectively. Lyric intersubjectivity manifests itself in religious or meditative poems as both a recreation and a recasting of the supplicant-deity relationship. By drawing readers into an intersubjective relationship with the various subject positions within religious and meditative lyrics, the poet can choose to reassure or to radically destabilize the standard dichotomy between the petitioner and the divine. By making both subject positions available to readers, the poet enables readers to represent God and thereby control God through this representation.

In spite of the ruling poetic trends in the long eighteenth century, this function of lyric poems, their lyric intersubjectivity, is a persistent poetic



attribute. Rather than construct or adopt a delimited set of lyric criteria, even for lyrical poems within the Restoration and eighteenth century, we should instead consider the lyric and lyricity in the period as a function of an individual poem's ability to initiate intersubjectivity, then turn our attention to the poets' goals for and adaptations of intersubjectivity in the period. I do not claim that this attribute fully encapsulates the wide array of individual poetic characteristics of lyrical verse, formal or otherwise, even within the Restoration and early eighteenth century. However, this intersubjectivity binds together lyric poems and poems with lyrical tendencies throughout the period and constructs a traceable constellation of lyric affiliation through the long eighteenth century.<sup>15</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup> This notion does not necessarily refer to a qualitative, transhistorical set of formal or poetic characteristics, conventions, or tropes similar to or indeed precisely those that characterize the lyric in other periods wherein it is the predominant mode. As Dubrow explains, literary characteristics, even within any particular period, can be used to signal any number of formal or modal allegiances.

**Chapter Two**  
**“Thou shalt in me survey thy self reflected”:**  
**Amorous Intersubjectivity in Philips, Rochester, and Behn**

Any attempt to illuminate a lost, forgotten, or misunderstood story of lyric endeavors in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries must come to terms with arguably the lyric poets of the fifty years following the Interregnum: the amorous lyricists of the Restoration. If we acknowledge that intersubjectivity and interobjectivity reveal crucial characteristics of lyric poetry in the long eighteenth century, it would seem that they are worthy of our close attention as they course through the period’s most famous – or perhaps infamous – texts. At times insipidly pastoral, hypersexual, bawdy, or profane, they almost always achieve more than these labels might suggest. At center, these lyrics function on and explore excess, typically to invert the *status quo*. This is especially true when the *status quo* in question is the lyrical model of ideal love well established at the beginning of the seventeenth century. Aphra Behn and John Wilmot, Second Earl of Rochester, use the amorous lyrics to posit variations on the Petrarchan and Neoplatonic conceptions of love that they inherited from their poetic predecessors like John Donne, Ben Jonson, Robert Herrick, and Katherine Philips. Tracing the intersubjective interaction within and surrounding the work of these lyricists reveals a picture of poetic love – what it means at a given time and place, how it should function, and what happens when good love goes bad – and how it evolves as succeeding poets engage, revise, rebuke, and revoke conventions and conceptions of lyric love. Representations of amorous intersubjectivity within seventeenth-century lyrics reveal a story of emendation,

subversion, and finally rejection of the Petrarchan and Neoplatonic system of love.<sup>1</sup>

I. "That moment when the soul parts on itself"<sup>2</sup>

As a metaphor for intersubjectivity, love is a logical choice. It is nearly ubiquitous and grants access to a communal vocabulary, a shared language of experience that heightens our understanding of intersubjectivity as a means of relating to one another and of understanding ourselves. And though she does not call it such, Anne Carson spends quite some time envisioning a model of amorous intersubjectivity. When she considers the relational structure of lyric poems, Carson envisions an unstable triangle. The first two points of Carson's erotic triangle belong to the speaker of the poem and the speaker's beloved. The third position on that erotic triangle is a continuously shifting version of the speaker that is the speaker's flawed conception of him- or herself and the

---

<sup>1</sup> For more information on Rochester and his verse, see Kirk Combe's *A Martyr for Sin: Rochester's Critique of Polity, Sexuality, and Society* (1998), Graham Green's classic *Lord Rochester's Monkey: Being the Life of John Wilmot, Second Earl of Rochester* (1974), James William Johnson's *A Profane Wit: The Life of John Wilmot, Earl of Rochester* (2004), and Melissa Sanchez's "Libertinism and Romance in Rochester's Company" (2005).

For further reading on Behn and her poetry, see Carol Barash's *English Women's Poetry, 1649-1714: Politics, Community, and Linguistic Authority* (1996), Paula Backscheider's *Eighteenth-Century Women Poets and their Poetry* (2005), Judith Kegan Gardiner's "Liberty, Equality, Fraternity: Utopian Longings in Behn's Lyric Poetry" (1993), and Heidi Hunter's *Rereading Aphra Behn: History, Theory, and Criticism* (1993).

For additional information on Philips, see Paula Backscheider's *Eighteenth-Century Women Poets and their Poetry* (2005), any number of articles by Claudia Limbert, Paula Loscoco's "'Manly Sweetness': Katherine Philips among the Neoclassicals" (1993), Dorothy Mermin's "Women Becoming Poets: Katherine Philips, Aphra Behn, Anne Finch" (1990), and Arlene Stiebel's "Not since Sappho: The Erotic in Poems Of Katherine Philips and Aphra Behn" (1992) and "Subversive Sexuality: Masking the Erotic in Poems by Katherine Philips and Aphra Behn." (1993).

For more information on the trope of premature ejaculation in lyric poetry, see Leo Braudy's "Remembering Masculinity: Premature Ejaculation Poetry of the Seventeenth Century."

<sup>2</sup> Carson *Eros the Bittersweet* (8)

beloved's idealized version of the speaker. Both versions of the speaker are "projected on a screen of what is actual and present by means of the poet's tactic of triangulation. That godlike [idealized] self, never known before, now comes into focus and vanishes again in one quick shift of view. As the planes of vision jump, the actual self and the ideal self and the difference between them connect in one triangle momentarily" (62). To comprehend this division, to intellectually and psychologically grapple with the actual self and the idealized version of the self, instigates an affective response that Carson calls *eros*.

In Carson's discussion of *eros* and subjectivity in *Eros the Bittersweet*, the real world and the textual realm are interwoven, but perhaps we should examine each of these planes of interaction separately to better come to terms with how each works alone before we focus again on how they impact one another as they come together during our reading of a lyric text. Social psychologists', sociologists', and phenomenologists' notions of intersubjectivity enable us to shift this textual phenomenon so that we can consider it extratextually. The affective state Carson delineates within ancient Greek lyrics of course is not a purely textual matter. In the world outside of the text, *eros* still is predicated upon our own recognition of a gap or disjunction between what we know to be our inner self and the self we assume others see when they consider us. For Roach, Mead, and Goffman, this recognition and our negotiation of it are not particularly erotic. Rather the psychological and sociological movements required by this recognition and subsequent negotiation mark our continually evolving conception of the self as we interact with other individuals. While the initiation and maintenance of love and desire likely rely on intersubjective relationality, the relationship between *eros* and intersubjectivity is not

necessarily reciprocal: intersubjectivity does not inevitably concern love.

Amorous relationships are just one of many kinds of bonds we establish simply through being a part of the web of intersubjective affiliations that structure our world, our existence within it, and our conception of the self.

To say that love and desire depend on our interaction with other individuals would oversimplify the crucial characteristic of this interaction: it is structured on intersubjective engagement that is, in turn, driven by our desire to reflect upon and mold our perception of our self. Amorous intersubjectivity ideally allows us to imagine a better version of our self, the version held by our lover, and then act in such a way that we attempt to make our “real” self match the lover’s ideal version that we access through intersubjectivity.<sup>3</sup> Rather than simplify, we should consider the complex relationship between love, desire, and intersubjectivity. What does this complex relationship look like? How, precisely, do *eros* and intersubjectivity impact one another? What are the consequences? In short, if we accept Rochat’s contention that all self-knowledge relies on intersubjective give and take, how does love work?

To instigate her meditation on the subject, Carson posits her own deceptively simple question: What does the lover want from love? As a starting point, it seems fairly obvious, but implicit in this question is the suggestion that being in love is much more complicated than could be conveyed in a list of its

---

<sup>3</sup> I say “ideally” because, obviously, not all amorous relationships provide the opportunity for the individual to access a more positive version of the self but can, in unhealthy relationships, provide a different source of subjective anxiety. When the image of the self provided by the perspective of the lover that the individual has access to via intersubjectivity is in fact negative or judgmental, the disjunction between the way that the individual views the self and the individual’s perception of the lover’s view of the individual causes a different sort of self-doubt, one that is, I would argue, much more psychologically damaging than having to contend with a more positively pitched disjunction. Time and space prevent my attending this potential consequence of amorous intersubjectivity at regular intervals, unless and until, of course, the lyric texts demand such attention.

effects. In Rochat's externalist social model, we go through life continually engaging and re-engaging intersubjectively with others, reading, interpreting, and analyzing others' perceptions of us based on conscious, unconscious, and subconscious clues they provide. "To be human is primarily to have the propensity to perceive and represent oneself through the eyes of others" (Rochat 15). After years of honing our skills, we become adept enough to interpret others signals. We combine the information we gather with our self-perception to construct a version of our self as both subject and object. This version is unstable; it evolves as we gather and interpret more and different reflections of our self through our interactions with others as we grow and change. Understandably, we are drawn to positive images of our self reflected to us by others, even to the extent that these images can initiate feelings of love and desire. These positive reflections carry with them an *appearance* of objectivity that makes them difficult to resist.

The blithe answer to Carson's question – What does the lover want from love? – is "the beloved." But of course this answer does not hold up under any amount of scrutiny. Clearly the self-love that in Lacanian models drives desire is an essential facet of intersubjectivity. We enter into intersubjective relationships with other individuals hoping they will present us with a better version of our self; such images of our self bolster our own self-perception. Our desire for this idealized image of our self compels us to strengthen these relationships. Imagination, sparked by intersubjective negotiation, renders both the beloved and the idealized version of our self held up to us by the beloved as the objects of love. The gulf separating our self-conception from the beloved's idealized version of our self, our knowledge of that gulf, and our anxieties about it evoke

the *frisson* of eros. By negotiating these multiple and often contradictory selves we feel both the excitement over and yearning for the ideal self envisioned by our beloved and also for the beloved for producing this version of our self in the first place. At the same time, the image that we find so seductive is, at its center, a fiction: we are seduced by a fictive version of our self. Consequently, anxiety riddles amorous intersubjectivity because we know how vast a gulf separates any idealized version of our self – fabricated by our lovers based on their impressions of our outward behavior and on their own desire for us – and the self we know intimately with all of its flaws and faults.

This contradiction throws these versions of the self into sharp relief and renders both the idealized self and our internal conception of our self as foreign, alien, constructed, and, depending on one's perspective, shifting and unstable. This moment of disjunction, in Carson's schema, initiates "sweetbitter" *eros* (62). But paradoxically, and perhaps more importantly, it offers subjective potential by providing us a better alternative to the inner self we perceive. By rendering the subject as object, this moment of *eros* produces the seductive possibility of combining the self as subject with the idealized self as object we perceive through the beloved. We do not simply desire the unreal, imagined, or, to use Stendhal's term, crystallized beloved but also the idealized version of our self the beloved makes possible by crystallizing us. As desiring subjects, we search for intersubjective relationships that bring us into contact with iterations of our self we find most attractive. We desire ideal reflections of our self that we can only see through intersubjectivity. Or, to put it somewhat differently, we desire our self as an object desirable by others. Inter-objectivity and the objectification of the self are at the heart of the matter.

What we desire when we desire are, first, the impossible iteration of the self held out to us by the beloved and, by extension, the beloved as the agent that makes possible that version of our self. The beloved's perception of us brings its potential into being. We love and desire the implied possibility of the ideal self available through intersubjective relationality, a self we cannot see without the mediation of the beloved. Through intersubjective interaction with the beloved, we can engage a version of our self we cannot otherwise access. By occupying the subject position of the beloved, we can shift our perspective on our self; no longer subject, we become object to our self. The objectified subject position we knew and the real self we know as we inhabit the position of the beloved becomes just another possible iteration of the self, on equal footing with the idealized self concocted by the beloved, crystallized upon the self we present to the world. By intersubjectively engaging the beloved, we objectify our self, and in so doing, we are seduced by and accede to the possibility inherent in the ideal self, namely that it is just as valid as the version of the self we construct. Put differently, in amorous intersubjectivity, we do not simply desire what we lack. We desire something more specific than that: an image of self-potential that we access only through self-objectification. We long for the potential to be the self the beloved imagines us to be even while knowing, fearing that we cannot, perhaps acknowledging that it may not even be desirable since it would require continual abnegation as we cede the self as subject in favor of the self as object.

This intersubjectivity and its effects do not, however, exist solely within the narrative framework of the poem; they extend outward to include our experience of reading the text as well. The intersubjective triangulation embedded within amorous encounters often mirrors the reader's experience of



the lyric. Poulet explains that intersubjective give-and-take characterizes the reading experience. In mentally pronouncing the words of another, we identify with that other and are alienated from ourselves; “another *I* replace[s our] own” and “will continue to do so as long as [we] read” (44-8). In a psychological move that parallels Rochat’s explanation of intersubjective interaction in our everyday lives, we juggle consciousnesses, trying to balance our own alienated self with the other *I* that has subsumed us. Or, as Poulet puts it, “I begin to share the use of my consciousness with this being whom I have tried to define and who is the conscious subject ensconced at the heart of the work. He and I, we start having a common consciousness” (44-5, 48). As Carson explains, engaging a poem “is a stark evocation of the present moment intersected by an echo from the past. [A reader] who can stand apart from her own experience and assess it in these terms is one who has learned to take up a certain vantage point on time, telescoping ‘then’ upon ‘now’” (120). This telescoping happens from many positions. Poets telescope then onto now as they engage their literary antecedents. As readers we fold time and place upon ourselves. As we engage intersubjectively with these texts, we too enjoy that privilege, inhabiting subject positions available to us within, along, and outside of the text, recreating and entering into the complex multidimensional web of erotic engagement these poets create. But in doing so, in enjoying this privilege, we surrender ourselves to fill objectifiable positions as well, interpreting subjects but also interpretable objects.

When we shift our focus from the non-textual to the textual realm, we can see that amorous intersubjectivity within lyric poems parallels the psychological movement and reorientation that occurs in intersubjective interactions outside of the text. Speakers regularly describe or refer to intersubjective engagement with

their lovers, showing us examples of their ideal versions of intersubjectivity as well as failed attempts and their consequences. As readers outside of the amorous interaction within the text, we, oddly, have access to the intimate intersubjectivity described by the speaker through our intersubjectivity with the speaker. The weirdness of these circumstances and their consequences is clear when we step back and consider that, through our intersubjective engagement with the subject positions within the text, we become a party to the amorous relationship at its center. We are engaging in a sort of psychological voyeurism: we “see” the intimacy of the relationship the lyric describes and, in seeing, we feel the sensations evoked in the text. Further, via the perspective we attain through intersubjectivity with the subjects within the text, we “see” and can analyze our own reactions and, if we choose, our new perspective on our self. Through intersubjective engagement with the subjects within and surrounding amorous lyrics, we can access a version of our self, our beliefs about love, and our reactions to its textual representation through self-objectification initiated by intersubjectivity.

## II. “When love, with one another so / Interinanimates two soules”<sup>4</sup>

This sort of amorous intersubjective and interobjective engagement structures many lyric poems on love and desire. As poets attempt to explore and delineate the psychological structure and implications of love, they often do so in terms that reflect the intersubjectivity delineated above. At the turn of the seventeenth century in England, the amorous lyric owed both a philosophical and literary debt to Italian Renaissance traditions. Paradigms of Petrarchan and

---

<sup>4</sup> Donne “The Ecstasy” 41-2.

Neoplatonic love influenced the development of the English amorous lyric in the mid-sixteenth century translations of Sir Thomas Wyatt and Henry Howard, the Earl of Surrey, and later in Sir Philip Sidney's *Astrophel and Stella*. Though these poets' attitudes toward love vary, for each poet the beloved is unattainable, and his love for her inheres in the spiritual or rational rather than the physical realm. These characteristics of love derive from the *dolce stil novo* of Dante's *La Vita Nuova*, from the pattern of praise and anguish of Petrarch's *Rime Sparse*, and from the Neoplatonic valorization of spiritual or rational love and its concomitant repudiation of the physical. This system of love, however, found few eager devotees among the English seventeenth-century lyric poets.

The weight of the amorous lyric tradition registered sharply on poets of the long seventeenth century. Sidney's opening sonnet in *Astrophel and Stella* eloquently states the difficult task of engaging the overdetermined concept of poetic love:

I sought fit words to paint the blackest face of woe:  
 Studying inventions fine, her wits to entertain,  
 Oft turning others' leaves, to see if thence would flow  
 Some fresh and fruitful showers upon my sunburn'd brain.  
 But words came halting forth, wanting invention's stay;  
 Invention, Nature's child, fled stepdame study's blows;  
 And others' feet still seem'd but stranger in my way. (5-11)

Sidney ends this sonnet with a clarion call for English poets to naturalize the amorous lyric tradition, to engage, revise, and revive the tropes they inherited from Italy and France rather than continue to ventriloquize the continental tradition. He concludes, "Thus, great with child to speak, and helpless in my throes, / Biting my truant pen, beating myself for spite: / 'Fool,' said my Muse to me, 'look in thy heart and write!'" (12-14).

This famous concluding image begins a trend in English amorous verse that persists throughout the seventeenth century. Continuing the interpretive tradition begun by Sidney, one by one seventeenth-century lyric poets including John Donne, Ben Jonson, Robert Herrick, and Abraham Cowley chipped away at the moorings of the Petrarchan and Neoplatonic body/soul divide and erected in its place a new paradigm of love that insisted upon its own physicality. So, too, do Behn and Rochester. In poems such as Behn's "The Disappointment" and Rochester's "The Imperfect Enjoyment," they engage this tradition, and at nearly every turn, they confront the conventions they inherit from their seventeenth-century predecessors. More precisely, Behn and Rochester use that trope of soulish intersubjectivity so popular with poets like Donne and Philips to destabilize inherited amorous models of lyricality. The result is a body of amorous verse that revives and revises the erotic economy of previous poets.

While earlier poets like Shakespeare<sup>5</sup> and Sidney<sup>6</sup> sometimes exhibit anti-Petrarchist tendencies, Donne drastically redefines the Renaissance paradigm of love to embrace physical consummation.<sup>7</sup> In "The Ecstasy" Donne presents a revised version of amorous intersubjectivity that rejects the Petrarchan and Neoplatonic desexualization of love and instead asserts a system in which

---

<sup>5</sup> For example, see Shakespeare's Sonnet 130, "My mistress's eyes are nothing like the sun."

<sup>6</sup> Also see Sidney's Sonnet 5, "It is most true that eyes are formed to serve," Sonnet 6, "Some lovers speak, when they their muses entertain," and Sonnet 52, "A stride is grown between Virtue and Love."

<sup>7</sup> Donne's version of amorous lyricality accounts for the material and the spiritual. For Donne's acknowledgment of the potential pitfalls of physical and material in love, see "Farewell to Love" "Being had, enjoying it decays: / And thence, / What before pleased them all, takes but one sense, / And that so lamely, as it leaves behind / A kind of sorrowing dullness to the mind" (16-20).

spiritual and corporeal consummation are both essential.<sup>8</sup> From the opening lines of the poem, the encounters described have already occurred in the world of the text; the speakers' presentations of them are retrospective. This fact is key. It imbues the speakers' physical consummation with additional meaning that can only be fully grasped in light of the intimate intersubjectivity that is only related later in the text: the two lovers are already "one anothers best," individuals who are perhaps each other's best loves but who also, as we shall see, present to one another the best version of each other (4).

The lovers recline on a bank described at once as the site of consummation – "a pillow on a bed" (1); as the somewhat phallic means of consummation – the bank is "swel'd up" (2); and as the result of said consummation – the bank is "pregnant" (2). Though they only sit on the bank simply holding hands, Donne, through his description of their hands, interjects erotic energy into this seeming platonic gesture. The lovers' hands, bespeaking the lovers' arousal, exude a "fast balm" that "firmly cement[s]" them together (6, 5). Donne describes this "entergraft[ing]" of their hands as only the first level of consummation: it is "as yet / [...] all the means to make [them] one" (9-10). Only after sharing this highly erotic physical connection can the ecstatic, intersubjective moment occur. The erotic physicality of the first three stanzas prefigures the corporeal consummation Donne insists upon in the final third of the poem and also serves as a fainter reflection of the intersubjectivity that structures the ecstatic encounter at the center of the lyric.

---

<sup>8</sup> John Donne, and Helen Gardner, ed., *The Elegies and The Songs and Sonnets* (Oxford: Clarendon P, Oxford UP, 2000) 59-61.

At the height of the lovers' initial physical contact, each lover sends out "eye-beams twisted" that intertwine with one another and then penetrate the other's eyes (7-8). In Petrarchan and Neoplatonic narratives of love, the eyes serve as the spiritual or psychological point of entry between two lovers.<sup>9</sup> Donne relies on this trope in his transition from corporeal to intersubjective relationality. He describes these parallel moments as a "propagation" that begets pictures of the lovers in one another's eyes. On a very concrete level, the sustained eye contact that comes from staring closely at someone will reveal a reflected image of oneself in or on that other person's eyes. Metaphorically, the image is equally stunning and highlights the importance of this moment in ushering in the lovers' imminent intersubjective ecstasy. As a consequence of their previous intimate interaction with each other, the lovers fashion their own versions of their beloved, affected by their feelings for their loved one, that they then reflect back to that individual. The lovers' contemplations of those reflections usher in an intersubjective moment wherein they each "negotiate" the differences between the reflected version of the self and their own conceptions of the self (17). These fecund moments of physicality beget an ecstatic intersubjective commingling of the lovers' souls.<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> Baldesar Castiglione. *The Book of the Courtier*. George Bull, trans. (NYC: Penguin Books, 1967). 334, 335.

In *The Courtier*, Bembo explains "when he sets eyes on some beautiful and attractive woman [he] recognizes that his spirit responds to hers, as soon as he notices that his eyes fasten on her image and carry it to his heart and his soul begins to take pleasure in contemplating her and feel an influx that gradually arouses and warms it, and those vivacious spirits shining from her eyes constantly add fresh fuel to the fire."

<sup>10</sup> I would argue that the notion of the soul within this text, and perhaps more generally in the seventeenth century, is nearly synonymous with our twenty-first century notion of the self. The *OED's* first list of definitions of "soul" supports this; the focus in the first line of definitions is on the soul as the distinguishing characteristic of the individual. Definition I.1 identifies a soul as "the principle of life in man or animals; animate existence" and relies on Hobbes's *Leviathan* as

The titular moment in Donne's poem is redolent of intersubjective and interobjective relationality. A state of ecstasy is "the state of being 'beside oneself,'" perhaps in contemplation that leads to enlightenment ("Ecstasy," defs. 1, 3.a). Donne's visual rendering and analysis of this experience and its effects demonstrate that his version of love correlates closely with amorous intersubjectivity. This poetic image helps us visualize the complex psychological maneuvering inherent in seemingly simple actions surrounding love and desire. As a poetic image, it is rehearsed time and again in the period as poets grapple with love through their verse.

In their moments of ecstasy, the lovers' souls leave their bodies and go out "to advance their state" (15). The scene is one of ecstasy literalized. The lovers are "beside themselves." Each lover is both soul and body. Donne utilizes the first person plural pronoun for both the bodies and the souls: both versions of the lovers' selves are "we." This ecstatic moment renders these various versions of the lovers' selves as both subject and object, separate but connected, able to reflect upon the multiple dimensions of themselves they suddenly can access through their ecstatic encounter. This meeting of the souls leaves the lovers' bodies "sepulchral statues," unable to speak or move in the moment but aware nonetheless (18). Though the lovers' bodies simply maintain the positions we see at the beginning of the poem – reclining on the bank, hands "firmly cemented / With a fast balm" – the lovers' souls interact during this ecstatic moment.

---

textual support. Entry I.2.a defines the soul as "the principle of thought and action in man." The *OED* provides twenty definitions of "soul" within this first major delineation ("Soul," def. I). The second major definition of "soul" of course concerns uses of the word that imply more religious considerations rather than psychological uses or iterations of the word that signal reflection on the idea of the soul as the seat of the subject ("Soul," def. II).

This private flash of psychological interaction and negotiation is impossible for others to discern by simply viewing the lovers' bodies on the bank. The souls alone can relate to us, with one voice, the lessons they have learned through their ecstasy: "This Ecstasy doth unperplex, / We said, and tell us what we love, / We see by this, it was not sex, / We see, we saw not what did move:" (29-32). The intersubjectivity the lovers experience shows them that they were not drawn to one another based on physical attraction. Instead they were drawn to one another and "move[d]" by the prospect of intersubjectivity and the enlightenment it offers. Donne visualizes this abstract psychological engagement between the two lovers as the mixing of their souls: "But as all several soules containe / Mixture of things, they know not what, / Love, these mixt soules, doth mixe againe, / And makes both one, each this and that" (33-36). The lovers' souls combine through their love for each other (33-35). Love then bisects this aggregate soul (36). Though each lover brought just his or her own soul to the ecstatic moment, each lover leaves with an "abler soul" (43).

Not only are the two newly blended souls strengthened through their commingling; as a result of this assimilation of the other, they are both newly and better aware of the composition of the self. Before the two souls joined together intersubjectively, neither had a true understanding of the self (34). Through their mutual "entergrafting," they attain a new and greater knowledge of their lover and of their self. They are able to arrive at this greater understanding of the self and of their lover because this mixing reflects a version of their individual selves within their beloved and incorporates the beloved into the individual. No longer ignorant or unrefined by love, "[w]e then, who are this new soule, know / Of what we are composed, and made" (45-46). After the



souls explain that they are now basically two versions of the same soul, each encompassing and reflecting their own version of the other as a consequence of their mixing, they explain that love “interanimates” their two souls (41-2). That is, each soul enlivens the other by providing a truer understanding of the self through the intersubjective mixing that is the hallmark of love and intimacy in this lyric, intersubjectivity only made possible as a result of the lovers’ physical connection. Ultimately, this mixing enables an evolution in self-knowledge, and the mechanism that enables this enlightenment is intersubjectivity.<sup>11</sup>

Katherine Philips, in her mid-seventeenth-century lyric “To my dearest Antenor, on his parting” (c. 1652), reverts to a more traditionally Neoplatonic model of intimacy.<sup>12</sup> Whereas Donne stressed the importance of physical and

---

<sup>11</sup> Other seventeenth century lyric poets attempted to reconfigure Donne’s anti-Petrarchan, anti-Neoplatonic paradigm of love by exploring different loci of physical consummation that do not result in depletion and dullness. Instead of privileging sexual intercourse as the goal of physical desire, Jonson and Herrick both attempt to inaugurate new economies of love that continually replenish lovers and their desire. Intent upon maintaining the physicality of love Donne championed in “The Ecstasy,” Jonson alights upon the kiss as a solution to the theoretical problem of desire explicit in Donne’s “Farewell to Love.” Jonson, in his *Charis* sequence, adapts the physical terms of the Petrarchan blazon as well as its goal of spiritual enlightenment. Jonson and Herrick create and deploy concrete blazons to achieve and to demonstrate their alterative erotic economy of replenishment: kissing. Jonson’s *A Celebration of Charis in Ten Lyric Pieces* is an extended and highly eroticized version of the Petrarchan lyric through which Jonson narrates his conception of ideal love: love is physical and regenerative; it can “make the old man young, / Keep the middle age at bay, / And let nothing high decay” (20-22). Jonson makes his case in the lyrics that follow for replacing the consumptive physical intercourse favored by Donne with an erotic economy whose currency is the kiss.

<sup>12</sup> There are any number of reasons Philips might have opted for a Neoplatonic model of love and intimacy instead of the dualistic model of intimacy that is popular in the amorous lyrics in the decades preceding “To My Dearest Antenor.” In the context of this poem, her choice simply might have been reflective of the logistics of the situation it describes and that likely reflected her own marital situation. She was a Royalist who lived in Wales; her husband was Colonel James Philips who held positions within the Protectorate, though knowing Katherine Philips’s royalist tendencies and the portrait of blissful intimacy she provides, we might assume that his role within Cromwell’s government was undertaken of necessity rather than because of strong moral feelings of support for the Cromwellian regime. Regardless of the degree of allegiance we assign to his motives, we can imagine that his role would have taken him away from Wales regularly. And so perhaps her reliance on a Neoplatonic model of love was a consequence of his absence.

Alternatively, perhaps her return to a Neoplatonic model of amorous interaction is a response to the very real examples of the physical body’s ephemerality in the wake of the public spectacle of the execution of Charles I and in the waste of life and limb that accompanied the Civil Wars. This

psychological or soulish intimacy between lovers, for Philips physical interaction is not necessary. Her speaker and Antenor enjoy a psychological closeness that her speaker presents as ideal. Clearly working within the lyrical models of love that she inherited, Philips represents amorous intersubjectivity through images of soulish intersubjectivity as she demonstrates the special intimacy essential to her description of love. In spite of the fact that Philips ignores the physical dimension of amorous interaction, her depictions of ideal psychological connection end up being quite similar to Donne's.

In "To my dearest Antenor," Philips provides for her readers an anatomy of the psychological landscape of love. She situates readers in a moment of impending separation between the speaker and her beloved Antenor.<sup>13</sup> Though the speaker admits that she feels like grieving at the prospect of Antenor's departure, she explains that their physical separation should not cause either of them to grieve because the intimate connection they share will prevent them from actually being separated from one another: "Though it be just to grieve when I must part / With him that is the Guardian of my Heart; / Yet by an happy change the loss of mine / Is with advantage paid in having thine" (1-4). This commonplace premise of amorous verse in and of itself would not normally distinguish this text. In this case, though, Philips's opening signals her keen interest in exploring the inner workings and consequences of amorous intersubjectivity throughout the rest of the poem, an exploration that not only elucidates for us the poetic take on and stakes of intimacy within amorous lyrics

---

focus on the fleeting nature of the body perhaps compelled her to turn her attention to a form of interaction that seems to be above, apart from, and more permanent than the physical.

<sup>13</sup> Antenor is believed to be Philips's pastoral moniker for her husband.

but also, through Philips's detailed exploration, invites readers into intersubjective interaction with Philips and her speaker. This intellectual and psychological experience, in turn, enables us to reflect on our reactions to the text and on our views on love and intimacy that the text and our engagement with it might have revealed. The first two couplets of the poem introduce Philips's claim about the love between her speaker and Antenor; in the 34 lines that follow, she analyzes their love to demonstrate the veracity of her claim that physical distance cannot separate the lovers she describes. The key to this seeming impossibility, according to the image of love that Philips delineates, is amorous intersubjectivity.

Philips provides three characteristics that distinguish the love she describes, images that explore and demonstrate the amorous interaction detailed above. First of all, the two lovers' souls are combined through conscious reflection upon the self in negotiation with the other: "Each of our Souls did in its temper fit, / And in the other's Mould so fashion'd it" (6, 13-14). According to our speaker, the lovers continually engage one another intersubjectively, reflect upon the image of the self they encounter through the beloved, and fashion and re-fashion their thoughts and actions to accommodate this reflection of the self as object and the self as subject. Upon being united in this fashion, they become one. Though this would seem to lessen them both by reducing them to one whole, it in fact results in the opposite: "So when united nearer we became, It did not weaken, but increase, our Flame / [...] / And Souls whom such an Union fortifies, / Passion can ne'er destroy, nor Fate surprise" (9-10, 17-18). In this case, one plus one equals one, though this new one is a stronger, more desirous, more strongly desiring subject. That expanded and improved one is at the same

time still two entities, though the two are separate parts of the improved one, having split apart from one another after the combination of their souls. The implication is that the “inclinations” of the souls of the speaker and Antenor tempered together as they combined, resulting in a homogeneous mixture of their individual parts that can be separated back into two now homogeneous halves of the same whole (15).

The two lovers within the text, then, engaged one another intersubjectively and finding, through interaction with the other a version of the self worth emulating, internalized that self-image and adapted their behavior so that their self perception matched the image held up to them by the beloved. Parsing this “math” is rather complicated. Doing so asks us as readers to accept the seemingly ideal intimacy that our speaker assures us she and Antenor enjoy. Accepting this view of their relationship is simpler if we engage with her intersubjectively. By inhabiting her subject position and imagining the way she feels in her intimacy with Antenor we can unravel her soulful “math” much more easily.

According to Philips, one consequence of their intimacy and the intersubjectivity it requires is a “secret Sympathy” that continually exists between the two lovers (21). To explain this intersubjective connection, Philips constructs a simile that recalls the metaphysical conceits popular much earlier in the century: “Now as in Watches, though we do not know / When the Hand moves, we find it still doth go: / So I, by secret Sympathy inclin’d, / Will absent meet, and understand thy Mind” (19-22). As a lyric device, the metaphysical conceit and other such complex extended similes like this one invite readers into the meaning-making of the text and create a sense of expansiveness that Samuel

Johnson described in *Rambler 158* as the key to the lyric's power. By requiring us to ponder precisely how the movement of the watch's hand is like the speaker's ability to know her lover, Philips creates a space for us to enter into her text. This space and extended engagement that such poetic devices offer enhance the opportunity not only of intersubjectivity between readers and the speaker – as we try to understand why and how she feels that illustration captures certain characteristics of her relationship – but also between readers and the poet, as we reflect on the experience of creating the simile and, in creating it, the poet's own consideration of her readers.

Once we have thought about the comparison between the speaker's knowledge of the mind of her lover and her knowledge of a watch's hand, we can begin to comprehend the implications of the simile. In the mid-seventeenth century, pocket watches typically only had an hour hand; thus the time it took for that single hand to move perceptibly was much longer than it would be for the two-handed watches that became popular later in the century. Though we cannot perceive the watch hand's movement if we stare at it while it is moving, we still know instinctively that it moves.<sup>14</sup> Similarly, though she cannot know Antenor's every movement or thought, the speaker can know his mind through the "secret Sympathy" she shares with him. The intimate intersubjectivity that connects them as desiring subjects and desirable objects enables the speaker to "meet" Antenor and "understand [his] mind" though he is not physically present (21-22).

---

<sup>14</sup> Gordon Campbell, *The Grove Encyclopedia of Decorative Arts* (New York: Oxford UP, 2006) 251-3.

The relationality that enables the speaker to ventriloquize Antenor in spite of their physical separation generates the final image of intersubjective love Philips describes in this text: that of the self reflected by the beloved. Philips renders this characteristic of amorous intersubjectivity very clearly:

And besides this thou shalt in me survey  
 Thy self reflected while thou art away.  
 [...] <sup>15</sup>  
 So in my Breast thy Picture drawn shall be,  
 My Guide, Life, Object, Friend, and Destiny:  
 And none shal know, though they imploy their wit,  
 Which is the right *Antenor*, thou, or it. (27-28, 35-38)

If the earlier safeguards that prevent the pain of separation from striking the lovers should prove inadequate, the speaker assures Antenor that neither of them will feel the sting of his departure because her version of him will never leave her. Even in Antenor's physical absence, he will be able to perceive a version of himself via the speaker as a result of their intersubjective engagement with one another; he carries her version of him as well. Similarly, in envisioning

---

<sup>15</sup> The lines I have excised here for brevity's sake present another interesting conceit that supports the broader notion of intersubjectivity discussed in chapter 1 above:

For what some forward Arts do undertake,  
 The Images of absent Friends to make,  
 And represent their actions in a Glass,  
 Friendship it self can onely bring to pass,  
 That Magick which both Fate and Time beguiles,  
 And in a moment runs a thousand miles. (29-34)

Patrick Thomas, in *The Collected Works of Katherine Philips, "The Matchless Orinda,"* explains this conceit with the following: "Seventeenth-century 'cunning-men,' wizards and sorcerers used mirrors as a means of divination, though most commonly their purpose in doing so was to catch thieves" (qtd in Backscheider *British Women Poets of the Long Eighteenth Century: An Anthology* 383). Philips here explains that friends' and lovers' intersubjective link is the only real means of achieving the work of the conjuror's divining glass. Interestingly, the image of the glass itself presents an opportunity for more parallels to social intersubjectivity: the divining glass that supposedly shows the friend or beloved potentially also reflects the self of the individual who peers into it. Through our desires to see our friend or loved one, we also crave their reflected versions of our self so that we can continue to fashion our actions and refashion our own notion of our self. We crave the self-objectification; as a result, we desire the medium of that reflection: our friend or beloved.

her version of Antenor in his absence, the speaker is assured of maintaining his presence through her even after he has left.<sup>16</sup>

This image depicts the central mechanism of amorous intersubjectivity and hints at the insurmountable paradox inherent in it. The lover reflects an image of the beloved to the beloved; the beloved must consider this version of the self in relation to his or her own notion of the self. In the case of Philips's poem, the image of Antenor reflected by the speaker is extremely positive; his love for the speaker is strong (7-8, 24) and unwavering (17-18).<sup>17</sup> And according to the speaker, at least, her version of Antenor is indistinguishable from the real Antenor.

The final two couplets of the poem bring to the forefront the question of the veracity of the versions of the self held by both the speaker and Antenor – and perhaps by extension the versions of the self we encounter through intersubjective interaction generally. The speaker insists that the picture of Antenor that she carries is so accurate that no one will be able to determine which is the true version of her beloved, the version she presents to the world or his version. But based on her idealization of their love as she describes it throughout the previous lines of the poem, we easily could entertain the idea that her perception and version of him are also idealized.

---

<sup>16</sup> Interestingly, this moment of intersubjective engagement in which the speaker and Antenor can see the speaker's iteration of her beloved does not require his presence as Rochat and other social psychologists who subscribe to externalist theories of subject formation might seem to require. This intersubjectivity occurs solely within the lovers' minds, though the intersubjectivity in the present of moment of the poem was built upon physical interaction, not just mental reflection.

<sup>17</sup> This intersubjectivity of course extends beyond the confines of the text in this particular instance, as Philips is known to have regularly referred to her husband as Antenor in her poetry. Consequently, the reflection of the beloved and their love is textual as well.

This difficulty highlights the doubts and anxieties inherent in intersubjectivity generally and which serve as central characteristics of amorous intersubjectivity. Faced with the beloved's idealized version of the self, the lover must attempt to reconcile his or her own self-conception with that presented by the beloved, either by aspiring to the idealization though probably never fully internalizing the idealized version of the self or by living with the acute awareness of the disjunction separating his or her version of the self from the beloved's idealization. For Carson, the acknowledgment of this disjunction causes eros. Because the Neoplatonic lovers are physically separate from one another, consistently at arms' length, never physically intimate, only described through sight or memory, they cannot challenge or enrich their conceptions of one another. Donne's speakers simply touch, but the erotic currency of that touch sets off an intersubjective encounter that is powerful enough to show them their true natures. Philips's Neoplatonic model of lyric intimacy, in comparison, seems less complex, less emotionally freighted. This is, in all likelihood, because she does not accept the potential disjunction that can result from considering the version of the self held by the individual and the version of the self the individual can access through intersubjective engagement with her lover. Instead, Philips insists that any sense of disjunction results from faulty self-perceptions rather than from any unwarranted idealization on the part of the lover. By disregarding the possibility of the validity of the disjunction between the two images of themselves that her speaker and Antenor hold up for one another, the intimacy described by her speaker seems somewhat flat.

As this lyric by Philips might suggest, many of the tropes of amorous lyrics – the images, metaphors, and allusions we expect to see in lyrical poems



about love – have their basis in amorous intersubjective relationality. Philips rehearses a number of them: exchanged hearts safely carried and preserved by the two lovers; combined souls that equal more together than the sums of their parts; the lover's carrying a picture of the beloved in her heart; the notion that each of the lovers reflects one another. But Philips is hardly the first poet to utilize these literary tropes to signal and analyze amorous intersubjectivity. Many earlier amorous poets used the lyric as a means of exploring the inner workings and ramifications of intersubjectivity on love and desire. Clearly the issue of amorous intersubjectivity resonated very strongly with seventeenth-century poets, especially as they manipulate and modify the model of amorous lyricality within which they choose to write.

### III. "Excess of Love his Love betrayed"<sup>18</sup>

By the time Restoration poets like Aphra Behn and John Wilmot, Second Earl of Rochester take up the amorous lyric, views on love and intimacy and their poetic representation had shifted drastically.<sup>19</sup> There was no longer a question of whether the physical was important in amorous relationships or in poetic representations of them. The primacy and acceptance of the physical, of materiality was set at Charles II's accession to the throne and the reaction to the

<sup>18</sup> Behn "The Disappointment" 88

<sup>19</sup> The complex, multivalent relational structure of late seventeenth century and early eighteenth century amorous lyrics deserves and rewards earnest investigation. Many scholars, like Melissa Sanchez, Roberta Martin, Jonathan Brody Kramnick, and others, have done just that. For instance, Sanchez, in "Libertinism and Romance in Rochester's Poetry," *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 38.3 (2005), explores the "pastoral conjunction of romance and libertinism" that suffuses Rochester's verse (455). Kramnick, in "Rochester and the History of Sexuality." *ELH* 69.2 (Summer 2002), situates Rochester's lyrics within a Foucauldian literary history of sexuality. Martin, too, in "'Beauteous Wonder of a Different Kind': Aphra Behn's Destabilization of Sexual Categories," *College English* 61.2 (Nov. 1998), claims space for Restoration lyricists within a literary history of sexuality – though in her model Behn not Rochester is the "true pioneer" – using Behn's verse to explore the Restoration's "brave new world of sexual possibility" (208).

Interregnum's conservatism. Instead, poets like Behn and Rochester began to question within their verse the validity of any of extant models of amorous lyricality. As they did so, Behn and Rochester incorporated into their verse images of soulful intersubjectivity that were so popular with earlier models, whether Neoplatonic or dualistic, in order to engage, to revise, and to interrogate these traditions. Through their lyrics, they offer reinterpretations of and ideas about ideal poetic love, how love fares in the extratextual world, and how each of these impacts the other.

Behn and Rochester both make their arguments against soulful poetic love explicit through their depictions of failed soulful intersubjectivity. They seem impatient and frustrated with the poetic models of love they inherit. But their incorporation of amorous lyric intersubjectivity is more than an ironic assimilation of a poetic trope of enlightened love. The amorous intersubjectivity inherent in texts such as these is complex and multidimensional, depicted within the text between lovers as well as outside of it, as Behn and Rochester invite readers to inhabit, if only for a moment, the subject positions within and surrounding the text. This potential readerly intersubjectivity lends additional weight to the arguments and views embedded within the individual poems, enabling Behn and Rochester to more deeply affect readers and achieve their didactic goals. In poems like "The Imperfect Enjoyment" and "The Disappointment," respectively, Rochester and Behn invoke the system of ideal intersubjective love detailed by poets like Donne and Philips, but they do so to critique it, to revise it, and to indict both the lyric idealization of love and the realities of Restoration society that make enacting that poetic paradigm impossible.

Rochester's "The Imperfect Enjoyment" depicts and initiates moments of erotic intersubjectivity with very clear and problematic ramifications for the individuals within the text; his is an example of what happens with Carson's triangles go awry, when erotic intersubjectivity reflects and reinforces a negative self-image rather than a positive one.<sup>20</sup> From the opening lines, Rochester hints at the imminent disjunction between the views of the lovers reflected back at them through their intersubjectivity; the speaker assumes that he and Corinna enter into this encounter with the same goals and expectations.<sup>21</sup> He explains that they are both "both equally inspire[d] with eager fire, / Melting through kindness, flaming in desire" (3-4). We see the potential for misreading and misperception behind this assumption, however, in the first lines of the poem: "Naked she lay, clasped in my longing Arms, / I filled with *love*, and she all over Charms" (1-2, my emphasis). These lines make it very clear to us that the speaker's interpretation of the situation is does not align with Corinna's; love

---

<sup>20</sup> John Wilmot, Earl of Rochester, and Harold Love, ed. *The Works of John Wilmot, Earl of Rochester* (New York: Oxford UP, 1999) 13-15.

<sup>21</sup> Melissa Sanchez explores the "pastoral conjunction of romance and libertinism" that suffuses Rochester's verse (455). She begins by noting that Rochester yokes together "the conceptual modes of romance – the faith in love's transcendence – and libertinism – the pursuit of physical pleasure as humanity's highest good" (441). Sanchez argues that "Rochester's awareness of the compromises of both romance sanguinity and libertine cynicism emerges in" his mockery of the "winking artificiality" and disingenuousness that pastoral convention and libertinism share (442). Rochester, in Sanchez's readings, emerges as an individual who attempts to acknowledge and to balance in his verse his dissatisfaction with conventional systems used to explain and to control love and desire. In "The Imperfect Enjoyment, in Sanchez's reading, Rochester systematically evokes traditional romance notions of love only to undercut them by deploying shockingly hyperbolic metaphors for the desiring body (lms 13-18, for instance). Rochester renders the libertine equally artificial by hyperbolizing it in an anti-blazon reduction of men and women to the physicality of their desires and desiring organs (lms 62-5). In case his depiction of romance and libertine traditions in extremis failed to highlight the artificiality and unviability of romance and libertine models, Rochester nullifies both systems through premature ejaculation. Transcendence through romantic union cannot, it seems, occur without physical union. Libertine satisfaction of erotic desires, too, demands physical coupling. Premature ejaculation thwarts both and highlights the ironic disjunction and incompatibility of the two systems that Sanchez believes guide Rochester's attitudes toward love and desire. By foregrounding his discussions of romance and libertine views of love in the inherently disingenuous pastoral tradition, Rochester highlights the artificiality and impossibility of both the romance and libertine traditions.

and sex are on his mind, but the speaker's limited perspective renders her an object, a body without similar thoughts of love, at least according to the speaker and the relationship he has to her. Though the chiasmus structuring the poem's initial couplet implies a sense of shared and equivalent experience to this moment of foreplay, we eventually discover that this sense of equivalence is false and that the lines' chiastic configuration in fact highlights the psychological separation that allows the speaker to misread Corinna. Here we find no commingled "we," no hints that the lovers share the intimate intersubjective connection that would enable them to know either the self or the beloved with any degree of precision. Our speaker knows his own thoughts, his own feelings, but has no access to Corinna's. Because of this lack of intersubjective access, he bases his actions upon assumption and interpretation unrefined by amorous intersubjectivity.

Without the "interanimation" that drives intersubjectivity in Donne and Philips, Rochester's lovers can only access – perhaps construct? – flawed versions of one another's perceptions of each other. Because they have such limited understanding from which to construct their lovers' conception of their selves, the versions of their selves reflected back at them are misperceptions. Guided only by his own skewed views of both himself and his beloved, the speaker must base his perception of Corinna's feelings and expectations on his own feelings and expectations. The speaker can clearly perceive Corinna's excitement at the prospect of sex with him: "With Arms, Legs, Lips close clinging to embrace / She clips me to her breast, and sucks me to her Face" (5-6). The difficulty for the speaker stems from an initial act of misinterpretation: he is "filled with love" and assumes her active ardor signals that she is filled with love as well (2). This

misperception ushers in a host of others that cement the fate of the two lovers: when love – imagined, assumed or real, shared or unrequited – enters into the equation, the speaker makes an irreversible conceptual leap. To the speaker's mind, this amorous encounter is no sexual lark, no meaningless drive to satisfy physical desire such as those he describes later in the poem. The speaker assumes and acts as if this is a scene of ideal and idealized love that according to earlier models should end in physical and spiritual consummation. We know, of course, that this ideal never materializes.

The embrace that opens the poem leads to a penetrative kiss whereby the lover's "nimble tongue," playing the part of the lovers' gazes in "The Ecstasy," conveys to the speaker that he "should prepare to throw / The all-dissolving Thunderbolt below" (7, 9-10). Further, the kiss signals to the speaker's soul that the appointed time for intersubjective engagement has also arrived: "My flutt'ring Soul, sprung with the pointed Kill, / Hangs hov'ring o'er her Balmy Lips of Bliss. / But whilst her busy hand would guide that part, / Which should convey my Soul up to her Heart" (11-14). Rochester completely intertwines the physical and the psychological in his depiction of intersubjectivity: the "flutt'ring soul" of line 11 is, of course, the center of the speaker's animate existence, but it also metonymically represents the speaker's penis, ready to "convey" the speaker's soul to his lover's heart (14). Rochester sharply and decisively skews earlier poetic renderings of amorous intersubjectivity. Rather than demonstrate the ideal manner in which the physical aspects of love and desire can complement the loftier mixing of souls through love, he presents an image in which physical intercourse is the only means of intersubjectivity.

Not content simply to skew the concept of poetic amorous intersubjectivity toward the physical, Rochester uses this paradigm shift to deconstruct the entire system. Corinna seems thoroughly captivated by the physical connection she shares with the speaker. The only sure physical action within the first section of the poem belongs to her. Her “*Arms, Legs, Lips* close clinging to embrace, / She clips [the speaker] to her *Breast*, and sucks [him] to her face” (5-6). Her “nimble *Tongue*” enacts the penetrative kiss that sends the speaker into his moment of ecstasy (7). Single-mindedly focused on physical acts of love and desire, Corinna misses her cue to join the speaker in the ecstatic moment and thwarts the intersubjective give and take we might expect to find even in a more physical revision of the earlier poetic narratives of love. The speaker experiences an ecstatic separation from his body alone; Corinna’s soul does not meet him in the air above their bodies to consummate their soulish love (11-12). She is so attuned to the physical, in fact, that she cuts short the speaker’s moment of psychological ecstasy. In doing so, she unequivocally renders impossible any potential for the resumption of amorous intersubjectivity either as described by Donne and Philips or in an iteration more attentive to the physical than either of theirs.

Rochester does not aim to reaffirm the system. Given Rochester’s continually twisting intersubjectivity into a parody of itself, the speaker’s premature ejaculation should come as no surprise to readers familiar with the tradition of the amorous lyric in the seventeenth century. Corinna, focused on physical pleasure rather than on intersubjective raptures is not present on both the soulish and corporeal levels. She thwarts the speaker’s ecstatic moment with a jarring reminder of their physicality: “her busy hand” touches his penis, and he

“dissolve[s] all o’er, / melt[s] into Sperm, and spend[s] at every pore” (13, 15-16). The speaker’s premature ejaculation transforms this scene from one with the potential to reinforce the ideal of physical and spiritual intercourse into one that instead provides Rochester with a platform from which to repudiate the poetic ideal.

In the aftermath of the speaker’s premature ejaculation, Rochester finally gives voice to Corinna. However, the one insight the speaker has into Corinna’s current state of mind indicates that, while she might not have expected the fate that awaited the speaker, she still assumed his premature ejaculation did not spell the end of their amorous encounter. The shock of the speaker’s premature ejaculation does not serve to reset the terms of their interaction: Corinna is still single-mindedly focused on her own physical pleasure, while the speaker remains in the self-reflexive, intersubjective frame of mind he has been in from the outset. In response to the unfortunate situation, Corinna simply smiles and “chides in a kind murmuring noise,” then asks him ““Is there then no more? [...] All this to Love and Rapture’s due, / Must not we pay a Debt to Pleasure too?”” (19-20, 22).

The speaker’s angry diatribe that makes up the remainder of the poem illustrates the intersubjective negotiation he grapples with as he tries to come to terms with his premature ejaculation, its impact on Corinna’s view of him, and its consequent power to transform his own view of himself. Corinna’s interjection points to the disjunction between expectation and reality that they both experienced. The gulf that separates the speaker’s failed encounter with Corinna from past experiences is vast indeed; his “Dart of Love, whose piercing point, oft tried, / with Virgin blood Ten Thousand Maids has dyed” and

“twould carelessly invade / woman or boy, nor aught its fury stayed” becomes instead a “dead *Cinder*” that “languid lies in this unhappy hour, / Shrunk up and Sapless like a withered Flower” (37-8, 41-2, 33, 44-45). The speaker is obviously struck by the disconnection between these two contrasting images of his sexual ability, but Corinna’s lingering question – “Is there then no more?” – implies that she, too, is aware of this disjunction.

Secure in his knowledge that neither of their expectations were met, the speaker reflects on the situation intersubjectively, revolving quickly between the three points on Carson’s erotic triangle: his conception of himself, his conception of Corinna, and his perception or misperception of the self reflected by Corinna. He attempts to resolve the disjunction by comparing his current state to past versions of the self, finds he is incapable of reconciling them, and so the cycle begins again. Attempting to come to terms with the “shame” and “rage” that prevent him from performing to his past standards, the speaker reiterates his current shame, which becomes heightened and multiplied in light of Corinna’s reaction to it. What was once the “All-Dissolving Thunderbolt” is now a “dead cinder” and a “trembling, confused, despairing, limber, dry, wishing, weak, unmoving Lump” (33, 35-36).

The shame the speaker feels undergoes similar magnification each time he recalls his former glory: what was a “dart of love” now lies languid (37). The drastic discrepancies between each example of potency he recalls and his current state increase his rage and resentment because these feelings are magnified by his assumptions about how drastically altered Corinna’s perception of him must be. Carson might argue that this disjunction and the speaker’s awareness of it would lend the situation an erotic *frisson*. In a more ideal amorous model,



perhaps Corinna would enable the speaker to successfully reconcile the conflicting versions of the self by proffering an understanding, positive version of the speaker to him, providing him with a new perspective from which to view himself. However, in Rochester's version of events, amorous intersubjectivity does not diminish psychological turmoil, and it prevents rather than generates *eros*.

While the speaker blames his failure on love (49,60), the real problem seems to be the heavily romanticized expectations that come into play whenever the speaker allows an idealistically and poetically loaded conception of love to become tangled up with sex. "Love," for the speaker, brings with it ideas of highly wrought artificiality of the sort we find in poems like Donne's "The Ecstasy" or Philips's "To my dearest Antenor"; the tone, language, and allusiveness of the first fifteen lines of the poem recall and operate within this idealized system of love. In loading the first part of this poem with the tropes of ideal intersubjective love, Rochester sets his speaker up for failure, a failure we are implicated in through intersubjectivity. We too are taken in by this short-lived Donnean model of love, and, with Rochester's speaker, we experience the vast difference between the lyrical ideal and the reality.

The speaker, clearly a believer in this narrative of spiritual and corporeal oneness, expects loving sex to involve ecstatic moments of spiritual and physical coupling. But the speaker's desire for this model "confounds" his desire for his lover and ushers him directly from anticipation to dullness (28). This indictment ultimately subverts the system of soulish love that created the disjunction between the speaker and Corinna in the first place: the speaker never considered that his love might be unrequited or that they did not love equally; this in turn

began the chain of intersubjective instability and the consequent self-doubt and shame the speaker rehearses in the last fifty-five lines of the poem. Through intersubjective engagement with the speaker, we gain access to a new perspective on our self, a perspective that shows us the futility of a model of love like Donne's. We now see both the Neoplatonic and the dualistic systems as essentially false, self-consuming, and self-defeating. Just like Rochester had hoped.

These subjective layers and our negotiation of them highlight the readerly intersubjectivity inherent in lyric poems like Donne's, Phillips's, Behn's, and Rochester's. In mentally speaking the words of the poem, in embodying the actions it contains, we identify with the personae within the text; we also speak the literal words of the poet and in so doing further alienate our self from our self. We happily and thoughtlessly exchange our subjectivity for the opportunity to become object to our self and to the subjectivities – both the poet's and those present within the action of the text – represented and revived in the text. This is more than mere ventriloquization or simple identification. This sort of engagement with a lyric text represents, reenacts, and skews the continual intersubjective and interobjective repositioning that powers our interactions with individuals every moment of every day.

Rochester invites this kind of readerly engagement by painting an immediate and vivid image of desire that becomes soulful vulnerability before it evolves into shame. He enables this sort of readerly intersubjectivity and interobjectivity through the subject positions he privileges and makes available to us within the text as well as through his formal poetic decisions. The vividness of the failed intersubjective encounter stems in part from the extreme

emotions Rochester describes but also from his evocative, sometimes synesthetic language. Consider, for example, the second couplet of the poem: "Both equally inspired with eager fire, / Melting through kindness, flaming in desire" (3-4). The language Rochester uses to describe these feelings encourages a sense of intimate immediacy for readers. "Inspired" at once suggests spiritual or soulish enlightenment while at the same time evokes the physical sensuality of breath and breathing that is hot because "eager fire" is the source of the inspiration ("Inspired," defs. 1, 2, 4). The gerunds "melting" and "flaming," both through their form and through their meaning, impart a sense of slow or arrested action that in the context of the poem serve to underscore Rochester's broader statements about the failure of love and desire that tries to operate within a system of poetic love. Such evocative language almost enacts its own form of seduction, drawing readers through the rich, nuanced, and multifaceted wordplay within the text. Further, Rochester only really offers readers a clear perspective from which to engage one other subject position in the beginning of the poem, that of the speaker. Once we engage the speaker's subject position, we are of course more likely to accept Rochester's indictment of poetic love because, like/as the speaker we fall prey to that system. Consequently, Rochester's repudiation of the soulish system of love and desire is also our response to the wrongs dealt to the speaker.

These techniques heighten the affective register of the scene and consequently amplify the persuasive force of Rochester's implicit arguments. In "The Imperfect Enjoyment," this readerly intersubjectivity with the speaker and with Corinna points out the impossibility of intersubjectivity, of having the sort of soulish interanimation and the total knowledge of the other and via that a

greater understanding of the self. What Rochester playfully shows us – but what the speaker cannot accept because he is still tangled up in a lyric model of love – is that amorous intersubjectivity is always on the verge of collapse. Since we cannot truly know the mind of any other, intersubjectivity is always based on misperception, always threatening cycles of negativity and shame, cycles that, for Rochester at least, should be avoided at all costs, even if the cost is our belief in a Donnean erotics of psychological and physical interanimation. Rochester achieves this didactic aim by drawing us in to intersubjective interaction with the subject positions within the text – we feel the speaker’s shame, his anger, his disappointment; we imagine Corinna’s own disappointment as the speaker’s cycles of self-recrimination and shame prevent their sexual encounter – and through intersubjective connection with him.

Our intersubjectivity with the speaker and the perspective of our self that we gain through this intersubjectivity show us unequivocally that, first, we found the glimmer of Donnean love in the poem’s opening lines compelling, and second, that both the Neoplatonic and dualistic lyric models of love are untenable because they are literary constructions, fantasies. Though we might sense the arguments and their validity on first reading, until we understand how precisely we engage them and that we do so as a result of a calculated rhetorical effort, we cannot fully comprehend the complex and unique craftsmanship inherent in what appears to be a simple bawdy poem about failed love and sex.

But Rochester further uses intersubjectivity to convince us of the validity of his view of these models of love by inviting us to engage intersubjectively with him. Though the poem might not demonstrate expansiveness in the sense

that Johnson described or that I elaborated on in Chapter One,<sup>22</sup> “The Imperfect Enjoyment” achieves it, and consequently makes spaces for us to join Rochester in constructing the broader implications of the lyric, by almost absurdly yoking together the earnestness of the speaker’s psychological pain and the satiric humor and play at work on the macro level of the text. Though intersubjectivity with the speaker and Corinna continuously draw us into the text, the nagging sense that the scene we are experiencing and witnessing is somewhat absurd. This disjunction in our affective response causes us to engage Rochester’s subject position in order to try to make sense of what we feel, of what he made us feel, during our reading experience of the text. Through his reliance on excess – in the specificity of his descriptions, in the speaker’s overreaction, in the resulting tirade – Rochester signals to us that, on the macro level, the energy of the lyric is satire, satire that shows us irrevocably that we are working within an untenable amorous system. We can reconcile these two levels of the text – the earnest, serious level that shows us pain as a result of faulty intersubjectivity and the satiric, derisive level of the text that, in case intersubjectively experience the speaker’s pain was not enough to convince us, highlights the inherent flaws of the lyric model of love – through intersubjectivity.

Like Rochester in “The Imperfect Enjoyment,” in “The Disappointment” Behn addresses the implications of the system of love described by Donne and Philips.<sup>23</sup> And like Rochester, Behn initially revises that system by charging the

---

<sup>22</sup> The lyric is explicit in the details of the encounter, leaving no blanks in the erotic scene for the reader to have to fill in, for example.

<sup>23</sup> Aphra Behn, and Janet M. Todd, ed., *The Works of Aphra Behn* (Columbus: Ohio State UP, 1992) 65-9.

scenes she describes with eroticism and anatomizing the act of sex itself, steps earlier lyricists ignored outright, simply gestured toward, or only discussed obliquely. Her attention to the moments leading up to and including the sexual encounter and its aftermath subverts the idealistic conceptions of physical and psychological oneness so prevalent in earlier amorous lyrics. Behn undercuts this tradition by introducing direct, vocal, and active female desire.<sup>24</sup> To use Carson's triangular model of erotic intersubjectivity, Behn inherits a system that privileges the masculine role, both in physical and psychological encounters, a system that shows us the view of amorous intersubjectivity from the male lover's point of the triangle. By giving voice and agency to the female in this system of love, Behn reveals how different this amorous model looks from the perspective of the female lover's point on Carson's triangle.

Unlike Corinna in "The Imperfect Enjoyment," Cloris desires and participates in both the physical and psychological dimensions of ideal love. But her active desire overwhelms the amorous narrative she inherits. Consequently, in "The Disappointment," we find Behn ironically treating a failed sexual encounter by using the same images Donne and Philips used to define and defend their versions of intersubjective love. Behn reveals a limitation built into the foundation of Donne's and Philips's conceptions of ideal love: it does not account for active female desire for both the physical and spiritual ecstasy their systems promise. Behn ultimately rejects this amorous system entirely.<sup>25</sup>

---

<sup>24</sup> Though in "The Disappointment" Behn clearly engaged other amorous lyric traditions as well, the poem is after all an adaptation of a Cautenac's "*L'occasion perdue recouverte*," by considering this text within the English amorous lyric tradition, we can better appreciate the complexity and the multifaceted nature of Behn's revisionary work.

<sup>25</sup> Building on work by Randolph Trumbach, Roberta C. Martin, in "*Beauteous Wonder of a Different Kind: Aphra Behn's Destabilization of Sexual Categories*," sees the late seventeenth and

In “The Disappointment,” the stage is set for a typical pastoral: the swain, “amorous Lysander,” and his beloved, “fair Cloris,” are sequestered in a bower lit only by the light shining from Cloris’s eyes (1, 2, 10). However, by the middle of the second stanza, it is clear that what ensues will not follow the customary rituals of idyllic seduction scenes. Rather than reiterate the actions and attitudes readers expect of a Lysander and a Cloris – active pursuit of the latter by the former and passive resistance to the former by the latter – Behn instead lends her shepherdess active desire. Not only does Cloris “permit [Lysander’s amorous] force” (14); she also physically draws him to her (15-17). Lysander, in a moment of obvious role reversal, “lay[s] trembling at [Cloris’s] feet” and is unable to resist her (18-19). By introducing Cloris’s desire into the model of amorous intersubjectivity we see in Donne and Philips, Behn short-circuits the entire system and ironically calls attention to its artificiality. This step not only indicts this particular poetic ideal but also implicitly questions the value of all systems of love that fetishize the sort of soulish and physical interanimation that Donne and Philips illustrate.

By stanza four, Cloris’s ventriloquized refusals arouse Lysander to action, reinstating the gender roles one might expect to encounter in such a pastoral setting:

And breathing faintly in his Ear,  
 She cried, ‘Cease, Cease – your vain Desire,  
 Or I’ll call out – What would you do?  
 My Dearer Honour ev’n to You

---

early eighteenth centuries as a transitional period in the history of sexuality in which writers “created subject positions that were neither male nor female, but instead were based on “sliding” or transitional experiences of gender and sexuality” (193). For Martin, Behn is the literary linchpin in the history of sexuality: “she undermined publicly polarized categories of gender and challenged the authority of dominant sexual discourses by turning indeterminate, private, gender positions into ‘public’ performances” through her verse (208, 194).

I cannot, must not give – Retire,  
 Or take this Life, whose chiefest part  
 I gave you with the Conquest of my Heart.' (23-30)

These lines simply do not fit Cloris's actions. She actively pursues Lysander in the first two stanzas of the text and even as she gives voice to the feminine resistance we might expect to find, her actions bespeak her desire. By playing this "proper" passive role, however, she does provoke Lysander into reacting. He now enjoys the only agency in the moments leading up to intercourse: he "kisses her mouth, her neck, her hair" and presses his "burning trembling hand" "upon her snowy breast" (34, 36-7).<sup>26</sup> Cloris passively enjoys his advances as she "lay[s] panting in his Arms" (38). Finally she responds by kissing Lysander. Behn here highlights the shortcomings of the pastoral ideal: when it comes to the physicality of this sort of love, this system only has room for one active participant at a time, and that active participant should be male.

In a moment redolent of the soulish intersubjectivity of Donne and, to a degree that of Philips, this kiss signals soulish intercourse predicated upon physicality: "Her Balmy Lips encount'ring his / Their Bodies as their Souls are joined; / Where both in Transports Unconfined / Extend themselves upon the Moss" (51-54). Their kiss is the act that causes their moment of transport: they both enjoyed a "state of being 'carried out of oneself,' [...] rapture, ecstasy" unconfined ("Ecstasy," def. 3). Brought on by Cloris's kiss, this ecstatic scene presents an image whereby physical intercourse is the only means of spiritual intercourse. Their ecstasy seems ideal: their souls combined and their bodies

---

<sup>26</sup> His "trembling hand" perhaps demonstrating that the passivity and timidity that he had demonstrated earlier in the text has not entirely left him.



extended “half dead” and showing “no signs of Life” (55, 59). In the Donnean paradigm, this scene should trigger their amorous intersubjectivity.

The moment of ecstasy appears idyllic until Lysander cannot maintain the soulish connection between them. The first two lines of stanza 7 hint at the trouble that awaits the lovers. Whereas after the second stanza Lysander had been active, at the beginning of the seventh stanza, Behn gives us the following lines: “He saw how at her length she lay, / He saw her rising bosom bare” (61-62). Behn tells us that rather than actively engage in either soulish or corporeal love, Lysander simply “saw.” Both he and Cloris actively desire one another physically; both experience the soulish interanimation that renders them sepulchral, like the lovers in Donne’s “The Ecstasy.” The ecstatic moment seems to be entirely in order for Cloris, her body and her soul prepared for consummation. However, by repeating “I saw,” Behn calls our attention to Lysander’s precarious position. No Donnean intersubjective enlightenment unifies the soul and body for Lysander in the stanzas that follow. Instead, body and soul are insurmountably separated for the “o’er ravished Shepherd” who “lies / unable to perform the sacrifice” (69-70).

As a being in this overly determined pastoral world, Lysander feels the paradoxical tensions inherent in the poetic narrative of ideal amorous interaction. To function properly, ideal poetic love in Donne and Philips relies on a finely balanced equation of desire that cannot bear up under the load of too much physical passion coupled with a surfeit of poetic expectations. Lysander is “too [psychologically] transported” by his “vast [physical] pleasure”; he cannot consummate their relationship physically because he feels the burden of “too much love” (72-74). Excess causes the system to collapse entirely, excess brought

upon by Cloris's active role in the scene (88). Lysander's inability to perform physically transforms this scene from one with the potential to reinforce the ideal of corporeal and intersubjective interaction into one that instead provides Behn with a platform from which to repudiate the poetic idealization of spiritually or psychologically enlightening love.

Lysander and Cloris, clearly believers in this narrative of soulful and corporeal oneness, expect sex to involve ecstatic moments of physical and spiritual coupling: stanza six describes in great detail Cloris's shift from physical to soulful lover, her body reminiscent of Donne's lovers' sepulchral statues, and stanza ten relates Lysander's disappointment, rage, and shame at being unable to join Cloris. But their desire for the intersubjective ecstasy they believe accompanies such love thwarts their physical consummation. Lysander is so aroused by the expectation of the heightened pleasure of sex with a partner he loves that when Cloris takes an active role in their amorous encounter, her kiss initiates the intimate intersubjectivity they crave and expect but paradoxically precludes further pleasure for either of them. Behn hints at this problem in stanza two and again in stanza eleven and twelve, when Cloris's touch reverses expected gender roles, rendering Lysander passive, fainting, and in Cloris's power: "Her Hands his Bosom softly meet, / But not to put him back designed, / Rather to draw 'em on inclined:" (15-18) and in stanza 11:

Her timorous Hand she gently laid  
 (Or guided by Design or Chance)  
 Upon that Fabulous *Priapus*,  
 That potent God, as Poets feign,  
 [...]  
 Then *Cloris* her fair Hand withdrew,  
 Finding that God of her Desires  
 Disarmed of all his Awful Fires,  
 And Cold as Flow'rs bathed in the Morning-Dew.

[...]  
 And from *Lysander's Arms* she fled,  
 Leaving him fainting on the Gloomy Bed.  
 (103-106, 111-114, 119-120)

Lysander's desire coupled with Cloris's desire confounds their desire entirely:

"Excess of love his love betrayed; / In vain he toils, in vain commands; / The insensible fell weeping in his hands" (88-90). His inability to perform "served to increase his Rage and Shame, / And left no Spark for New Desire: / Not all her Naked Charms could move / Or calm that Rage that had debauched his Love" (98-100).

Though Behn aims some of the ironic energy of the last third of the poem at Lysander's inability to perform, she most strongly indicts the tradition of the seventeenth-century lyric idealization of love. She implies that this poetic narrative of love sets up unrealistic expectations for the realities of love and sex. It is a system that "poet's feign," that they falsely put forth in their verse; but, homophonically, it is also a system that they desire, that they wish were true, an idealized system that, in Behn's rewriting of it, is utterly impossible to achieve. This indictment ultimately subverts the poetically feigned / fained system of love that late-seventeenth-century poets inherited: an idealized narrative of love touted by Behn's predecessors that promises extreme psychological intimacy and supposedly enables ecstasy-inducing physical consummation.

Like Rochester, Behn also relies on evoking readerly intersubjectivity to achieve her subversive goals. Unlike "The Imperfect Enjoyment," whose speaker is one of the lovers describing his own feelings and actions and Corinna's actions and his perceptions of her feelings and reactions, the speaker in "The Disappointment," until the final stanza of the lyric, is an anonymous voice with

limited access to the feelings of either Cloris or Lysander. What we realize once we reach the final stanza, however, is that what insight into the affective states of Cloris and Lysander the speaker presents is, within the fictional realm of the text, the speaker's perception of their feelings that she gains through intersubjectivity:

The *Nymph's* Resentments none but I  
 Can well Imagine or Condole:  
 But none can guess *Lysander's* Soul,<sup>27</sup>  
 But those who swayed his Destiny.  
 His silent Griefs swell up to Storms,  
 And not one God his Fury spares;  
 He cursed his Birth, his Fate, his Stars;  
 But more the *Shepherdess's* Charms,  
 Whose soft bewitching Influence  
 Has Damned him to the *Hell* of Impotence. (131-140)

When we first read these lines, we realize that, throughout the lyric, the descriptions the speaker provided were, by and large, descriptions of action and reaction. What explicit description we have of the psychological states of the lovers derives from the speaker's intersubjective engagement with them: the speaker deduces that Lysander seeks Cloris "without Respect or Fear" (41), that Cloris felt no "Pride and Shame" (64), and that his impotence left Lysander "in despair," "Rage and Shame" (93, 97), but the speaker does not explore the lovers' feelings any deeper within the text. The realization that the speaker provides so little description of the lovers' feelings likely comes as a surprise to us; as we read the lyric, we likely feel as though the text thoroughly and explicitly relates the emotions they experience. This sense, however, is a result of our own intersubjective engagement with the lovers. By providing such explicit detail of the lovers' physical actions – "Silent as a yielding Maid's Consent, / She with a

---

<sup>27</sup> Though the speaker disavows any access to Lysander's grief, fury, or curses, she describes him from the same "distance" from which she describes Cloris; her description of their feelings is basically even, rather than demonstrating a greater level of access to one than to the other.

Charming Languishment, / Permits his Force, yet gently strove" (12-14) or "Her Bright Eyes sweet, and yet severe, / Where Love and Shame confus'dly strive" (21-2), for example – but withholding almost all description of their psychological states, Behn provides us the space to intersubjectively join her in the meaning-making of the lyric. By modeling intersubjectivity with the lovers through her speaker's interaction with them, Behn reveals to us, upon reflection on the poem as a whole, that we had been enjoying a similar sort of interaction with the lovers as the speaker. We see their anger, their disappointment, their fear, their desire explicitly in their actions within the text, but only through intersubjectivity can we fill in the psychological blanks that surround their actions, psychological blanks that actually carry the bulk of the weight of Behn's indictment of the system of love she inherited. Behn builds her subversion and refusal of this system upon her lovers' intense psychological reactions to the steps they both take in this erotic encounter, psychological reactions she relies on readers to supply.

By crafting a relational structure built on intersubjectivity within texts like "The Imperfect Enjoyment" and "The Disappointment," Rochester and Behn encourage readers to join in the amorous experience they describe in order to shape their readers' own conceptions of ideal love, desire, and intimacy. As a result, both the lyric itself and the experience of reading it become amorous encounters. Exploring the intersubjective relationality that runs throughout these texts helps us look beyond the surface to the center of the textual encounter, revealing its inner workings and giving force to the work the poets hope to accomplish as they reform inherited model of love and desire.

Neoplatonic love, we see, is not acceptable to the Restoration lyricists like Behn and Rochester. Both showcase the physicality of love by returning to a more Donnean lyrical model, and then intensify its elements to the point of excess, an intensification that, though within the textual realm, seeks to evacuate from the amorous lyric model the idealism implicit in it and replace that idealism with a dose of disappointing reality.

Unraveling the tangled threads of intersubjective engagement inherent in so many amorous lyric poems reveals the complex affective and rhetorical impact imbedded in and enacted through these texts. By harnessing our related abilities both to negotiate multiple subject positions and to reflect upon the self as an object, amorous lyricists in seventeenth century utilize lyric intersubjectivity to parallel the erotic experience described within the poem. As a consequence of this, we sometimes find poetic encounters that reinforce expected conceptions of eros, but we more often find iterations of love and longing that surely trouble, question, and counter typical amorous models. Donne, Philips, Rochester, and Behn clearly struggled with how to use intersubjectivity to model through their lyrics their views on love. As we will see in Chapter Three, the psalm translators of the early eighteenth century shared similar difficulties. As they attempt to represent divine love through their lyrical translations of psalms, poets like Elizabeth Singer Rowe, Mary Masters, and Anne Rennew also rely on relational models of intersubjectivity, occasionally even conflating paradigms of amorous and divine love.

### Chapter Three

#### Savior, Self, and Soul: Psalm Translations and the “Personal Lyric”

It could be argued, then, that lying before our eyes for more than 250 years, hymns have been the eighteenth century’s personal lyric, that form that allegedly has been missing.

- Paula Backscheider *Eighteenth-Century Women Poets and Their Poetry*

In the final years of the seventeenth century and well into the eighteenth century, the lyric impulse shifts from the amorous court poetry of Rochester, Behn, and others to focus instead on religion. Just as the amorous poets of the previous generation used representations of lyric intersubjectivity to try to understand the thoughts, feelings, and motivations of the beloved, poets of the early eighteenth century represent intersubjectivity in their religious lyrics as they interrogate, manipulate, and modify the way that they and their readers imagined the relationship between the individual and God. This is abundantly clear in one very popular manifestation of the lyric: verse translations of the Psalms. Some of the most popular psalms for eighteenth-century poets are lyric texts – like Psalm 23, Psalm 42, and Psalm 139 – that imagine through metaphor the relationship between God and the petitioner.<sup>1</sup> As the poets choose and then transform into lyric verse these particular psalms, they exaggerate the intersubjectivity portrayed in the 1611 Translation to further illuminate facets of the ideal spiritual relationship, a relationship that underwent substantial changes

---

<sup>1</sup> As we will discuss more fully later in the chapter, as a rhetorical figure whose meaning-making requires both the poet and the reader, and in fact invites the reader into the active shaping of meaning, metaphor often initiates intersubjective relationships between readers and poets and readers and speakers.

Stephen Rogal, in *A General Introduction to Hymnody and Congregational Song*, provides tables that begin to demonstrate the popularity of psalm translations in the eighteenth century. A simple search for “psalm” within the “Languages and Literature” sub-section of Eighteenth-Century Collections online supports Rogal’s assessment that a full accounting of their popularity would be difficult to complete, given the volume of printed psalm translations and given the variety of sorts of collections psalm translations were included in.

over the course of the seventeenth century. God is a shepherd; God is a lover; and God becomes another version of the self. These three Psalms together depict a sort of revolution in the way that their poets imagine the individual's relationship with God: the 23<sup>rd</sup> Psalm presents to us an ideal relationship and the comfort it can bring the individual, the 42<sup>nd</sup> Psalm explores the turmoil of an individual who feels forgotten by God, and the 139<sup>th</sup> Psalm brings us full circle, quelling fears that the relationship between the individual and God is unrequited. Each of the lyric iterations of these psalms not only helps the poets and their readers understand the ideal way that they should interact with God; each of the lyric re-renderings of these psalms illustrate how the poets utilized intersubjectivity to explore the limits of subjective expression and understanding in the individual's spiritual relationships, and, as a consequence, expand our own understanding of the power of this lyric technique.

Britain underwent monumental change during the winter of 1688 and 1689. Amid unrest in England that was equal parts religious, social, and political, William of Orange sailed from the Dutch Republic on a "protestant wind," led the Dutch fleet up the Thames, and landed in Devon on 5 November 1688. In the diplomatic power struggle in the six weeks that followed, James II fled England, returned, and then left again, fearing for his safety. On 28 December 1688, William became head of a provisional government that resulted in the English Convention Parliament, which convened on 22 January 1689. The House of Commons decided by acclamation that James II had broken "the original contract," had "abdicated the government," and had left the throne



“vacant” (Horowitz 9-10).<sup>2</sup> The House of Lords, many of whom still harbored some loyalty to James II, amended the House of Commons’ language, stating that James had “deserted” the throne rather than “abdicated,” and eventually appointed William and Mary monarchs (10-11). The Convention Parliament drafted and presented to William and Mary a *Declaration of Right* in March 1689, thus solidifying – if one were to ask a Whig – or granting – if one were to ask a Tory – a number of rights that shifted the balance of power in England from the monarch to Parliament (12). William and Mary were crowned on 11 April 1689.

The events that occurred during this “Glorious” Revolution fundamentally changed the country. The many political changes that this transition of power within the Stuart House entailed certainly impacted the relationship between the monarchy and Parliament, but it also initiated changes that impacted the lives of English individuals, especially the ways they conducted worship. Religious toleration and Protestant primacy were at the center of the struggle between Parliament – and the English citizenry – and James II. James’s Catholicism and the birth of his son, which seemed to guarantee a Catholic succession to the English throne, compelled a group of men, Tory and Whig, titled and untitled, one even a Bishop in the Anglican Church, to invite William to force James II from the throne and prevent his son – whom they claimed was an imposter – from succeeding.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> Henry Horowitz. *Parliament, Policy and Politics in the Reign of William III*. Manchester: Manchester UP, 1977.

<sup>3</sup> Signed by William Cavendish, Charles Talbot, Thomas Osborne, Bishop of London Henry Compton, Edward Russell, Henry Sidney, and Richard Lumley, the Invitation explained: “We have great reason to believe, we shall be every day in a worse condition than we are, and less able to defend ourselves, and therefore we do earnestly wish we might be so happy as to find a remedy before it be too late for us to contribute to our own deliverance [...] the people are so generally dissatisfied with the present conduct of the government, in relation to their religion,

As part of the propaganda campaign that helped pave the way for William's voyage to England and transition to the English throne, William issued a *Declaration of Reasons for appearing in arms in the kingdom of England* in October 1688, a month before he would land in Devon.<sup>4</sup> The *Declaration of Reasons* stated that William's actions were England's only hope in thwarting James II's plot to assert a Catholic, absolutist regime that would solidify the "creeping tyranny" of the recent years (Claydon 25-6). The *Declaration of Reasons* was William's first explicit entry into the flurry of propagandist publications supporting his installation as king. The other element was tied less directly to William himself and was implemented through sermons given in large part by Gilbert Burnet, who Tony Claydon terms William's "chief of propaganda" (28-9). If the *Declaration of Reasons* addressed the political and constitutional motives behind William's actions, Burnet's facet of the campaign addressed the religious benefits of accepting William as king. In so doing, Burnet appealed to and helped crystallize the religious aspect of the revolution as a central source of English dissatisfaction with James, as the main cause of social and political unrest that William, a member of the Dutch Reformed Church, could ameliorate.<sup>5</sup>

---

liberties and properties (all which have been greatly invaded), and they are in such expectation of their prospects being daily worse, that your Highness may be assured, there are nineteen parts of twenty of the people throughout the kingdom, who are desirous of a change; and who, we believe, would willingly contribute to it, if they had such a protection to countenance their rising, as would secure them from being destroyed."

<sup>4</sup> Tony Claydon. *William III and the Godly Revolution*. Cambridge Studies in Early Modern British History. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1996.

<sup>5</sup> Claydon traces Burnet's relationship with what he calls the Orange propaganda machine from Burnet's associations with Gaspar Fagel at the Hague between 1686 and 1688. During this time, Claydon explains, Burnet wrote numerous pamphlets to undermine James II, "citing his experiences of Catholic bigotry," "question[ing] the legality of the king's policies in England," and "denounc[ing] the cruelty and absurdity of his religion" (29-30). Claydon continues, "As the member of the Orange team with local knowledge, [Burnet] was a more suitable director of English propaganda than Fagel, and was effectively promoted to this position during the

Burnet solidified the focus on the religious benefits of accepting William's rule in a sermon he gave on 23 December 1688 at St. James's Palace. In it, he "steered clear of the constitutional justifications" for William's expedition and instead concentrated his attention and the attention of his audience – both those individuals present and those who would read or hear the widely distributed printed version of the sermon – upon God and providence. Burnet argued "that William's invasion had been favoured by God" and "demonstra[ed] that the prince of Orange's success had been brought about by heaven, and that it had proceeded according to some divine plan," "outlining a series of extraordinary miracles that had marked William's smooth progress to London" (31).<sup>6</sup> Burnet "play[ed] down arguments from an earthly and man-made constitution" and instead "appeal[ed] to divine blessing upon" William's actions. According to Burnet, God smiled on William's Protestantism and on his promises of religious tolerance, allowing William smooth entry into England and enabling him to, in Burnet's words, "turn the hearts of the whole nation as one man to him" (31). According to Burnet, God appointed William to initiate religious reform in England, reform that would transcend dissention between Anglicans and

---

expedition. Burnet accompanied William to England as his chaplain, and used the resulting intimacy with the prince to advise his master on how to resent himself to James's subjects. During the expedition, Burnet got involved with the physical production of Orange propaganda; he spoke in William's defense at vital moments during the invasion; and he wrote pamphlets to rebut the charges of Jacobite authors. Further, Burnet set up public occasions on which William's message could be propagated. These included religious services to pray for the prince's success, ceremonial entrances into towns, public readings of William's *Declaration*, and formal expressions of support by the prince's English allies" (29-30).

<sup>6</sup> Among these "miracles" Burnet included the "protestant wind" that had, uncharacteristically for the season, guided William toward England rather than pushed against his progress, Louis XIV's surprising decrease in diplomatic power in Europe, and the revelation of "the plots of evil counsellors" (31).

Dissenting groups and help reestablish social and political accord through ecumenism.

Out of these goals arose the 1689 Act of Toleration. The longer name of the act is revealing: “An Act for Exempting their Majestyes Protestant Subjects dissenting from the Church of England from the Penalties of certaine Lawes.” The Act granted freedom of worship to nonconformist Protestant groups like Baptists, Congregationalists, and other Dissenters, so long as they registered their places of worship, their ministers were licensed, and they took certain oaths of allegiance.<sup>7</sup> While it maintained certain political restrictions like exclusion from political office, the Act ensured that individual Dissenters could worship openly and could legally separate themselves from the Anglican Church.

In the preceding decades, one of the many points of contention that divided Dissenters and Anglicans is the importance Dissenting groups placed on revealed religion and the individual’s right, and for some groups, the individual’s responsibility, to engage with and interpret scripture for themselves rather than depending upon the interpretations given to them by priests. These groups valued active, engaged, interpretive acts of worship, and they believed that the Anglican liturgy was a stumbling block that prevented the active engagement they believed was necessary for true worship. This impulse to privilege the individual’s role as interpreter shifted the focus of religious practice, asserting the portability of worship – since interpretation rested with the individual and was not dependent upon time, place, or company – and

---

<sup>7</sup> "Toleration Act." *Encyclopædia Britannica. Encyclopædia Britannica Online Academic Edition.* Encyclopædia Britannica Inc., 2012. Web. 01 Mar. 2012.  
<<http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/598612/Toleration-Act>>.

amplifying the importance of the literate worshiper and the printed texts necessary to augment her worship and spiritual reflection.

In the early years of the seventeenth century, James I commissioned a new, expansive translation of the Bible that provided interpretive space to coalesce Anglicans, Scottish Presbyterians, and early Dissenting groups alike. And as the century drew to a close, Parliament and William followed through with the promises of religious tolerance that played such an important role during the campaign to invite and accept William, culminating in the eventual passage of the Act of Toleration in 1689. For the second time in almost 90 years, then, the English monarchy encouraged ecumenism.

The intervening decades witnessed important changes in the way English individuals lived, worked, and worshipped. The individual's role within worship and her responsibilities for the state of her beliefs and soul increased tremendously, not only with the increase in Dissenting groups but within the established Anglican Church as well. James I not only wanted a new translation of the Bible; he wanted it to be accessible to individuals, wanted its rhythms to invite them into the text, and through this, he wanted to "bind together [England's] people, its churches, and its king" (Nicholson 107). The Interregnum extended the importance of the individual's role in her own spiritual state, as separating and non-separating Puritans obtained a more impactful social, political, and religious position during Cromwell's rule. By the Restoration of Charles II in 1660 and the passage of the Act of Uniformity in 1662 that reestablished the role of the pre-civil war Anglican Church and instigated the issuance of a new *Book of Common Prayer*, the religious leeway of the previous decades was firmly in place, and the changes those years had gradually brought

about in the lives of English worshippers were too well established to turn back. By the end of the seventeenth century, many Christians in England had made the self-reflection so valued by Jacobean Reformed groups an essential part of their religious practice and almost certainly must have approached sacred texts – whether Biblical or literary – fully confident in their ability to engage and grapple with the ideas contained within them in order to arrive at their own interpretations.

While the way learned individuals viewed the subject certainly changed in the period as a result of and as reflected in the views of Hobbes and Locke, for example and while the impact of urbanization and the growth of a capitalist economy certainly changed the way that individuals lived, worked, and viewed themselves in the early part of the long eighteenth century, shifting religious beliefs and practices also certainly must have played a substantial role in the development of the English populous that we find at the turn of the eighteenth century. This was now a population more urban and more literate than any in England's history, a population with a thirst for the printed text.<sup>8</sup> And among

---

<sup>8</sup> J. Paul Hunter, in *Before Novels: The Cultural Contexts of Eighteenth-Century English Fiction* (1990) ties the growing literacy rates directly to changes in the religious environment in the seventeenth century. "Broad cultural campaigns to spread literacy, begun in the late sixteenth century for religious reasons and continued for reasons that were economic, political, and even psychological, had borne substantial fruit by the time of Wordsworth and Scott" (65). By 1800, Hunter estimates, England contained close to "a million and a half, [or] perhaps two million" readers, between 60 and 70 percent of the population; he contrasts that with approximately 25 percent, the comparable figure in 1600 (66). "The desire for literacy," Hunter explains, "was apparently based deep in the national consciousness, rooted in Protestant imperatives" (82). Further tying increased incitements for literacy to religious reasons, Hunter cites Isaac Watts: "The novelist, hymn-writer, and teacher Isaac Watts pretty well spoke for the culture in insisting that reading was necessary for everyone, of whatever class, and that 'The *Art of Writing* also is so exceeding useful, and it is now grown so very common, that the greatest part of Children may attain it at an easy Rate.' And, he added, '*Reading* is as needful for one Sex as the other.' The explicit reasons usually involve religious benefits, both individual and communal, to be derived from universal literacy – a powerful argument in a Protestant culture devoted to interpret for themselves, and bent on kicking over the traces of dependence on both oral tradition and the orality of daily community life. Some imagined a world where everyone could (and would())

the favorites of this anonymous British readership were religious tracts like sermons, hymn collections, and Psalm translations.<sup>9</sup>

In the surge of Psalm and hymn publication around the turn of the eighteenth century, we can see poets engaging religious questions that reflect the concerns of this population, especially questions of how to envision the self, how to envision God, and how to envision the individual's relationship to him. Both the sheer volume of these printed materials and the decisions made by poets to translate certain psalms over others together suggest that interest in and anxiety about subjectivity as it impacts the individual's beliefs and spiritual practices were central concerns both for poets and for their new and developing anonymous readership. These textual translations of psalms into verse offer another window into the subjective experience of the rapidly changing eighteenth-century English populace.<sup>10</sup>

J. Paul Hunter in a recent article on the effects of periodization on our view of the first part of the eighteenth century claims that we create "unwitting blank spaces in literary history," "dark corners in our closets" where "we keep some pretty good poets," poets whose work is forgotten or marginalized because it was "written during gaps between more or less reified and defined periods" (Hunter 434, 442). As representations of the individual poet's and the anonymous reader's efforts to comprehend the subjective implications of the growing importance of the individual's intimate relationship with God, lyric

---

read the Bible daily[... .] But piety was the most acceptable, most persuasive, and perhaps most fundamental basis for literacy" (82-83).

<sup>9</sup> Hunter *Before Novels* 86.

<sup>10</sup> These psalm translations are not the same as the metrical psalms that were included in psalters and sung or recited during Anglican worship; the lyrical psalms we will focus on in this chapter were written, packaged, and printed as texts.

psalm translations stand beside hymns, which Backschieder claims “have been the eighteenth century’s personal lyric, that form that allegedly has been missing” (144). These religious texts, which, as Backscheider explains, have been “lying before our eyes for more than 250 years,” not only in the form of hymns but in many forms of religious verse including psalm translations, certainly represent one of Hunter’s “blank spaces” (Backscheider 144). Perhaps taking our cues from Pope, Swift, and other members of The Scriblerus Club, we assumed that these poets were simply hacks who churned out pages of drivel to appease the mob.<sup>11</sup> Or perhaps, as Backscheider argues, the women poets we will discuss have been overlooked because of their gender. In any event, the poets and texts we have relegated to the dark corners of our closets are not outliers we should be willing to continue to overlook.<sup>12</sup>

The eighteenth-century poets who transform the Psalms into lyric verse do not do so as superficial religious or poetic exercises simply meant to increase

---

<sup>11</sup> Sir Richard Blackmore, who translated a version of the 42<sup>nd</sup> Psalm, was one of Pope’s favorite targets in both *The Dunciad* and in *Peri Bathos*. Pope’s 268<sup>th</sup> footnote in *The Dunciad* treats in great detail the opinions of his friends on Blackmore as a poet, and Pope mentions Blackmore specifically a number of times in both poems.

<sup>12</sup> Scholarship on early eighteenth-century verse and how we as critics ought to engage it is rich and varied. Paul Hunter calls on critics of eighteenth-century verse to devote more of our time and energy to moments that our narrative of literary development overlooks in “Missing Years: On Casualties in English Literary History, Prior to Pope” (2008). For a broader call to expand our notions of eighteenth-century verse, see Margaret Doody’s *The Daring Muse: Augustan Poetry Reconsidered* (1985). For the role of women poets in the creation of an alternative landscape of eighteenth-century lyric verse, see Paula Backscheider’s *Eighteenth-Century Women Poets and Their Poetry: Inventing Agency, Inventing Genre* (2005) and Carol Barash’s *English Women’s Poetry, 1649-1714: Politics, Community, and Linguistic Authority* (1996). Heather Dubrow, in *The Challenges of Orpheus: Lyric Poetry and Early Modern England* (2008), and Gabrielle Starr, in *Lyric Generations: Poetry and the Novel in the Long Eighteenth Century* (2004), offer alternative frameworks that both attempt to shift the way that we think about poetry in the period, Dubrow by reframing early modern lyricism and Starr by shifting the way that we think about the relationship between lyric subjectivity and novelistic subjectivity.

Literary scholarship on psalm translations specifically is less abundant, and scholarship on psalm translations as texts rather than as hymns is even less so. Though their focus is more on metrical psalms that are meant for singing, Donald Davie’s *The Eighteenth Century Hymn in England* (1993) and Madeleine Forrell Marshall’s and Janet Todd’s *English Congregational Hymns in the Eighteenth Century* (1982) both provide needed context on the popular poetic task of translating psalms into verse.



their religious feeling or to hone their facility with rhyme and meter. Further, these poets did not render these psalms into lyric verse for the purposes of congregational singing, and their texts are not counter-offerings to the Sternhold's and Hopkins's *The Whole Book of Psalms* (1562) or Tate's and Brady's *New Version of the Psalms of David* (1696). These lyric poems are verse translations packaged, printed, and sold to be read as texts by the emerging print consumer.<sup>13</sup> In these translations of the 23<sup>rd</sup>, 42<sup>nd</sup>, and 139<sup>th</sup> Psalms, poets explore, manipulate, and model different facets of the ideal relationship between God and the individual, drawing on a variety of relational models in order to better comprehend their own religious state and perhaps offer insights for their readers as they undertake their own spiritual self-reflection. Attention to their poetic treatments reveals that intersubjectivity continues to affect and mold representations of intimacy and spiritual interaction.

The transition of power from the Tudor to the Stuart house occurred amidst a similarly unsettled social, religious, and political landscape to that witnessed by the English populace during the Glorious Revolution. One of the ways that James I attempted to overcome the religious tension he faced as he tried to bring together Scottish Presbyterians, Anglicans, and nonconforming Protestant groups was to commission a new translation of the Bible. The 1611 King James Bible became the standard by which seventeenth- and eighteenth-

---

<sup>13</sup> These poems were typically included in sacred miscellanies by a group of individuals and also within collections of single authors' body of work. At times these texts would be grouped with other religious writing, which would imply that they were sold as part of a program or method of spiritual self-reflection and worship. When metrical psalms were packaged, printed, and sold to be sung, they typically were accompanied by a list of popular tunes that they could be sung to.

century readers judged all other English translations of the sacred text. In part a project meant to unify the divisive religious viewpoints James inherited upon his ascendance to the British throne, the 1611 translation in many ways is a study in tonal and textual expansiveness and ambiguity, setting within its very phrases enough interpretive space to engage and compel Puritan, Anglican, Presbyterian, and Catholic readers alike.<sup>14</sup> Or such at least was James I's goal and his charge to "God's secretaries."<sup>15</sup> The King James Bible's "great and majestic beauties, a conscious heightening of the word of God [...] is a window on" James's optimism and desire for social, political, and religious unity through compromise at the beginning of his reign, "in which the light of understanding and the majesty of God could be united in a text to which the nation as a whole, Puritan and prelate, court and country, simple and educated, could subscribe" (Nicholson 172).

James recognized that in order to achieve his goals of unification and reconciliation, he would need to rely on men who could successfully navigate the complicated social, political, and religious tensions of the time. Consequently, the King James Bible was translated by a group of, above all else, courtly men. They "knew everything about duplicity and politicking, constantly aware of the unreliability of language and men, of whisperings in ears and comments muttered behind the hand, but which nevertheless valued a courteous surface, the smooth and upholstered working of the demands of power" (144-5).

---

<sup>14</sup> If, in commissioning this new translation of the Bible, James could reassert, consolidate, and strengthen the religious authority of the British monarchy as he eased tensions between rival religious groups, all the better. Nicholson argues, in fact, that this was his primary goal and that religious unification was at best a secondary, though clearly related, concern.

<sup>15</sup> James took as his motto *beati pacifici*, and his call for this new translation was one of the ways he intended to demonstrate his benevolent, thoughtful peacemaking.

Individually, they were well versed in the ways of Jacobean political maneuvering, as knowledgeable about the nuances of court interactions and preferment as they were about Hebrew, Greek, or Aramaic. Collectively, this social training informed their textual decisions.

Rhetorically, the Translators relied on the same circumlocution in their translations that drove their courtly behavior. Thomas Wilson in his 1553 *The arte of rhetorique* defined circumlocution as “a large description either to sett forth a thyng more gorgeous-lie, or else to hyde it” (145). “The words of this translation, then, could embrace both gorgeousness and ambiguity” or perhaps gorgeousness through ambiguity (208).<sup>16</sup> This notion of expansiveness through ambiguity “is the central mechanism of the translation, one of immense lexical subtlety, a deliberate carrying of multiple meanings beneath the surface of a single text” (209). This single rule lies behind the feeling that the King James Bible has given its readers that its words are somehow extraordinarily freighted, with a richness few other texts have equaled. The 23rd Psalm exemplifies these textual, political, and religious goals. Again and again, the Jacobean Translators chose a word not for its clarified straightforwardness (which had been Tyndale’s focus in the 1520s and ‘30s, and the Geneva Calvinists’ in the 1550s) but for its richness, its suggestiveness, its harmonic resonances. That is the heart of James’s irenicon: divergence held within a singularity, James’s Arcadian vision made word (209-210).

The King James 23rd Psalm exemplifies these textual, political, and religious goals. Careful attention to the structural, rhetorical, and poetic

---

<sup>16</sup> Drawing out the political implications for these rhetorical decisions, Nicholson continues, “this is the heart of the new Bible as an irenicon, an organism that absorbed and integrated difference, that included ambiguity and by doing so established peace” (209).

decisions made in this Psalm demonstrates how the Translators used words to implement change, change made possible by the intersubjectivity that marks the relationships within the text and that is reflected in the way the text engages the reader. A key tool for implementing this goal was ambiguity. The Jacobean translation illustrates an “endless careful picking of the nuance of sound and meaning, the finely balanced, the audibly intelligible, more often than not choosing a form of words that embraces and bridges an ambiguity” (549).

The King James translators rendered the first verse of the 23rd Psalm as follows: “The Lord is my Shepherd; I shall not want.”<sup>17</sup> Two short clauses. Nine almost painfully simple words. But within this short space, the Jacobean Translators undertake no less a task than conveying a picture of the ideal relationship between the petitioner and the Divine.<sup>18</sup> The first verse of this Psalm

---

<sup>17</sup> *The Holy Bible*, King James Version. New York: American Bible Society: 1999; Bartleby.com, 2000. [www.bartleby.com/108/](http://www.bartleby.com/108/). [8 Aug 2011].

<sup>18</sup> Adam Nicholson. *God's Secretaries: The Making of the King James Bible*. New York: Harper Collins, 2005. Nicholson describes in detail the process of translating the King James Bible, from James I's commissioning of the new translation and his reasons for doing so, to the assembling of the committees of translators, to the steps they took to achieve a translation that they could agree on, to its publication and proliferation across England.

There were at least fifty translators who, Nicholson explains, “were bound together in a complex web of shared experience at both school and university and in a set of mutually reliant networks of clientship and patronage” (368). According to Nicholson, their work as translators was simply another step up the patronage ladder which, at that time, mingled court and church, social, religious, and political. There were six different “Companies,” each with its own “Director.” The First Westminster Company was responsible for translating Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Ruth, I Samuel, II Samuel, I Kings, and II Kings. Lancelot Andrewes served as Director. Other members included John Overall, Hadrian a Saravia, Richard Clarke, John Layfield, Robert Tighe, Geoffrey King, Richard Thomson, William Bedwell, and Francis Burleigh. The First Cambridge Company translated I Chronicles, II Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther, Job, Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and the Song of Songs. Edward Lively served as Director, and other members included John Richardson, Laurence Chaderton, Roger Andrewes, Thomas Harrison, Robert Spaulding, Andrew Bing, and Francis Dillingham. The First Oxford Company focused on Isaiah, Jeremiah, Lamentations, Ezekiel, Daniel, Hosea, Joel, Amos, Obadiah, Jonah, Micha, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, and Malachi. John Harding served as Director. Other members included John Reynolds (Rainolds), Thomas Holland, Richard Kilby, Miles Smith, Richard Brett, and Richard Fairclough (Featley). The Second Cambridge Company translated The Apocrypha. Its members included John Duport (Director), John Boys (Bois), William Branthwaite, Andrew Downes, Jeremiah Radcliffe, Robert

demonstrates that this relationship is, above all, direct and causal. And, with what is surely no small hint of textual irony, the translators convey the directness of this relationship between God and the speaker through a figure of supreme rhetorical indirectness: metaphor.<sup>19</sup> They describe what God is by describing what he is not. The translators do not describe God's actions: God does not do or say anything; he simply is. The use of metaphor built upon the be verb implicitly claims a directness, an openness, an honesty, and a large degree of expected reciprocation in the speaker's interactions with God that mark this relationship as one built upon a level of access to the Divine that is so well established it needs no explanation or justification. Furthermore, the way the two clauses structurally relate to one another underscores the characterization of the speaker's access to and relationship with God. The clause following the semi-colon clearly describes the consequences of and expectations for the petitioner's interaction with the Divine: "The Lord is my Shepherd; I shall not want."

As a rhetorical figure, metaphor exemplifies the circumlocution essential to courtly success. Courtiers presented to the world one picture that carried a certain explicit message; interpreting the hidden meaning behind that façade was

---

Ward, and Samuel Ward. The Second Oxford Company attended to the Gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, and Revelation. It was directed by Thomas Ravis and also included George Abbot, Richard Eedes, Giles Tomson, Sir Henry Savile, John Peryn (Perne), Ralph Ravens, John Harmar, Leonard Hutten, John Aglionby, and James Montague (Montagu). The Second Westminster Company was directed by William Barlow. Its members included Roger Fenton, Ralph Hutchinson, William Dakins, Michael Rabbet, and Thomas Sanderson. They translated the New Testament Epistles.

<sup>19</sup> Certainly the Jacobean translators cannot be given all the credit for every rhetorical decision made in their translation of the Bible. The formal characteristics of the original source text, the Hebrew psalms, especially their chiasmic structure and its relationship to metaphor, deserve more attention here than I am able to give them. However, the fact that chiasmus and metaphor continued to be important in the Jacobean version of the text indicates that the translators found them useful for their purposes and compelling to their early seventeenth century readers. For a discussion of form, syntax, and rhetorical structure in the Hebrew psalms, consult R.L. Alden, J. Bazak, R.C. Culley, J.C. Knight, L.A. Sinclair, M. Tsevat, and J.T. Willis.

the task of his fellow politicians. Often those subtexts were the more important details of the courtier's performance, but because they were implied, 'correct' interpretation was never certain. As players in the game of courtly, social, and religious preferment, the translators would know intimately the importance of circumlocution within the political sphere; its impact on the rhetorical decisions they made as they translated the Bible, and the 23<sup>rd</sup> Psalm in particular reflect this knowledge and enable the expansiveness that was key to achieving James's ecumenical goals. The potential for a multiplicity of meanings characterizes courtly interactions and also characterizes the metaphor driving this Psalm, broadening the literary and the religious scope of the text while casting a shadow of doubt upon the true intentions of and sincerity behind James's goals, the translators' rhetorical maneuvering, and the sense of intimacy that they might evoke through their translation.

On the surface, metaphors seem to provide readers with a direct, concrete, more nuanced understanding of an abstract idea. However, their meaning-making relies entirely upon allusion, assumption, and connotation. The writer sets up the comparison; it is up to the reader to draw out the implications of that comparison. These implications can vary depending upon the body of knowledge each individual reader brings to the text. One way to imagine metaphor is as an implicit argument masquerading as an explicit argument: it seems to offer certainty of meaning, but the only meaning it makes depends solely on what the reader gives it. In an explicit argument the writer carries the rhetorical burden; in an implicit argument, that burden falls in large part on the reader. Meaning in metaphors, then, is flexible.

This lexical fluidity of the Jacobean translation causes a sense of ambiguity and expansiveness that invites readers in and provides them with a space to unconsciously incorporate their own beliefs and experiences into the text while readers are led to believe that they are mostly passive receivers of information rather than active agents of information creation and transmission. They are lulled into this misassumption through the straightforward rhetorical construction of a metaphor: *x is y*. So long as readers can accept the terms of the initial comparison itself, the metaphor simply reflects the readers' own views rather than offering up any truths of its own. In this way, the metaphor simply serves as a textual mirror. The writer holds up the comparison and implicitly requires readers to generate the implications of it. It is as if readers do so and respond, "Why that is precisely what I have always thought! I must be very smart indeed to have always thought the same thing as this writer though I have never before read anything she has written."<sup>20</sup> Because the writer initiates the comparison, however, the reader feels as though the writer confirms rather than reflects the readers' opinions. In this way, metaphor is a sort of rhetorical flattery that reflects the intersubjective give and take of Carson's erotic triangle or Rochat's circular diagram of perception and self-perception: readers think they value in the metaphor what the writer says, but what they actually value is the reflection of their own beliefs shining back at them from the lines on the page.<sup>21</sup>

---

<sup>20</sup> Or as Pope much more eloquently put it in his *Essay on Criticism*: "True wit is nature to advantage dress'd, / What oft was thought but ne'er so well express'd. / Something, whose truth convinc'd at sight we find, / That gives us back the image of our mind." (297-300)

<sup>21</sup> As Rochat explains, "the self is externalized in the relation to others" in the world outside of the mind; "the origins of selfhood are situated in the transaction of the individual with others" (13). For Rochat, the self is "social in nature," an external construction that resides at the intersections of our own first-person interpretations of self and of our intuited third-person perspective of self that we learn to construct through interaction with others (13-14). This model

The freight of this value expands exponentially when what we, as readers, see is a version of our own religious beliefs reflected to us through expansive intersubjective metaphor. The rhetorical work of the Shepherd metaphor in the King James Bible's 23rd Psalm is to guide readers' conceptions of the ideal relationship between the petitioner and God while being open enough to accommodate divergent Catholic, Anglican, and Puritan versions of that ideal relationship.

<sup>1</sup>The Lord is my shepherd; I shall not want.

<sup>2</sup>He maketh me to lie down in green pastures: he leadeth me beside the still waters.

<sup>3</sup>He restoreth my soul: he leadeth me in the paths of righteousness for his name's sake.

<sup>4</sup>Yea though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil: for thou art with me; thy rod and thy staff, they comfort me.

<sup>5</sup>Thou preparest a table before me in the presence of mine enemies: thou annointest my head with oil; my cup runneth over.

<sup>6</sup>Surely goodness and mercy shall follow me all the days of my life: and I will dwell in the house of the Lord forever.

What follows the initial metaphor in the first verse is a list of the actions undertaken by God-as-Shepherd on behalf of the petitioner. While this list seems to specify and concretize the characteristics of the relationship, it in fact perpetuates the sense of inclusive, ambiguous expansiveness generated by the

---

requires that we shift from our own subject position to another's in order to attain a perspective on our self that enables us to see our self more clearly. This move relies on our objectifying our self. Further, it demonstrates to us that not only do we engage with others intersubjectively but we also engage with them as a self-objectified others.

Carson's spatial or geometric metaphor is more concretely realized. The first two points of Carson's erotic triangle belong to the speaker of the poem and the speaker's beloved. The third position on that erotic triangle is an evolving version of the speaker that is the speaker's flawed conception of him or herself and at the same time the beloved's idealized version of the speaker. Both versions of the speaker are "projected on a screen of what is actual and present by means of the poet's tactic of triangulation. That godlike [idealized] self, never known before, now comes into focus and vanishes again in one quick shift of view. As the planes of vision jump, the actual self and the ideal self and the difference between them connect in one triangle momentarily" (62). To comprehend this division, to intellectually and psychologically grapple with the actual self and the idealized version of the self instigates *eros*.



metaphor of the opening verse, gradually shifting from the metaphorical to the real world and back to the metaphorical, at every turn largely leaving the pacing and pitch up to the reader. In the second verse, for example, the translators explicate and seem to concretize the shepherd metaphor with details about how a shepherd cares and provides for his sheep. As the metaphor becomes more concrete in its details, its real world implications become clearer.

This more explicit coupling of metaphor and reality leads directly to the turn away from the guiding metaphor in the third verse. It parallels the structure of verse two in both syntax and meaning, but rather than metaphorical or real physical sustenance, the translators shift our attention to the more important spiritual sustenance that God can provide. God's responsibility in his relationship with the speaker is clear: he actively and directly restores the speaker's soul. The choice of "restore" in this instance is telling. It can mean "to bring back to the original state; to improve, repair, or retouch (a thing) so as to bring back something like the original form or condition" (OED "restore" c. gen.), "to bring (a person or part of the body) back to a state of health, vigour, or strength; to heal (OED "restore" a. trans. also intr.).<sup>22</sup> The implication here is that the speaker's soul needed restoration, whether from an innate diminishment, from pollution from contact with the outside world, from being driven down with past needs not being fulfilled by the shepherd, or from the speaker's own sin. The speaker's implicitly direct and close relationship with God continues to unfold in the second half of the third verse. The actively engaged shepherd/God directly leads the speaker to act righteously, not for the

---

<sup>22</sup> "restore, v.1". OED Online. December 2011. Oxford University Press. 19 February 2012 <<http://www.oed.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/view/Entry/163992?rskey=xzpttd&result=2&isAdvanced=false>>.

speaker's glory but for the glory of God. Whatever additional characteristics of the shepherd/God readers bring to their personal explication of the psalm's driving metaphor, the translators imply that God is not passive: he takes an active, direct role in the speaker's – and by extension, the reader's – physical and spiritual life. The intersubjectivity embedded in the rhetorical structure of the metaphor enables this shift from the pastoral metaphor to the concrete world of the readers' and speaker's physical needs and again to the speaker's and readers', again metaphorical, spiritual realm. It allows the translators and readers to shift the plain of perspective and meaning yet again in the fourth verse.

The rhetorical maneuvering in verse four is complex and rewards close attention. “Yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil: for thou art with me; thy rod and thy staff they comfort me.” This verse foregrounds the multi-faceted nature of the translation. The two clauses each represent two levels of meaning, paradoxically separated and joined together by punctuation: the first clause further explicates the implications of God's spiritual guidance, while the second regrounds us in the shepherd metaphor. But this regrounding accentuates the relationship between the shepherd/God and the sheep/speaker (and translators and readers). Whereas before, God was simply active and engaged, the relationship between God and the speaker now seems more intimate and personal as the translators shift the pronoun form the speaker uses to refer to God. In the first three verses, God was “He,” “The Lord,” “my shepherd”; in verse four, “He” becomes “thou.” Though it might seem that the use of the third person in the previous three verses would make the relationship between the speaker and God seem distant, the syntax

prevents that. Though God seems potentially removed from the scene, the speaker's straightforward and sure descriptions of their relationship assert the directness of his relationship to God. This shift to first person in the fourth verse, though, makes the relationship even closer: at its center stands not only a caring God who acts upon, for, and on the behalf of the speaker but also a speaker who has an active and direct voice in the relationship. Their relationship – and by extension and conflation the translators' and readers' relationship with the Divine – is mutually interactive.

The final two verses of this Psalm continue the rhetorical, metaphorical, and religious elision so masterfully coupled in the fourth verse and so second-nature to the courtly Jacobean translators. “<sup>5</sup>Thou preparest a table before me in the presence of mine enemies: thou anointest my head with oil; my cup runneth over. <sup>6</sup>Surely goodness and mercy shall follow me all the days of my life: and I will dwell in the house of the LORD for ever.” Verse five again steps back from the guiding metaphor of the psalm and presents images of abundance and protection. The first image reiterates the protection God provides to his sheep at the end of verse 4; it reaffirms the abundantly provisional nature of God and the value he places on the speaker. By preparing a table for the speaker in the presence of the speaker's enemies, God demonstrates that whatever the situation, he will provide for the speaker because the speaker is a God-marked believer. The cup image also supports the bounty of God's continual provisioning. Finally verse six is summative and reaffirming. The first half of the statement refers to the life the speaker has described: a pastorally marked journey to death along a righteous path whereon God will provide the speaker with what he needs and from which God will receive glory as he acts through and on behalf of the

speaker. Goodness and mercy follows the speaker on this path – goodness because people will see the actions of God in his life and mercy because he continuously travels with God. At the end of the pastoral journey to death, the speaker is certain that he will live in God's house forever. The translators reassert the continual intimacy of the relationship between the speaker and God – it not only continues throughout the entire journey through life to death – and they also extend that intimacy beyond death, when and where the speaker will live together with God forever.

The King James 23rd Psalm inherited by Joseph Addison and by Elizabeth Singer Rowe achieves and represents intersubjectivity through the translators' reliance upon the central Shepherd metaphor. The translators achieved expansiveness and grandeur through their use of metaphor to give readers room to bring themselves into the model spiritual relationship the Psalm seems to advocate. Rather than promote a rigid relational example, however, this metaphor-driven intersubjectivity in fact enables readers to populate that relationship with the details their specific version of Christianity expected. The shepherd metaphor, rather than define explicitly what that relationship should entail, surreptitiously reflects readers' own expectations for that spiritual relationship. This subtle and gentle affirmative lesson relied for its success on intersubjectivity achieved through the translators' treatment of the shepherd metaphor.

The first and most apparent difference between the Jacobean version of this Psalm and the eighteenth-century iterations of it by Rowe and Addison is the ways that they manipulate the concept of this shepherd metaphor. Addison renders the 23<sup>rd</sup> Psalm thusly:

The Lord my pasture shall prepare  
 And feed me with a shepherd's care;  
 His presence shall my wants supply  
 And guard me with a watchful eye;  
 My noonday walks He shall attend  
 And all my midnight hours defend.

When in the sultry glebe I faint  
 Or on the thirsty mountain pant,  
 To fertile vales and dewy meads  
 My weary, wandering steps He leads,  
 Where peaceful rivers, soft and slow,  
 Amid the verdant landscape flow.

Though in a bare and rugged way,  
 Through devious lonely wilds, I stray,  
 Thy bounty shall my pains beguile;  
 The barren wilderness shall smile,  
 With sudden greens and herbage crowned,  
 And streams shall murmur all around.

Though in the paths of death I tread,  
 With gloomy horrors overspread,  
 My steadfast heart shall fear no ill,  
 For Thou, oh Lord, art with me still;  
 Thy friendly crook shall give me aid  
 And guide me through the dreadful shade.

Addison begins his poetic iteration of the 23rd Psalm with the following couplet:

“The Lord my pasture shall prepare / And feed me with a shepherd's care.”<sup>23</sup> At

first glance, Addison seems to have it both ways: he relies on the shepherd analogy and does so sounding decisively Augustan. The structure of the closed couplet draws out and strengthens the connections in the meanings of the two lines individually as well as their weight as a couplet. He provides us with more explicit detail than the 1611 Translators did. Metrically, as we will see, his lines parallel Rowe's lilting and even iambic tetrameter. Simple math might imply that he managed to craft a version of the 23rd Psalm that results in the best outcomes of the translators' version of the text: Jacobean metaphor plus

---

<sup>23</sup> Addison's version of the 23<sup>rd</sup> Psalm first appeared in *Spectator* No. 441 on 26 July 1712.

Augustan poetic and syntactical explicitness should equal an expansive and direct relationship between the speaker and God that would please a readership divided by loyalties to varying Protestant groups while at the same time explicitly describing the implications of that relationship with the deity in such a way that would appease an Augustan reader's appetite for poetic detail. However, Addison here defies the laws of simple mathematics. One plus one does not equal a greater two.

Instead, Addison's rendering of his relationship with God is marked by spiritual distance and poetic precision that at times feels somewhat rigid. His version of the Psalm is less direct and intimate than either the 1611 description or, as we will see, Rowe's rendering of the same relationship with the Divine. Addison's problem is a syntactical and structural one. Aiming for both directness and explicitness, he eschews the seemingly explicit shepherd metaphor in favor of a less direct and implicit simile: Addison's God feeds him and cares for him like a shepherd would. He situates these lines even more soundly within the Augustan tradition by constructing both the meaning of the first couplet and the structure each of the first two lines upon the inversion so popular with early eighteenth-century couplet writers. As is typical for closed couplets, each of the two lines conveys its own point. The first line explains that God will prepare Addison a pasture, while the second line explains that the Lord will feed Addison. Together, though, the two lines convey one additional piece of meaning: God is like a shepherd. To make sense of the individual lines, you must reflect back on them upon understanding their meaning as a complete couplet. So, to make sense of the lines, we must first understand that God is like a shepherd (the main thrust of the entire couplet) and as such, he will

symbolically prepare Addison a pasture (the literal meaning of the first line) and will care for and feed Addison (the literal meaning of the second line).

As we read these first two lines of course, this sort of unraveling of meaning happens nearly instantaneously; we understand each of the levels of meaning as we bring to bear upon the lines our knowledge of the 1611 version and its guiding imagery as well as our experience with the rhetorical maneuvering embedded within Augustan couplets. But strictly as written, the structure of these lines obfuscates their individual meanings as well as their meaning as a couplet. If the reader does not already know that Addison claims God is like a shepherd, the individual meanings of the first two lines do not make sense at all. While the King James translators chose direct language and syntax to convey the openness and straightforward nature of the relationship between God and the speaker, Addison uses indirection and inversion, resulting in a relationship that seems stilted, over-determined, constrained, and distant. For better or for worse, the structure – to skew ever so slightly Pope’s famous lines – echoes the sense.

These characteristics derive in no small part from the syntactic and rhetorical decisions Addison made as he carefully crafted this verse translation. The grammatical structure of the first lines of the Jacobean version imply and buttress the notion of the speaker’s direct access to God. By replacing the straightforwardly constructed Shepherd metaphor with a much less directly implied simile, Addison obliquely presents the relationship at the center of the shepherd/sheep metaphor as much less intimate than in the 1611 original. Perhaps this distance is Addison’s tacit acknowledgment of the relative religious freedom and the multiplicity of ways his readership might imagine the ideal

relationship between God and the speaker; perhaps his decision seemed to him to align more completely with the decorum that, according to his cohort, characterized "good" poetry; perhaps this distancing results from the growing focus on the autonomous individual in the period; or perhaps, and most likely, it is some combination of these. Regardless of the specific reasons, though, Addison underscores this more distant relationship by using words like "guard" and "watchful eye" to describe God's continuous presence. Lines 5 and 6, coming after the more distant relationship and the word choice in line 4, imply a sort of policing God rather than a kind caring shepherd. Addison's God defends and provides for him, but he appears controlling and distant rather than caring and intimately close to Addison. Addison's second stanza continues the parallel development of the syntactical distancing of God and Addison. Lines seven and eight – "When in the sultry glebe I faint / Or on the thirsty mountain pant" – are two long, wordy, overwrought adverbial clauses that refer to "My weary, wandering steps" of line ten. We do not get to God until the very end of line ten, the fourth line of this second stanza. Addison's structural decisions make the spiritual relationship seem that it is all about Addison and the unpleasantness of his situations – a stanza of complaint enumerating what God can and should do. To further highlight the separation between God and speaker and the relative importance of the speaker to God, the sentence that makes up the stanza is inverted unnecessarily. This syntax results in a sense of "me me me" from the speaker rather than "God God God" that we see in the original Psalm. In this instance, Addison's indirect syntax is diametrically opposed to the very direct syntax of the 1611 text, and the consequence is that in Addison's version, God seems secondary, an afterthought.



The third stanza expands upon the pastoral bent of Addison's shepherd simile as it plays out in the second stanza, a task Addison will continue through the second half of the poem. This pastoral section demonstrates, at times, poetic beauty, sonority, and a striking symmetry between sound and sense. The s-sounds and lilting, regular rhythm in "peaceful rivers, soft and slow" sonically flow through the lines like the river flows through the "verdant landscape," and the return of the s-sound in "landscape" reminds us of this fact at precisely the right time in the line (11-12). At times, however, the text feels overwrought, partly as a result of the strained word choice and the convoluted syntax of the lines and partly because of the images Addison chose. The pastoral in the fourth stanza, for example, seems to compound on itself, spiraling into a moment of poetic and syntactical self-indulgence as Addison piles on more – and more exaggerated – poetic techniques with each successive clause. The accumulation of Addison's images, word choice, and syntax across the third and fourth stanzas reveal the highly constructed nature of this poem, a transparency that draws our eyes and minds to the text's constructedness as a literary artifact rather than to the meaning it attempts to convey. Addison uses every spice in his cabinet, and all we taste is the spice. The same techniques that lend the lines poetic beauty and balance – sibilance, consonance, and assonance in his pastoral descriptions, for example – overshadow the purpose of the text, highlighting the disjunction between how the speaker should be focused on God but is instead focused on himself.

This fourth stanza aligns with the fourth verse of the Jacobean psalm, and after Addison finishes his pastoral descriptions, he turns his attention more directly back to the speaker's relationship with God. Addison's version of the

image of the valley of the shadow of death is wilder with its "gloomy horrors" than the 1611 original. The differences between the translators' "I shall fear no evil" and Addison's "My steadfast heart shall fear no ill" reveal further distinctions between the speaker in each version and their relationships to God. Addison's speaker calls himself steadfast, a word that assumes for the individual much of the power or strength readers might expect the individual to rely on God to provide. Further, in Addison's text, we still get the shift from third person to first person, but only after the speaker's assertion of his own ability to remain steadfast, which, incidentally, directly contradicts stanza three in which the speaker strays from the righteous path. Rather than indicate that the relationship between the speaker and God is a mutually and intimately communicative one as it does in the translators' version, the shift to first person in Addison's lyric demonstrates a tone of formal address that draws attention to the stilted relationship between the speaker and God.

If one were to read Addison's version of the 23rd Psalm looking solely for the same sort of expansiveness and intersubjectivity so apparent in the Jacobean translators' version, one would be sorely disappointed. The syntactic and poetic decisions Addison made as he crafted his verse translation prevent that precise sort of engagement. Addison renders the relationship between God and the speaker as distant and focused on the self rather than on the Divine. The preponderance of pronouns in the text are in the first person – there are fifteen separate instances of "my," "me," or "I," more than twice as many as direct references to God – and the speaker is the object of every sentence in the poem. Further, Addison's use of inversion syntactically mirrors and supports the distancing effects of his pronouns, while his Augustan urge to specify and

explicate within the text further closes off the expansiveness necessary to achieve the sort of intersubjectivity found in the King James psalm.

But rather than prevent any sort of intersubjective engagement, the speaker's precise, detailed, somewhat rigid, self-referential perspective practically forces a different sort of intersubjectivity: by voicing the self-focused perspective of the speaker, readers achieve a sort of ventriloquistic intersubjectivity with him. Poulet describes this sort of indentificatory voicing in "Criticism and the Experience of Interiority":

Whenever I read, I mentally pronounce an I, and yet the I which I pronounce is not myself. [...] For as soon as something is presented as thought, there has to be a thinking subject with whom, at least for the time being, I identify, forgetting myself, alienated from myself. [...] Another I, who has replaced my own, and who will continue to do so as long as I read. Reading is just that: a way of giving way not only to a host of alien words, images, ideas, but also to the very alien principle which utters them and shelters them. (44-5)

Poulet further considers the subjective and self-objectifying give and take that occurs when readers encounter a text: "I begin to share the use of my consciousness with this being whom I have tried to define and who is the conscious subject ensconced at the heart of the work. He and I, we start having a common consciousness" (48). When the text itself forces us, again and again, to pronounce the I of the speaker, this reader-speaker intersubjectivity is inevitable, even while the techniques and consequences used to extort this engagement might strike us as distasteful. While it may sit less comfortably than the sort of intersubjectivity in the 1611 version – after all, self-centeredness is not likely to be the sort of spiritual relationship we as readers hope we embody – it is an intersubjective stance we assume as we engage with the text. As we embody the voice within Addison's psalm, we gain a perspective on our self outside of the

text, perhaps glimpsing a different lesson to be learned from this instance of intersubjectivity: a certainly unintentional warning against the sort of relationship with God that Addison presents and evokes through his thoroughly Augustan take on a seminal lyrical piece of the King James Bible.

It is easy to understand how the structural and tonal characteristics differentiating the three versions of the 23rd Psalm might have led scholars to accept the common eighteenth-century critical story that, where it exists, the period's lyric voice is more like Addison's than Rowe's – more focused on distancing than on intimacy, better able to stand between a person and God, and attentive to outwardly focused rather than self-referential didactic ends. After all, the winners write history, and as one of England's first and most prolific literary critics, Addison assured a spot in history for his version of poetic taste and expectations. Clearly each of the three versions of the 23rd Psalm relies on a unique poetic structure and tone to render slightly different pictures of the ideal relationship between their speakers and God. However, if we accept the tonal and structural differences and look beyond them, what emerges is a shared lyric model built on intersubjectivity. Within religious lyrics like these and other eighteenth-century psalm translations that we will discuss below, intersubjectivity emerges as a way for poets to forge and re-forge connections between the reader, the speaker, the poet, and God in order to worship and to proselytize, manipulating the way that we conceive of our relationship to God and promoting their own ideal version of that spiritual relationship.

Intersubjectivity drives the spiritual lessons of Addison's and Rowe's versions of the 23rd Psalm as well, though they each evoke it differently. Their individual poetic explications of the King James version of the 23rd Psalm

demonstrate very concretely the interpretive implications of the translators' intersubjective shepherd metaphor: as readers and poetic translators of the original, Addison and Rowe depict their relationships with God, perhaps believing they simply offered a version of the text better suited to the poetic tastes of eighteenth-century audiences. The result is two very distinct verse translations of the 23rd Psalm. Their starkly different treatments of the original text throw in sharp relief the actual variety of voicing, poetic style, and subject matter of the supposedly uniform Augustan age. Close attention to both versions reveals that the two poems offer clear qualifications to the standard expectations of Augustan verse while demonstrating that lyric intersubjectivity can be evoked through different – sometimes divergent – means.

The intimacy, trust, and directness of the relationship between the psalmist and God so apparent in the 1611 text carry over in Rowe's translation. While she manages to evoke the sense of expansiveness of the Jacobean psalm, she does not use the intersubjective shepherd metaphor to do so. Instead, she relies on direct statements of her relationship with God to illustrate her version of that ideal:

The Lord is my defence and guide,  
 My wants are by his care supply'd:  
 He leads me to refreshing shades,  
 Through verdant plains, and flow'ry meads;  
 And there securely makes me lie,  
 Near silver currents rolling by.  
 To guide my erring feet aright,  
 He gilds my paths with sacred light;  
 And to his own immortal praise,  
 Conducts me in his perfect ways.  
 In death's uncomfortable shade,  
 No terror can my soul invade:  
 While he, my strong defence, is near,  
 His presence scatters all despair.  
 My spiteful foes, with envy, see

His plent'ous table spread for me:  
 My cup o'erflows with sparkling wine,  
 With fragrant oils my temples shine.  
 Since God hath wondrous mercies shew'd,  
 And crown'd my smiling years with good;  
 The life he graciously prolongs,  
 Shall be employ'd in grateful songs;  
 My voice in lofty hymns I'll raise,  
 And in his temple spend my days.

Rowe's most striking deviation from the Jacobean Translators' version is her rejection of the guiding metaphor for the 23rd Psalm.<sup>24</sup> God is not described as a shepherd; instead, Rowe dispenses with metaphor altogether and in so doing increases the feeling of intimacy inherent in the speaker-God relationship by making it even more direct syntactically and literally. "The Lord is my defense and guide" syntactically asserts a similarly close spiritual relationship to that described in the 1611 Psalm, relying on the same *be* verb and sentence structure as the King James translation. But rather than imply the qualities of the relationship through metaphor, Rowe states them simply and straightforwardly, claiming explicitly that God is both her defense and her guide. Her refusal of the shepherd metaphor means that this relationship is even more explicitly direct and intimate. The Lord isn't her shepherd – just as, implicitly anyway, the Lord isn't an actual shepherd in the King James translation; instead, Rowe claims his guidance and defense directly and literally without the intervention of metaphor from the very outset of her text. By foregoing the shepherd metaphor, Rowe gives herself room to clarify and make explicit the implications of her relationship with God as she sees them rather than count on readers to fill them in as they choose. She replaces the King James "I shall not want" with the longer

---

<sup>24</sup> *The miscellaneous works in prose and verse of Mrs. Elizabeth Rowe*. London: printed for R. Hett, at the Bible and Crown in the Poultry; and R. Dodsley, at Tully's-Head in Pall-Mall, 1739. 210-211.

and more detailed explanation “My wants are by his care supply’d.” A guiding, defending, caring deity, in Rowe’s estimation, will supply her every want.

The first two lines of Rowe’s version of the 23rd Psalm also demonstrate some distinctly eighteenth-century poetic preferences. Written in rhymed couplets of iambic tetrameter, her lines reflect Augustan expectations of measured metrical regularity. The closed couplet formally implies a similar structural relationship between the two lines as the semi-colon does in the 1611 text: the first line sets up the relationship between Rowe and God, while the second line expounds upon that relationship. Rowe deployed and manipulated a number of the standard poetic techniques of the period – including metrical precision and rhyming couplets – to convey in more explicit verse the surety and finality of the full-stopped sentences of the translators’ prose, a means and an end of Joseph Addison’s version of the Psalm as well.

While unraveling a metaphor as readers brings us into a close relationship with the writer and the text, and while the relationship a metaphor describes seems more nuanced and more intimate than it might be otherwise, metaphors actually separate the concepts they purport to join and reveal the distance between the two ostensibly equivalent things that make up the comparison. Rather than rely on metaphor to communicate the relationship between her speaker and God, Rowe simply and directly states it in the first lines of her paraphrase. By replacing the shepherd metaphor with such a direct statement of this relationship, Rowe dismisses the potential for the interpretive ambiguity that so distinctively marked the 1611 Psalm; as a result, she closes one potential avenue of readerly engagement with her text. She replaces the unifying Jacobean ambiguity with directness and explicit detail as Addison does, though she does

not fall prey to the temptation to let the constructed nature of her verse outshine the important message she wants to impart.

Throughout her verse translation, Rowe explicitly asserts the directness and intimacy of this spiritual relationship that is foreshadowed syntactically in the opening phrase of her version of this Psalm. Rowe chooses language and sentence structure that is simple, straightforward, and to the point. While there is no shepherd metaphor here, Rowe does use pastoral imagery throughout her iteration of the psalm. Unlike Addison's use of pastoral adjectives and images, Rowe's use of them seems easy and natural. Her syntax isn't tortured or twisted. Addison uses more – and more overwrought – adjectives: “sultry glebe”; “thirsty mountain”; “weary, wandering steps”; “peaceful rivers, soft and slow”; “verdant landscape”; “bare and rugged way”; “devious lonely wilds”; “barren wilderness”; and “sudden greens and herbage.” His verbs are more agonized: he “faints” and “pants.” And his syntax is more convoluted and inverted. Rowe uses a lighter, more subtle, and more nuanced touch poetically:

He leads me to refreshing shades,  
Through verdant plains, and flow'ry meads;  
And there securely makes me lie,  
Near silver currents rolling by. (3-6)

These two couplets demonstrate many of the same poetic techniques so popular in Augustan verse and on ample display in Addison's psalm. The sibilance, assonance, and consonance are more evenly spread over the course of the line rather than recurring every word or syllable. Rowe also uses inversion sparingly, and when she uses it, the distance separating the natural order of the elements of her sentences is much shorter than Addison's. By lessening the literal distancing between these elements, Rowe maintains the poetic



expectations of Augustan taste while preventing the evocation of separation between speaker and God and speaker and reader that Addison's extreme inversion creates. While the accumulated effects of Addison's poetic decisions were rigidity, artificiality, and distancing, Rowe's text seems more natural, less rigidly constructed, and intimate, more like a sincere poetic devotion or prayer than a carefully wrought lyric artifact.

The closeness in the relationship between the speaker and God that Rowe evokes through her poetic decisions is reflected in the lexical meaning of and images within the lyric:

To guide my erring feet aright,  
 He gilds my paths with sacred light;  
 And to his own immortal praise,  
 Conducts me in his perfect ways.  
 In death's uncomfortable shade,  
 No terror can my soul invade:  
 While he, my strong defense, is near,  
 His presence scatters all despair. (7-14)

Rowe here diverges in her meaning from both the 1611 translators and Addison: tellingly, she makes no mention here of restoration. Instead of a spiritual relationship that includes enough space for the speaker to stray to the extent that she requires extreme correction, Rowe describes a spiritual relationship marked by constant, intimate guidance. Rowe does focus on God's active role in guiding her erring feet or correcting her errant behavior, but these lines evoke a sense of continuous guidance rather than the sort of large-scale correction that results from a less intimate spiritual relationship. Rowe here continues to eschew the shepherd metaphor in favor of direct statements; however, the image of God as her defender and comforter is here in full force: in Rowe's version, God does not just keep the speaker from fearing evil but is able to keep all despair at bay

simply through his presence. This shift is important: in the Jacobean text, God's rod and staff comfort the speaker, implying that what comforts the speaker is God's potential for action. This comfort comes from the implicit promise that God will wield the rod and staff against any foes to protect the speaker. However, Rowe depicts a more intimate relationship. God's presence is all she needs to feel no despair; they are so close that he does not have to take special pains to act, he simply has to be, to continue the actions he has already undertaken to maintain their relationship.<sup>25</sup>

While Rowe's version of the spiritual connection between the speaker and God seems to be much closer and more direct than that of the 1611 psalm or Addison's depiction of it, Rowe foregoes the pronoun shifts that Addison and the Jacobean translators highlight in their versions of the lyric. Addison's shift to second person over halfway through his text, rather than evoking a sense of closeness as we might expect it to, paradoxically reveals the distance between the speaker and divine, both through his stilted, formal second person address to God and through his assertion of individual power in the line preceding it. Though Rowe never addresses God directly, the relationship between them continues to be described as more intimate and direct than that in Addison's version of the psalm. Rowe's speaker instead asserts a personal relationship with God built upon continual interaction and utterly reciprocal in nature. She ends her version by making these characteristics explicit:

---

<sup>25</sup> In *The Daring Muse*, Margaret Doody claims that "the religious experience of the Augustans has never been fully or perfectly treated. I suspect that it is not peripheral but central to Augustan literature" (1). Rather than assume that poetry like Addison's above or that Pope's couplets should shape our dominant understanding of the period's verse, we should be willing to reevaluate our conception of the poetry of the first part of the eighteenth century. For Doody, the central characteristics of Augustan poetry are "liberty and audacity, adventure and experiment," "restless reaching," appetite, enthusiasm, and expansiveness (7-8, 17). Texts like Rowe's certainly support Doody's position.

Since God hath wondrous mercies shew'd,  
 And crown'd my smiling years with good;  
 The life he graciously prolongs,  
 Shall be employ'd in grateful songs;  
 My voice in lofty hymns I'll raise,  
 And in his temple spend my days. (19-24)

Unlike Addison, Rowe does include the final verse of the original in her paraphrase. But rather than rely on a conditional statement that ends the psalm with at least some small bit of uncertainty such as that evoked at the end of the 1611 text, Rowe shifts the tense of her final six lines. The Jacobean speaker asserts his trust in God to continue to care for him in the future as he currently does. In the Jacobean text, "surely goodness and mercy shall follow" the speaker, and the speaker "will dwell in the house of the Lord forever." Rowe, though, grounds her conditional statement in past actions (19-24). Rather than merely hope and believe that God will care for her in the future, Rowe provides concrete examples of past divine provisions and deduces from them that because God has provided so faithfully for her in the past and because she has done her part in accepting and praising his guidance and correction, she will continue to praise and thank him as long as she lives and he will continue to praise him in the future. This relationship has and will continue to rely on mutual reciprocation.

Rowe personalizes the final lines of the text with her own form of praise: poetry. In this metapoetic moment, Rowe acknowledges that by engaging in this text with her, we have shared in and perpetuated an act of worship and praise. This temporal change reaffirms the intimacy of the relationship between the speaker and the divine – the channels of communication between them are clear and open and communication is expected – and finally makes the reciprocal nature of their relationship explicit: there is a clear exchange in this relationship,

not only of words but of actions. There is no active reciprocity in the final verse of the 1611 text. Including the speaker's actions in Rowe's version does not simply highlight the intimate and reciprocal relationship she illustrates in her lyric. This act started as her own, but in this moment at the end of the paraphrase, we see that by inhabiting the subject position she crafted for herself, this "lofty hymn," this "grateful song" is ours as well. This sense of shared experience, of intimate engagement with the speaker, signals the primary source of intersubjectivity in this text. Rowe's poetic decisions lend the lyric an air of earnestness and ease. This feeling in turn allows an easy intimacy to develop between the speaker and reader that is forced in Addison's version of the psalm through his colonizing use of the first person.

Unlike Addison's use of intersubjectivity, which held up for readers a negative example of a relationship with God, Rowe allows readers to ventriloquize a version of a relationship with God that we perhaps want to believe is true. Neither is the intersubjectivity within Rowe's text parallel to that of the 1611 psalm. In fact, it is something of a reversal of the Jacobean version's surreptitious intersubjectivity-via-metaphor. Whereas the 1611 translation's metaphor had us as readers import our own beliefs into the text and then tricked us into believing that the text simply reflected and reaffirmed our own ideas, Rowe holds up a more concrete image of the spiritual relationship and through our ventriloquistic voicing of her speaker's "I," we are given a standard by which to measure our own relationship and change our behavior, actions, and frame of reference so to either maintain or to generate the spiritual intimacy she highlights in her lyric.

The spiritual closeness, guidance, and reciprocity that characterize the speaker's relationship to God are meant to appeal to us as readers as we form the speaker's words in our minds. Her words become ours and provide us with insight into what it might be like to have the sort of relationship she describes. At the same time we engage with the speaker in this way, we gain distance and perspective that allows us to reflect on ourselves. Through this intersubjective self-reflection, we inevitably compare our own spiritual situation with that of the speaker, comparing the reflection we see in the mirror with the one we see through the eyes of the speaker. Like Carson's model of erotic intersubjectivity, the intersubjectivity in the text allows us to see a version of our relationship with God that we might hope is true but that we perhaps worry is not.<sup>26</sup>

The ideal spiritual relationships described in each of these versions of the 23<sup>rd</sup> Psalm imagine a God that is a caretaker deeply concerned for the welfare of the petitioner. This view of the caretaker God skews the petitioner's self-reflection. Concerned with deserving God's provisions, the ideal petitioner compares her thoughts, actions, and feelings against a standard of behavior that she considers "deserving" of God's continual care. This standard, however, is impossible to achieve. Typically, Christian paradigms are built upon Christ's willingness to undergo torture and ultimately to sacrifice his life to "pay for" the

---

<sup>26</sup> Carson explains that when we imagine ourselves from the perspective of our beloved, we see our self from a perspective clouded by our beloved's love for us; typically, this view of our self can enable us to overlook characteristics of our self we might not like to examine or at least to see those characteristics in a more positive light.

Unlike in the erotic model of intersubjectivity, however, individuals use the perspective that spiritual intersubjectivity provides them in order to discover their flaws rather than to overlook them. This shift in the utility of intersubjectivity as it is transmuted into religious verse departs sharply from the way that Phillips evoked it in her amorous lyric to her husband or as Donne described it in "The Ecstasy," for example.

sins of mankind.<sup>27</sup> Rowe tacitly acknowledges the impossibility of this situation for Christians toward the end of her version of the psalm. In exchange for the care that God has given to her over the course of her life she will happily sing his praises until her death.

The idea that the relationship between God and the petitioner is built upon a debt that cannot possibly be paid, that the relationship can never be equal, mirrors the amorous relationships in many earlier lyrics – secular lyrics like those by Wyatt, Surrey, Shakespeare, Donne, Jonson, Rochester, and Behn as well as religious lyrics like those by Donne, Herbert, and Crashaw. The extreme desire to attain that state of reciprocity within the relationship is one of the most recognizable characteristics of the unrequited love trope. For any relationship to be “requited,” it must be “reciprocated,” “returned,” or “repaid.”<sup>28</sup> Little wonder, then, that poets regularly turned to lyric representations of amorous relationships to try to explain the desire and psychological distress they experience when they consider their unpayable debt to God: many poets found the vocabulary of impossible relationships and the psychological impact they have on the individuals involved as applicable to spiritual concerns as to romantic ones, though the utility of the spiritual intersubjective relationship would be to help individuals see flaws in themselves and their relationship with God rather than to provide them with a rose-colored-glasses picture of the self

---

<sup>27</sup> This transactional model of interaction between the individual and God, while not the only extant model in the period and certainly not the only model available to us now, seems to be replicated again and again in the lyrical Psalms we will see in this chapter and in the hymns that we will focus on in the next. Perhaps a reflection of the burgeoning capitalism of England in the period or perhaps just a convenient concretization of the relationship, this characterization of the relationship seems to have quite a lot of traction for poets in the period.

<sup>28</sup> “requited, adj.”. OED Online. December 2011. Oxford University Press. 19 February 2012 <<http://www.oed.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/view/Entry/274303?redirectedFrom=requited>>.

that individuals take away from Carson's erotic triangle and the intersubjectivity that structures it. We can see poets' inflection of amorous relationality onto religious interactions in the King James translation of the 42<sup>nd</sup> Psalm:

<sup>1</sup>As the hart panteth after the water brooks, so panteth my soul after thee, O God.

<sup>2</sup>My soul thirsteth for God, for the living God: when shall I come and appear before God?

<sup>3</sup>My tears have been my meat day and night, while they continually say unto me, Where is thy God?

<sup>4</sup>When I remember these things, I pour out my soul in me: for I had gone with the multitude, I went with them to the house of God, with the voice of joy and praise, with a multitude that kept holyday.

<sup>5</sup>Why art thou cast down, O my soul? and why art thou disquieted in me? hope thou in God: for I shall yet praise him for the help of his countenance.

<sup>6</sup>O my God, my soul is cast down within me: therefore will I remember thee from the land of Jordan, and of the Hermonites, from the hill Mizar.

<sup>7</sup>Deep calleth unto deep at the noise of thy waterspouts: all thy waves and thy billows are gone over me.

<sup>8</sup>Yet the LORD will command his loving kindness in the day time, and in the night his song shall be with me, and my prayer unto the God of my life.

<sup>9</sup>I will say unto God my rock, Why hast thou forgotten me? why go I mourning because of the oppression of the enemy?

<sup>10</sup>As with a sword in my bones, mine enemies reproach me; while they say daily unto me, Where is thy God?

<sup>11</sup>Why art thou cast down, O my soul? and why art thou disquieted within me? hope thou in God: for I shall yet praise him, who is the health of my countenance, and my God.

The analogy and allusion driving the action of this Psalm reveal and describe the psychological state of an individual painfully aware of the lack of reciprocal intimacy – and the impossibility of it – in his relationship with God.

The opening image of the hart recalls the popular early modern play on the word and its homophone "heart"<sup>29</sup> by some of the period's leading lyric poets

---

<sup>29</sup> By the time Shakespeare wrote *Coriolanus*, some time between 1605 and 1610, usage reflected the distinction between "heart" the organ and "hart" the deer. Until then, its usage appears to be

as Thomas Wyatt in his "They Flee from Me that Sometime did me Seek" and Henry Howard, the Earl of Surrey, in his "A Lesson in Love," among others. We can safely assume that the 1611 translators had this poetic tradition in mind as they labored over this particular psalm. This amorous allusion reverberates throughout the translators' choice of words and syntax as it plays out over the first half of the psalm. The speaker is desperate to encounter God, so desperate in fact that he describes his need as a matter of life and death, a matter of physical sustenance (verse 1-3). The verbs especially focus our attention on the seriousness of the speaker's longing: he "panteth," "thirsteth," and "pour[s] out" (1, 2, 4). And like the unrequited lover who continues to long for what he does not have, the speaker contents himself by analyzing signs that he believes indicate that his beloved does in fact care for him in spite of his current certainty that he is alone in the relationship; the speaker sees God's love, power, and control written into the very movements of the world around him: "Deep calleth unto deep at the noise of thy waterspouts: all thy waves and thy billows are gone over me" (7). Of course, what the speaker actually wants is the kind of psychological intimacy with God that we have traced above; the intensity of his pain results from its absence.

---

interchangeable though its interchangeability only underscores the slippage of meaning embedded in it and the allusive mileage it gave poets interested in exploring the implications of conflating the amorous chase and the hunter's chase.

"hart, n.". OED Online. December 2011. Oxford University Press. 19 February 2012  
<<http://www.oed.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/view/Entry/84401?redirectedFrom=hart>>.

"heart, n.". OED Online. December 2011. Oxford University Press. 19 February 2012  
<<http://www.oed.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/view/Entry/85068?rskey=Cabao&result=1&isAdvanced=false>>.



Perhaps unsurprisingly given its allusiveness, this psalm was one of the most popular source texts for eighteenth-century poets interested in Biblical verse translation. While some poets, like Ann Rennew, Samuel Boyse and Sir Richard Blackmore, crafted lyrics inspired by specific verses within the Psalm, as often, others like Mary Masters<sup>30</sup> dealt with the Psalm in its entirety. Their manipulation of both the heart/hart analogy and the unrequited lover trope and the choices they made in the way that they rendered the relationship between their speakers and God reveal a different facet of the ideal spiritual relationship described by Rowe and Addison in their versions of the 23<sup>rd</sup> Psalm. By rendering the relationship between the petitioner and God through the lens of amorous intersubjectivity, these verse translations reveal a more detailed picture of the psychological impact of this spiritual relationship on the individual.

---

<sup>30</sup> Ann Rennew. *Pious And Holy Breathings; Or, A Treatise Of Choice And Precious Hymns. ... By Ann Rennew, A Blind Maid, ... At Cambridge. Composed and branched out from divers chosen Texts of Scripture out of the Old and New Testament.* [Cambridge?]: Printed for and sold by the author, 1714. 56-57.

Richard Blackmore. *A collection of poems on various subjects. By Sir Richard Blackmore, Kt. M. D. Fellow of the Royal-College of Physicians.* London: printed by W. Wilkins, for Jonas Browne at the Black-Swan without Temple-Bar; and J. Walthoe, Jun'. over-against the Royal-Exchange in Cornhill, 1718. 318.

Blackmore, in "Psalm 42.v.5 Why art Thou cast down, O my Soul, &c.," and Boyse, in "Part of Psalm XLII, In Imitation of the Style of Spenser," both conflate the amorous and religious in their translations.

Blackmore's language and imagery reflect his speaker's despair and imply the universality of those feelings for individuals who feel the absence of intimacy with God. His speaker is "dismay'd," "dejected," "afraid," "Agonizing," "with Woe opprest," and "Hoarce with [...] Groans, and delug'd with [...] Tears" (1-5). His is the sorrow of unrequited love; if the translation did not mention the Psalm in its title, its spiritual focus would be utterly elided until the eleventh of its seventeen lines, when Blackmore finally mentions God explicitly.

Like Blackmore, Boyse pairs the amorous and the spiritual, though he relies on the heart/hart trope to do so.

Mary Masters. *Familiar letters and poems on several occasions.* London : printed for the author, by D. Henry and R. Cave, 1755. 135-138.

Rennew's<sup>31</sup> conflation of the amorous and spiritual in her Hymn XXXII, a translation of a selection of the 42<sup>nd</sup> Psalm, is clear and relatively stable over the eight stanzas of the text. By relying on the language and imagery of secular love lyrics, Rennew reveals that the desire and despair that her speaker feels result from a lack of intersubjective connection, an insight into the source of longing and anguish in both secular and spiritual relationships:

My soul for thee, my God, dost thirst,  
 For thee the living God,  
 Who hast me made out of the Dust,  
 Thy sweet and blest Abode

I long to see, my God, most dear,  
 Thou well doest know my Heart,  
 Before thee when shall I appear,  
 Who did my Soul convert?

When shall I see thy shining Face,  
 Who art the mighty One,  
 Who hast me saved by thy Grace?  
 Oh when wilt thou make known

More of thy secret Love to me,  
 Who for thy Love do cry,  
 My Lord, with thee when shall I be  
 To all Eternity?

When shall I know as I am known  
 Of thee, the God of Might?  
 When shall I know, O mighty One,  
 Thou dost in me delight?

When shall those living Streams thus flow,  
 Which I so long to see,  
 When shall I to my Comfort know  
 How well thou dost love me?

Dear God, e'er thou dost take me hence

---

<sup>31</sup> Very little is known about Ann Rennew. The title of her collection of verse indicates that she was blind. It was printed at Cambridge. An Anne Rennew, christened on 27 NOV 1690 Stetchworth, Cambridge, England, could possibly be the same person. *Pious and Holy Breathings* is the only collection of her verse.

These Favours to me show,  
 Clear up, clear up my Evidence,  
 That I may truly know

I shall with thee for ever be,  
 Who art the God of Might  
 Singing to all Eternity  
 Thy Praises with Delight.

Though *Rennew* eschews the familiar heart/hart trope, she embraces the language of worldly love in the first two stanzas of the text. If we removed “God” from her lines, we would be left with the pose of the despairing unrequited lover. At the center of the speaker’s longing, she claims in stanza two, is the desire to “see” God (5, 9). Consideration of the implications of seeing in stanza four, however, reveals to the speaker that simply seeing is not what she truly wants; seeing serves as the stand-in for her true desire to “know as I am known / of thee” (17-18). The speaker wants an unwavering intersubjective relationship with God that will reveal to her a stable understanding of his perceptions of her rather than the tenuous one she imagines as she reflects upon herself from God’s perspective. This realization represents a fleeting shift from the secular to the spiritual realm; however, the moment is short-lived and seems to initiate its own demise: the contrast between the constant and reciprocal intersubjectivity she craves and the one-sided intersubjectivity that has caused her longing quickly brings her anxiety and doubt back to the forefront of her mind. The barrage of unanswered questions in the fifth and sixth stanzas highlight the speaker’s anguish and uncertainty, which she now acknowledges results from the abstract nature of knowledge gleaned from perceptions of others’ feelings about ourselves (28-9). Rather than acknowledge and grapple with her doubt, *Rennew*’s speaker decides to trust in God’s promise and to

attempt to prepay/repay the debt she owes him: like Rowe, though seemingly much less contentedly, she consigns herself to “Singing to all Eternity / Thy Praises with Delight” (31-2).

Unlike *Rennew*, *Masters* translated into verse the entire Jacobean 42<sup>nd</sup> Psalm, a decision that gave her the interpretive scope to offer a different relational economy than either of those suggested by Rowe or *Rennew*. While she rehearses many of the same moves we have observed in other eighteenth-century translations, *Masters* focuses her attention on the perspective her speaker gains on herself through her intersubjective relationships with non-believers. By emphasizing the role of the “insulting Foe,” *Masters* skews the speaker’s perception of her relationship with God; this shift provides insight into the emotional implications of unrequited spiritual love that translations like those by *Rennew*, *Blackmore*, and *Boyse* ignore:

<sup>1</sup>As thirsty Harts pant for the cooling Flood,  
 So pants my longing Soul for thee, my God.  
 I pant, I languish, and I thirst for thee;  
 Oh, when shall I thy living Lustre see!  
<sup>5</sup>When will thy Presence wonted Joy impart,  
 Fill my desiring Soul, and cheer my Heart?  
 In vain the Sun displays his radiant Light,  
 In vain to Day succeeds the Starry Night;  
 For each to me alike one Gloom appears,  
<sup>10</sup>And both are witness to my falling Tears;  
 Careless of Ease, and negligent of Rest,  
 Devouring Grief has my whole Soul possess’d;  
 While, to encrease my Pain, th’insulting Foe,  
 With Joy malignant, mocks my rising Woe;  
<sup>15</sup>I hear, I feel, the deeply wounding Scorn,  
 And with incessant Anguish only mourn,  
 Whilst thus the Scoffers tauntingly upbraid;  
 Where is thy God? Where now, his promis’d Aid?  
 For I had gone with the devoted Throng,  
<sup>20</sup>And in his Temple join’d the sacred Song,  
 With those who joyful tune the sprightly Lay,  
 And to his Honour dedicate the Day.  
 Why, O my Soul! art thou so much distress’d?

Oh! why such a Weight of Sorrow press'd?  
<sup>25</sup>In the Most High thy Confidence repose,  
 Almighty Pow'r shall crush thy fiercest Foes;  
 Heed not the Fools who scoffingly upbraid,  
 I yet shall thank him for his promis'd Aid;  
 Look down, my God, behold my wasting Grief;  
<sup>30</sup>From thee my suff'ring Soul implores Relief,  
 Where'er I am, I still invoke thy Name,  
 From *Hermon's* Mount, by *Jordan's* limpid Stream:  
 Oh, with one gracious Smile my Grief asswage,  
 Who long have born the cruel Tyrant's Rage,  
<sup>35</sup>While the loud Torrents rushing force their Way,  
 Wave after Wave in terrible Array!  
 Yet sure my God will give his kind Command,  
 And drive far hence the vile insulting Band;  
 Then shall his Praises dwell upon my Tongue,  
<sup>40</sup>And ev'ry Night shall hear the grateful Song:  
 To him each Day shall rise the constant Pray'r,  
 And constant Praise implore perpetual Care.  
 But why, my God, my Strength, am I forgot?  
 Why left to gloomy Care and pensive Thought?  
<sup>45</sup>Still thou art absent, still I daily mourn,  
 Th'insulting Enemies repeated Scorn.  
 Not the disjointing Sword or venom'd Dart,  
 Can, like thy Absence, penetrate my Heart:  
 While I am doom'd to feel the Scorner's Rod,  
<sup>50</sup>Who flouting cry, where now thy boasted God?  
 No hostile Weapon can so deeply wound,  
 As this afflicting Thought, this piercing Sound:  
 But why, my Soul, art thou so much distress'd?  
 Oh! why with such a Weight of Sorrow press'd?  
<sup>55</sup>Still in thy God full Confidence repose,  
 Almighty Pow'r shall crush thy strongest Foes,  
 His Favour yet thou shalt with Joy proclaim,  
 And all thy Pow'rs uniting, praise his Name.

Clearly, Masters traces many of *Rennew's* steps in her translation of the psalm.

Her speaker wants to "see" God, but she quickly shifts her focus from seeing

God to desiring a deeper level of engagement so that her "desiring Soul" might

be filled up by God's "presence" (4, 6, 5).<sup>32</sup> Her speaker is overcome with the

---

<sup>32</sup> In Carson's erotic triangle, intersubjectivity typically relies on seeing. Donne's "The Extasie" plays this out explicitly: "Our eye-beames twisted, and did thred / Our eyes, upon one double string; / So to'entergraft our hands, as yet / Was all the meanes to make us one, / And pictures in our eyes to get / Was all our propagation" (7-12); while his "A Valediction: Forbidding

despair we would expect to find in a description of unrequited secular love: lost in the speaker's tears and "Devouring Grief," day and night lose their meaning (7-12). In line 13, however, Masters skews the pattern we have observed in other versions of this psalm.

The decisions that these poets made about how to incorporate the "enemies" of the tenth verse of the 1611 psalm have a surprising impact on their individual images of the relationship between the individual and God. Renew ignores the "enemies" altogether. Blackmore focuses on the "persecution" itself rather than on the persecutors (16). Though Boyse does mention his "proud Foes" in the third stanza of his translation, the 1611 enemies' reproaches originate with Boyse's own speaker. Unlike Renew, Blackmore, or Boyse, Masters devotes eighteen lines to "th'insulting Foe" (13). While this distinction might seem insignificant, the impact the "Scoffers" have on the speaker and on the speaker's relationship with God definitely is not (17).

By focusing so intently on the "enemies" and their taunts and then detailing the speaker's reaction to them, Masters illustrates a facet of the spiritual relationship glossed over by other poets. The "scorn" of the "vile insulting Band" initiates intersubjectivity between the speaker and her tormenters (13-16). Imagining herself from the perspective of these non-believers, the speaker attempts to come to terms with the sense of separation she feels from God. She

---

Mourning" traces the way that "presence" does not have to mean physical presence: "But we by a love so much refined, / That ourselves know not what it is, / Inter-assured of the mind, / Care less, eyes, lips and hands to miss" (17-20). Similarly, Philips reiterated this expansion of the idea of "presence" to include mental "presence" in her "To My Dearest Antenor." When lyric intersubjectivity moves from amorous to spiritual concerns, the notion of "presence" evolves and expands further. While Donne's and Philips's speakers were imagining a beloved that they had certainly seen before, the speakers in these psalm translations are imagining a God they had never seen, a God that is unknowable, in an imaginative act that renders God in completely human terms and that is, consequently, heretical.

catalogs the steps she has taken to prove her devotion and attempts to bolster her confidence in her relationship with God (19-28). The result of this self-reflection is not acceptance; instead, she desperately and impatiently makes demands of God (29-36). She claims that with one “gracious Smile” God could “asswage” her grief, but as she continues to consider herself from this non-believing perspective, her demands increase: no longer content with a “gracious smile,” the speaker requests that God should “give his kind Command, / And drive far hence the vile insulting Band” (33, 37-8). At this point in the typical pattern we have observed, we might expect the speaker to shift her focus from seeing God to longing for spiritual closeness with him and then promising to praise him eternally. But, because she highlights the intersubjectivity between the speaker and the non-believers, Masters changes course. Her speaker only offers continual praise *in exchange* for explicit action on the part of God. God must first drive away the non-believers, *then* “shall his Praises dwell upon [the speaker’s] Tongue, / And ev’ry Night shall hear the grateful Song: / To him each Day shall rise the constant Pray’r, / And constant Praise implore perpetual Care” (39-42). Rather than beg for a closer relationship with God, the speaker implores God to remove her enemies, the foes who brought her grief and doubt to her attention as a result of the perspective on herself they let her see through intersubjectivity: the speaker’s greatest wish is for God to remove the subject position from which she saw her doubt, thereby acting in her life in an explicit way and removing her doubt and anxiety. Only after God proves his devotion to her through this concrete action will the speaker praise him eternally.

With this realignment of intersubjectivity, Masters drastically shifts the economy of devotion. God must earn the speaker’s praises and songs through

action rather than vice versa. However, God does not appear to comply: the speaker feels forgotten, “left,” alone, and still scorned (43-44). Even extreme physical pain cannot “so deeply wound” the speaker as the “afflicting Thought, [the] piercing Sound” of “the Scorners’” words (47-52). God’s lack of response to her demands leaves the speaker feeling abject and alone. Masters eventually recalls the amorous imagery from the beginning of the translation – lines 47 through 52 rehearse many of the same heart/hart tropes of unrequited love – but she recontextualizes them so that they now reflect a heightened vocabulary of despair appropriate for the magnitude of feeling shunned by God.

The final lines of the text return to the self-reassurance the speaker attempted – and failed at – in lines twenty-three and twenty-four, but there is no reason to assume that this second attempt should be any more successful than the first. Indeed, in the end the speaker cannot possibly accept the uncertainty of her relationship with God because the understanding of her situation that she achieves through intersubjectivity is not from her own perspective or from her imagined version of God’s perspective; either of these two viewpoints would have justified her actions, even if any such justification could entail reflecting on her own doubts and anxieties. Instead, within Master’s version of the 42<sup>nd</sup> Psalm, the speaker sees herself from the perspective of a scornful non-believer<sup>33</sup>; rather than cast her psychological turmoil as a normal step in spiritual reckoning, this non-believing perspective on herself exacerbates her suffering. Instead of finding acceptance, the speaker is caught in a cycle of doubt and anxiety.

---

<sup>33</sup> In moments like this one especially, the lyric offers more subjective play than other non-textual models of intersubjectivity. Because it is text-based, the intersubjectivity here becomes more multi-dimensional than most models of this sort of interaction typically consider.



Conflating the amorous with the spiritual in eighteenth-century verse translations of the 42<sup>nd</sup> Psalm allows poets to access and to reflect upon facets of their relationships with God that the 23<sup>rd</sup> Psalm did not. Further, considering religious struggles within a context of amorous intersubjectivity provides them with a poetic vocabulary to express a close approximation of the sort of tumultuous anguish they feel when they believe they are separated from God. Because we have seen how amorous intersubjectivity plays out within secular verse, it is easier for us to recognize that the speakers' longing is not necessarily for physical proximity but for a psychological intimacy they feel is missing, for knowledge, understanding, and belief rather than in simple seeing: these speakers are desperate for a divine version of Donne's soulful but secular ecstasy.<sup>34</sup>

---

<sup>34</sup> Incidentally, Psalm 42 is still a popular Psalm for translation into modern "lyrics," though lyrics this time of praise and worship songs like "As the Deer" by A. Martin Nystrom:

As the deer panteth for the water  
 So my soul longs after you  
 You alone are my heart's desire  
 And I long to worship you

You alone are my strength, my shield  
 To you alone may my spirit yield  
 You alone are my heart's desire  
 And I long to worship you

You're my friend and you are my brother  
 Even though you are a king  
 I love you more than any other  
 So much more than anything

You alone are my strength, my shield  
 To you alone may my spirit yield  
 You alone are my heart's desire  
 And I long to worship you

I want you more than gold or silver  
 Only you can satisfy  
 You alone are the real joy giver  
 And the apple of my eye

The 23<sup>rd</sup> Psalm considers carefully the interaction required within the ideal relationship between God and the individual, and both Rowe and Addison presented more clearly that this relationship requires intersubjectivity to establish the individual's trust and to instigate a practice of regular self-reflection. The 42<sup>nd</sup> Psalm, on the other hand, explores the turmoil of an individual who feels forgotten by God. Masters, Renew, and others drew upon the Jacobean translation's initial conflation of the amorous and the spiritual to more deeply delve into the psychological crisis that unrequited intersubjectivity can cause an individual to experience. The 1611 version of Psalm 139 brings us full circle, quelling fears that the relationship between God and the individual is not reciprocal. In fact, as it translates the individual facets of this spiritual relationship into very human terms, it demonstrates that though at times the spiritual relationship seems to be one-sided, intersubjectivity is at the center of every believer's relationship with God:

<sup>1</sup>O lord, thou hast searched me, and known me.

<sup>2</sup>Thou knowest my downsitting and mine uprising, thou understandest my thought afar off.

<sup>3</sup>Thou compassed my path and my lying down, and art acquainted with all my ways.

<sup>4</sup>For there is not a word in my tongue, but, lo, O LORD, thou knowest it altogether.

<sup>5</sup>Thou hast beset me behind and before, and laid thine hand upon me.

---

You alone are my strength, my shield  
 To you alone may my spirit yield  
 You alone are my heart's desire  
 And I long to worship you.

In fact, the tendency for contemporary praise and worship song-writers to conflate the amorous and religious came under some popular scrutiny in episode 709 of *Southpark*, which originally aired on 23 October 2003. In it, Cartman parodies contemporary Christian rock songs as being identical to love songs except that they reference Jesus instead of the singer's lover.

<sup>6</sup>Such knowledge is too wonderful for me; it is high, I cannot attain unto it.

<sup>7</sup>Whither shall I go from thy spirit? or whither shall I flee from thy presence?

<sup>8</sup>If I ascend up into heaven, thou art there: if I make my bed in hell, behold, thou art there.

<sup>9</sup>If I take the wings of the morning, and dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea;

<sup>10</sup>Even there shall thy hand lead me, and thy right hand shall hold me.

<sup>11</sup>If I say, Surely the darkness shall cover me; even the night shall be light about me.

<sup>12</sup>Yea, the darkness hideth not from thee; but the night shineth as the day: the darkness and the light are both alike to thee.

<sup>13</sup>For thou hast possessed my reins: thou hast covered me in my mother's womb.

<sup>14</sup>I will praise thee; for I am fearfully and wonderfully made: marvellous are thy works; and that my soul knoweth right well.

<sup>15</sup>My substance was not hid from thee, when I was made in secret, and curiously wrought in the lowest parts of the earth.

<sup>16</sup>Thine eyes did see my substance, yet being unperfect; and in thy book all my members were written, which in continuance were fashioned, when as yet there was none of them.

<sup>17</sup>How precious also are thy thoughts unto me, O God! how great is the sum of them!

<sup>18</sup>If I should count them, they are more in number than the sand: when I awake, I am still with thee.

<sup>19</sup>Surely thou wilt slay the wicked, O God: depart from me therefore, ye bloody men.

<sup>20</sup>For they speak against thee wickedly, and thine enemies take thy name in vain.

<sup>21</sup>Do not I hate them, O LORD, that hate thee? and am not I grieved with those that rise up against thee?

<sup>22</sup>I hate them with perfect hatred: I count them mine enemies.

<sup>23</sup>Search me, O God, and know my heart: try me, and know my thoughts:

<sup>24</sup>And see if there be any wicked way in me, and lead me in the way everlasting.

An implicit acceptance of God's omniscience serves as the foundation of this psalm, and included in God's boundless knowledge is a complete understanding of the speaker: "O Lord, thou hast searched me, and known *me*. Thou knowest my downsitting and mine uprising; thou understandest my thought afar off. Thou compasses my path and my lying down, and art acquainted *with* all my

ways. For *there is* not a word in my tongue, *but*, lo, O LORD, thou knowest it altogether" (1-4). The speaker acknowledges God's impressive creations – "marvellous are thy works; and that my soul knoweth right well" – though admits that he cannot fully comprehend them – "such knowledge is too wonderful for me; it is high, I cannot attain unto it" (14, 6). The speaker seems to accept that he cannot equal God's omniscience, and shifts his focus to the aspect of God's understanding that he can potentially begin to comprehend: God's knowledge of him. This Psalm concludes with the speaker inviting God into an intersubjective relationship with him; he wants God to search him, know his thoughts, and lead him to a less sinful place. The final two verses of this Psalm are particularly revealing. An omniscient God who continuously sees into the speaker's mind and soul would not need to be prompted to do so, and further, there would be nothing new there for him to discover. The last two verses, then, demonstrate that what the speaker wants is intersubjectivity with God and the self-reflection implicit in it. In asking God to search him, know his thoughts, uncover any wickedness, and lead him to an "everlasting way," the speaker transfers his own power to initiate intersubjectivity to God, a step that misleadingly diminishes and subordinates the speaker's agency each time he undertakes any exercise in self-reflection.

The implications of intersubjectivity in the Jacobean translation of the 139<sup>th</sup> Psalm are subtle. While the 1611 translation of the psalm is compelling, it is, at times, disjointed. Eighteenth-century translators of this psalm, however, focus their attention on this spiritual relationship and how it works, illuminating the steps involved in and the consequences of this intersubjectivity, almost as if in answer to the inevitable doubts almost certainly felt by many believers and so

apparent in the 42<sup>nd</sup> Psalm. Poets like Joshua Squire (1707) and Thomas Newcomb (1726) and an anonymous poet whose verse translation of the Psalm appeared the 1739 *Divine Melody: or, A Help to Devotion. Being, A Choice Collection of Hymns, Psalms, and Spiritual Songs for the use of the Pious and Sincere Christian* each brought the intersubjectivity between God and the speaker into greater relief, highlighting its mechanisms and their impact on the individual.<sup>35</sup>

The verse translations by Newcomb and Squire and the *Divine Melody* translation each draw out and clarify the subtle connections in the Jacobean text. The result is a more unified picture of God's relationship with individual believers. In Newcomb, God is an almost ominous panoptic presence:

By thy surrounding watchful eyes,  
Great God, are all my counsels read;  
Both when I sit, and when I rise,  
Thy pow'r I own, and presence dread.  
In the deep foldings of my heart,  
Each secret guilt and dark design,  
I may conceal with care and art  
From human search, but not from thine. (1-8)  
[...]  
Ere yet my words have utt'rance found,  
Thy eye into my heart can see;  
My formless thoughts, e're cloth'd with sound,  
All mark'd, and open all to thee. (1-8, 13-16)

Rather than provide the speaker comfort, God's omnipresence seems threatening. Squire, on the other hand, interprets the relationship between God and the speaker in the Psalm as comfortable, happy, and content:

O Lord, my secret Soul, to Thee,

---

<sup>35</sup> Psalm 139 was very popular with eighteenth-century poets. Daniel Burgess (1714), Thomas Gibbons (1750), Thomas Blalock (1754), Thomas Drummond (1756), and Benjamin Martin (1758) each translated their own versions of the Psalm. Interestingly, you can follow the development of translation trends over the course of the first half of the eighteenth century. Based on interpretive decisions that are made over and over by successive poets and that have little to do with the 1611 version, it seems plausible that certain poets took as their source text only slightly earlier verse translations rather than the Biblical Psalm.

Is naked, and from cov'ring free;  
 Each Motion, thy quick Eye descries,  
 Whene'er I sit, or when I rise.  
 My Thoughts, before they're made my own,  
 To Thee, are all distinctly known.  
 [...]  
 The Words my moving Tongue does feign,  
 To Thee, O Lord, are perfect plain. (1-6, 9-10)

Where Newcomb expands his explanation of God's omniscience and of his speaker's dark thoughts and chooses words whose connotations cast a shadow over the scene he describes, Squire does not; his choices result in a speaker who is relieved by God's watchfulness and in awe of God's knowledge and care. The *Divine Melody* poet's version of the spiritual relationship falls somewhere between Squire's and Newcomb's. The beginning images of God are gentler versions of Newcomb's:

Thou Lord, by strictest search hast known,  
 My rising up and lying down;  
 My secret thoughts are known to thee,  
 Known long before conceiv'd by me.  
  
 Thine eye my bed and path surveys,  
 My publick haunts and private ways:  
 Thou knows't what 'tis my lips would vent,  
 My yet unutter'd words intent. (1-8)

Ultimately, however, the speaker arrives at a position of acceptance, contentment, and awe at the impact God's searching can have on his actions.

While each of these translations characterizes the relationship between the speaker and God somewhat differently, as interestingly, they each describe their speakers' use of intersubjectivity to make sense of and to benefit from the idea of an omniscient God. The God in these translations, it is clear, is always already aware of the inner workings of the speakers' minds and hearts. The translators weave their versions of the thirteenth through sixteenth verses of the 1611 psalm

into the narrative they tell about God's timeless and infinite wisdom and knowledge:

Thine eye my substance did survey,  
While yet a lifeless mass it lay;  
In secret how exactly wrought,  
Er're from its dark inclosure brought.

Thou did'st the shapeless embrio see,  
Its parts were register'd by thee;  
Thou saw'st the daily growth they took;  
Form'd by the model of thy book. (*Divine Melody* 41-48)

For these speakers, God's knowledge of them was complete before they were conceived and extends well beyond their present state. Since the purpose of intersubjectivity is for one party to imagine another's thoughts and feelings, and since the speakers believe God possesses this knowledge as a result of his omniscience, God does not actually need to enter into an intersubjective relationship with the speakers.

However, to comprehend God's omniscience, the speakers in each of the translations rely on intersubjectivity built upon and residing entirely with the speaker's imagination; the conception of God that they evoke is an imagined - and therefore utterly human and limited - version of God's presence. Regardless of the tenor of the relationship between God and speaker, whether the speaker is content with her relationship with God or desperate to improve that relationship, each speaker accepts that he cannot comprehend God's omniscience. In spite of this fact, each of the speakers is utterly convinced of the reality of this boundless divine knowledge. They accept this as fact by putting viewing their relationship as intersubjective. Over and over, they each explain that God has "searched" them, that he "sees" into the hidden reaches of their hearts, that no past action or future thought is unknown to him. Further, they continuously assert that they

cannot fathom God's knowledge. However, they are aware of what they see as their sinful nature. In their understanding of their sinfulness and their relationship with God, they assume that God's omniscience means that he is aware of their proclivity to sin as well.

In their attempts to correct their corrupt natures, the speakers imagine God's knowledge and realize that the only part of it that they can comprehend is God's knowledge of themselves. To test this, the speakers access the perspective of God that they each imagined to interrogate and to reflect upon themselves, their thoughts, and their actions. The speakers bring their own knowledge of their flaws to their encounters with God, and perhaps inevitably, they attribute their own knowledge of those flaws to God. It is this removed perspective, this more expansive view of their own actions and thoughts that the speakers request of God in the final lines of each of these versions of the 139<sup>th</sup> Psalm. In the *Divine Melody* translation, the speaker begs that God will "search, try, O Lord, my reins and heart, / If evil lurk in any part; / Correct me where I go astray, / And guide me in thy perfect way" (53-56). Squire's happy and grateful speaker requests that God "search my secret Soul within, / And try my Thoughts, and purge the Sin, / Lest Wickedness should revel there: / Oh, guide me in they righteous Fear" (57-60). These speakers ask for God to search them, but what they truly desire is God's presence as a subject position that they can temporarily inhabit while they reflect on their thoughts and behavior from his position. This intuited divine point of view gives the speakers a better understanding of their sinfulness. Though they attribute this searching to God, what the poets actually represent is each speaker searching himself and requesting that God remain a presence in their lives so that they can access this self-reflection via



intersubjectivity. While it may seem that this sort of intersubjectivity calls into question God's omniscience, in the minds of the speakers it in fact solidifies the traditional Biblical power structure: the self-objectification and othering of the self that intersubjectivity requires transfers the speakers' agency onto God, diminishing and subordinating the self-reflexive power within the speakers as they initiate these intersubjective encounters.

The Christian intersubjectivity we have observed in the psalm translations above instigates self-reflection on the part of the speaker, and, by extension, the reader. The consequence of this self-reflection is likely the impulse to correct, to realign our own situation so that it more fully parallels the intimate spiritual relationship we might crave. In other words, the intersubjectivity at the heart of lyrics like Rowe's, Squire's, and in the *Divine Melody* Psalm serve as moments of acute proselytization: as readers of their lyrics we reflect on ourselves, perhaps see that we are not enjoying the same relationship with God that these speakers do though we might long for it, and we then attempt to change our behavior to induce a similar spiritual relationship. Likewise we see in the translations of the 42<sup>nd</sup> Psalm and in Addison's translation of the 23<sup>rd</sup> Psalm models of the relationship between God and the individual that likely serve as warnings, warnings that we perceive as we explore the subject position of the speaker intersubjectively.

It is little wonder that intersubjectivity is so central to lyric representations of the relationship between God and the individual. The central claim of Christianity is that Christ became human – took on the form, identity, and point of view of the individual – to achieve a better understanding both of humanity and of the human perception and

interpretation of the divine. The continual reliance on intersubjectivity – that relational model so familiar and useful to poets trying to unravel amorous relationships – that we see in the 23<sup>rd</sup>, 42<sup>nd</sup>, and 139<sup>th</sup> Psalms can perhaps be understood as an attempt by eighteenth-century Christian poet-translators to understand this ultimate instance of Christian love and sacrifice, this embodied example of intersubjectivity. The Christian tradition explains that this act was motivated by Christ's love for humanity. Not only are these poetic attempts to comprehend divine love via representations of intersubjectivity central to the psalm translations of the period; they also serve as a continual undercurrent to lyric psalms' early eighteenth-century counterpart, the congregational hymn. As we will see in the next chapter, hymnists also use intersubjectivity as they attempt to understand their relationship to God, and one of their favorite images is the *corpus christi*, the image of intersubjectivity made concrete in the crucified body of Christ.

## Chapter Four

### “Let us our voices raise”: Congregational Singing and Intersubjectivity

#### I. “The Image of my Heart is Painted in Them”<sup>1</sup>

Unsurprisingly, when most people think of lyrics in the early eighteenth century, they think primarily of the burgeoning congregational hymn tradition of Watts and Wesley rather than of verse translations of psalms. Congregational hymns become the meeting point of the private lyrical impulse and the public didactic impulse of the eighteenth century, a place where the most popular forms of poetic expression of two periods – the metaphysical and baroque of the seventeenth century and the Augustan – coalesce, impacting and reflecting upon one another. As such, religious lyrics like those by Watts and Wesley perhaps should be considered the culmination of early eighteenth-century verse. This religious poetry is emotional, feeling, intimate. It is focused on reflecting – and through reflecting, creating – specific psychological reactions in readers. At the same time, it is attentive to poetic expectations of evenness, simplicity, rationality, clarity. And above all, it is keenly didactic, with all of didacticism’s attendant implications of being outward looking, communal, and public in nature. In encompassing public, performative characteristics and the private, the intimate, congregational hymns could be the ideal place to trace the intersubjective energies that lyrics articulate and release.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Watts *Horae Lyricae* 18

<sup>2</sup> For the purposes of this chapter, I will focus on the hymns as lyric texts and as songs used both within Dissenting worship services and by non-Dissenting and Dissenting individuals and groups in house or field meetings or other gatherings outside of the Anglican liturgy.

Congregational singing within the prescribed Anglican liturgy was restricted to metrical psalms transcribed into verse and included in their psalter. These metrical psalms differ from the psalm translations discussed in Chapter Three in that the psalms in the psalter were sung within the

Donald Davie speaks for many critics when he describes these poets as working under a poetic paradigm remote from what came before or since their time. “The affectation, or the rhetorical illusion, that the poet speaks ‘from the heart,’ nakedly, is now for many readers so inextricable from their experience of poetry that they cannot make contact” with these poets, “for whom that affectation or rhetorical illusion is undesirable and uninteresting” (31). Though Davie should be commended for the seriousness with which he has devoted his time and considerable efforts to studying the English hymn tradition in the period, a number of problems arise from the attitude conveyed at moments such as these in Davie’s work. This claim relies on false dichotomies. For Davie, poetry can either pretend to speak “nakedly” and from the heart, or it can speak in “a tone of address too high for [readers’] comfort” (31). Poetry can either be accessible to readers because it is written on their lower level, or it can be too “Romanist” and therefore too difficult for readers to engage and understand. It will either reveal its writer’s allegiance to the Neoclassical paradigm, or it will be part of the vast body of poetry that pretends to speak “from the heart” that has barred readers from engaging with the lofty tone and substance of Enlightenment verse (31). Either/or. One or the other. Davie’s is a model of dualities. We know, however, that things are rarely so simple. Congregational hymns like those by Watts and Wesley also reconcile the binaries that Davie charts. Their congregational hymns bridge the dichotomies that divide the Early Modern and Romantic lyric from the eighteenth-century lyric, the public from

---

Anglican Church and the lyrical versions of the psalms in Chapter Three were printed and sold as texts meant to support the individual’s self-reflection and spiritual development.

When I refer to a “lyric” or to “lyrics” in this chapter, I refer, as I have throughout the project, to the lyric poem, not the words or lyrics that make up the hymn.

the private, the didactic and revelatory from the reflective and supportive, the distant from the intimate. Key to their integration of these seeming opposites is their use of intersubjectivity.

Davie is far from alone in his tendency to view the period's verse dichotomously. In *English Congregational Hymns in the Eighteenth Century*, Madeleine Forell Marshall and Janet Todd establish a different set of binaries around which they arrange eighteenth-century hymns and hymnists. In their view, hymns cannot and should not be considered as lyric poems. According to their framework, "the predominant characteristic of hymns, however expressive of conviction or religious passion they may be, may only be described as their impersonality" (1). Further, they argue, "religious verse that proceeds spontaneously, from the soul, as the private expression of the individual, is wholly inappropriate for congregational use[. ...] In its quality and purpose the emotion expressed in hymns intended for congregational use is depersonalized and doctrinally corrected, thereby differing from the more individual emotion shown by lyrics" (1, 7). In their attempt to carve out a space for the literary study of hymns, to claim for hymns an importance worthy of literary attention, they separate them from existing narratives. On one side of their dichotomy stand lyric poems, and on the other stand hymns. Religious lyrics are personal, soulful, private, individual, emotional, and spontaneous-seeming; hymns are public, communal, doctrine-oriented, impersonal, and commonplace. Religious lyrics and hymns, in the views of Marshall and Todd, oppose one another fundamentally. While Davie and Marshall and Todd start from dualistic positions, they admirably use them to incorporate long overlooked English hymnists into the story we tell about poetry in the eighteenth century. While I

see the way that these hymns fit into the story we tell about literature in the period differently than Davie and Marshall and Todd, we all agree that critics have overlooked this vast body of popular texts far too long. Incorporating hymn writers into the traditional view of the long eighteenth century is not enough. We must instead consider the possibility that English religious lyrics are central to both the story of the early eighteenth century and to how the period's verse relates to other moments of lyric significance.

In congregational hymns such as those by Watts and Wesley, lyric intersubjectivity manifests itself as both a re-creation and a recasting of the supplicant-deity relationship. Speakers within the hymns call out to God, at turns praising him, loving him, begging him for guidance, and beseeching him for punishment. They call for singers – and implicitly readers – to imagine themselves as God, to feel the pain Jesus felt, to sense God's indifference to petitioners but for the intercession of Jesus. They view themselves from God's perspective, embodying him and viewing themselves from this presumed divine point of view. They other themselves and in so doing they provide themselves with the distance they need to reflect on their own spiritual condition and on their relationship with the divine.<sup>3</sup> These hymns prompt us as engaged readers to do the same. The intersubjectivity within many congregational hymns illuminates these and other essential characteristics of human subjectivity and of the individual's relationship with God. By crafting within their religious lyrics a

---

<sup>3</sup> Of course, within the Augustinian Christian paradigm, the self-reflection, the attempt to see the self from the perspective of God or to examine the self against a backdrop of godly behavior and expectations is part of the spiritual life of the individual. When considered from a psychological standpoint, however, this ability to see the self from the perspective of an omniscient God who knows our sins before we commit or are even aware of them, as poets explore in their lyric versions of Psalm 139 as we will see below, implies that viewing the self from this perspective weirdly provides the individual with access to the abject.

relational structure built upon intersubjectivity, poets like Watts and Wesley invite readers to join in the religious experience they describe and exemplify in their verse. Relying on intersubjectivity to structure interaction both within and outside of their lyrics enabled Watts and Wesley to justify, to reassure, to complicate, or to radically destabilize the standard dichotomy between the petitioner and the divine.<sup>4</sup>

For Marshall and Todd, lyricity hinges on whether a poem is personal and individual, two characteristics that, for them, permanently separate the lyric text from the hymn; this definition of lyricity is the linchpin of the binary that they explore. When we revise the definition, however, and consider lyricity via the intersubjectivity it reveals and initiates, the hard line that separates the sides of their dichotomy dissolves: hymn and lyric then sit alongside one another on a continuum of poetic characteristics and effects, bound to one another by the intersubjectivity that animates them and affects us as readers, singers, or both. These are the reasons the eighteenth-century congregational hymn deserves our attention: not because it is so unique that it must be studied on its own, or because it is so clearly a part of the “Enlightenment” tradition that we cannot ignore it, but because, as part of the broader lyric tradition, it complicates and enriches our understanding of the period, its poetics, and its relationship to what came before and what comes after it.

Hymns are an essential part of the lyric tradition in the long eighteenth century, a tradition that, as we have seen already, investigates and challenges divisions between emotional and rational, spontaneous and controlled, public

---

<sup>4</sup> Though its face, this action may not seem particularly radical, the agency that the poet takes upon himself in revising the relationship between the petitioner and God is quite subversive, especially when this revision itself upsets the traditional power structure of the relationship.

and private, communal and individual. I would argue, in fact, that the eighteenth-century congregational hymn – as a result of the particular space it inhabits as a public and private text and as a result of the consequent shifting of intersubjectivity it presents and initiates as the hymn is read alone, read collectively, then sung alone, and finally sung with a group – is one the best examples of this paradoxical nature of lyrics. Hymns like those by Watts and Wesley, like the amorous lyrics by Rochester and Behn and the Psalm translations by Rowe, Masters, and Rennew, depict and instigate many levels of intersubjectivity for their readers as they engage the subject positions available to them within and around the text. Intersubjectivity is at work within and around the hymn text between the speakers and God, between the poet and speakers, and, as a result, between the poet and God. We experience each of these sorts of intersubjectivity as well as we interact with the hymn texts as readers, using it to engage with the hymn's speakers, with the poets, and with God via both the poets and their speakers. Hymns, though, because of their performative dimension, expand the possibilities for intersubjective engagement beyond the text to include one's fellow singers.

These levels of engagement encompass many dimensions of intersubjectivity. But hymns open up yet another level of engagement beyond the text itself and outside of the privacy of our individual interaction with the lyric: congregational hymns, unlike most other lyric verse, are recited publicly and *en masse*. It is this through this characteristic that they expand our conception of intersubjectivity. The lyrics of Rochester might have had a public



performative component;<sup>5</sup> Psalm translations like Addison's certainly had public lives;<sup>6</sup> and printed texts are always already public and the experience of reading communal no matter how private and intimate they seem. But the public element of intersubjectivity – the knowledge that someone else, somewhere else, at some time is, has, or will engage with the subject positions made available to us in these lyrics – is always more implicit than explicit, more a potential for communal intersubjectivity than a demonstration of it. Implicit and latent, that is, until the congregational hymn. The chorus of voices that join together to sing the hymns of Watts and Wesley do not represent individuals going through the motion of worship. The "I" of the hymn becomes a chorus of "I"s, each enacting its own personal spiritual encounter that is at the same time and of necessity a very public and communal encounter, not just between the lone "I" and God but also between the many "I"s of the congregation.. This enrichment of worship through the inclusion of hymns, the new and stronger connections between singers and God and between the singers themselves, is one of the central goals of Watts and Wesley, and the means of this goal, though they certainly would not have called it such, is intersubjectivity.

## II. "To raise our fancies and kindle the fires of our passions"<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> As scenes featuring the poetry-reciting rake Dorimant in Etherege's *The Man of Mode* and scenes from Stephen Jeffreys's *The Libertine* would have us believe that some of Rochester's best-loved lyrics were "composed" and performed for drinking companions and fellow courtiers *a la minute*.

<sup>6</sup> Addison's text appeared in a publication of *The Spectator*.

<sup>7</sup> This is from a letter from Enoch Watts to his brother Isaac cited in David Guy Fountain's *Isaac Watts Remembered*.

William Hogarth immortalized in his engravings images of eighteenth-century English life that have become iconic illustrations of the period. Among them are a number of interiors of churches during worship services, including “The Sleeping Church” (1729), “The Sleepy Congregation” (1736 and 1769), and “The Industrious ‘Prentice Performing the Duty of a Christian” (1747). Hogarth’s representations of religious life in the period, though exaggerated for satiric effect, align with other extant descriptions of the common practices in Christian worship in eighteenth-century England. With the 1662 revision to the *Book of Common Prayer*,<sup>8</sup> Anglican worship at its most basic consisted of “an uninterrupted sequence of four items: morning prayer, litany, ante-communion (first part of the Lord’s Supper), and sermon. [...] The combined services provide a rich dose of scripture: a chapter from both testaments, an epistle and gospel, plus ample psalmody and canticles” (White 99). The service was ordered, regular, and, because of the set liturgy, duplicated in Anglican congregations across the island. The calm, communal, evenness of eighteenth-century Anglican worship services is on display in the background of Hogarth’s “The Industrious ‘Prentice Performing the Duty of a Christian”; moreover, this scene depicts

---

<sup>8</sup> As James F. White in *Protestant Worship: Traditions in Transition* explains, “the Anglican tradition, more than any other, is a tradition of a book, a single book, the prayer book” (95). His brief history of the book is clear: “Archbishop Thomas Cranmer (1489-1556) was largely the architect of the first *BCP*, which became mandatory for all churches in England on Pentecost, June 9, 1549. On November 1, 1552, it was superseded, being ‘explained, and made fully perfect’ by the second prayer book. This had a short life because of the return to Roman allegiance under Queen Mary, July 18, 1553. Another change in the reign brought the Elizabethan *BCP* of 1559, only slightly altered from 1552. The beginning of the Stuart reign saw a new version in 1604 and the Restoration produced a further revision in 1662. From 1645 to 1660, the *BCP* was abrogated by Parliament in favor of the *Directory for the Public Worship of God* [, a text that allowed for more freedom of worship since it served as a guideline rather than a set of requirements for the conduct of worship services]. [The 1662 *BCP* stood alone until the late twentieth century.] While still retaining the 1662 *BCP*, the Church of England published *The Alternative Service Book* 1980” (95-6).

worshippers more than likely singing one of the metrical renderings of the Psalms included in the *Book of Common Prayer*.

The other side of the coin for Anglican congregants, however, is foregrounded in Hogarth's "The Sleepy Church" and "The Sleeping Congregation." Both of these engravings illustrate a congregation of individuals who have fallen asleep as a result, perhaps, of an uninspired homily, an order of service that required their passivity, or a lack of passion and fervor for worship. These images support the idea that Anglican services in the period were frightfully dull. James White distinguishes the worship style of the late seventeenth century and the eighteenth century as "a period in Anglican worship few would care to reproduce today" (107). "The service must have seemed long and tedious, and the sermon at the end must have had to contend with the onset of lethargy" (99). He explains this development as a consequence of latitudinarianism. "Many Anglicans, from Archbishop John Tillotson (1630-1694) on, advocated a latitudinarianism that sought to minimize theological and liturgical distinctions among Christians," and as a result, "worship in general, and the sacraments in particular, were subverted to the cause of morality and social order" (107). While resistance to these practices existed, largely in the Methodists' "strong emphasis on sacramental life" and the "Evangelicals[ ...] commitment to personal religion," theirs "were largely countercultural movements and did not reverse the pervasive blandness of Anglican worship, which dreaded 'enthusiasm' throughout much of this period" (108).

Though Watts was the first English hymn writer to gain a broad audience for his hymns, he was not the first to introduce congregational hymnody into English worship services. Bringing congregational hymns to worship services in

Great Britain is a Baptist innovation, “specifically the Calvinist congregation at Broadmead Church, Bristol, whose members carried on that activity between 1671 and 1685. The initial force behind the spread of English congregational hymnody manifested itself in the form of a Baptist minister and prolific prose writer who endured suffering and imprisonment for his Nonconformist principles. Benjamin Keach, who began preaching under the Baptist banner at the age of eighteen, came in 1668 from his native Buckinghamshire to London as pastor of a Calvinist (or Particular) Baptist church at Horsleydown, Southwark. His earliest hymns appeared in narrative prose and poetic tracts, such as *War with the Powers of Darkness* and *Distressed Sion Relieved or, The Garment of Praise for the Spirit of Heaviness*. Then in 1691 he published *The Breach Repaired in God’s Worship; or, Singing of Psalms, Hymns, and Spiritual Songs Proved to be a Holy Ordinance of Jesus Christ* – a collection of three hundred hymns” (Rogal 79-80). Keach’s hymns never took root far beyond local Dissenting congregations, though, because “he tended to rely upon the congregational hymn as a propaganda vehicle for promoting his Baptist principles against threats (real or imagined) from papists and nonbelievers” (80-81).

Watts hoped to combat this lethargy Hogarth depicted by infusing worship service with original hymns. This goal stands at the center of his explanations of and justifications for his 1707 volume of hymns. A telling letter from Enoch Watts to his brother Isaac from 1700 serves as a window into the apparently ongoing and lengthy conversation surrounding the importance of revitalizing the order of service and the practices of worship to include original hymns. In it, Enoch urges Isaac to publish the manuscript of hymns that will become his *Hymns and Spiritual Songs*:

## "Southampton March

1700

Dear Brother,,

In your last you discovered an inclination to oblige the world by showing it your hymns in print; and I heartily wish as well for the satisfaction of the public as myself, that you were something more than inclinable thereunto. I have frequently importuned you to it before now, and your invention has often furnished you with some modest reply to the contrary, as if what I urged was only the effect of a rash and inconsiderate fondness to a brother. I am very confident, however, that whoever has the happiness of reading your hymns will have a very favourable opinion of their author, so that, at the same time you contribute to the universal advantage, you will procure the esteem of men the most judicious and sensible.

Furthermore, consider how very mean the performers in this kind of poetry appear already. There is great need for a piece vigorous and lively as yours, to quicken and revive the dying devotion of the age, to which nothing can afford such assistance as poetry, contrived on purpose to elevate us even above ourselves. Yours is the old truth, stripped of its ragged ornaments, and appears, if we may say so, younger by ages, in a new and fashionable dress.

As for those modern gentlemen, who have lately exhibited their version of the Psalms all confess to me a vast difference to yours, though they are done by persons of no mean credit. Dr. Patrick most certainly has the report of a very learned man, and, they say, understand the Hebrew extremely well, which indeed capacitates him for a translator, but he is thereby never the more enabled to versify. Tate and Brady still keep near the same pace. There is in them a mighty deficiency of that life and soul, which is necessary to raise our fancies and kindle and fire our passions. I have been persuaded to a great while since, that were David to speak English, he would choose to make use of your style. If what I have said seems to have no weight with you, yet you cannot be ignorant what a load of scandal lies on the dissenters, only for their imagined aversion to poetry. You remember what Dr. Speed says:

"So far hath schism prevail'd, they hate to see  
Our lines and words in couplings to agree,  
It looks too like abhorr'd conformity:  
A hymn, so soft, so smooth, so neatly drest,  
Savours of human learning and the beast."

And, perhaps, it has been thought there were some grounds for his aspersion from the admired poems of Ben. Keach., John Bunyan, etc., all flat and dull as they are; nay, I am much out if the latter has not formerly made much more ravishing music with his hammer and brass kettle.

Now when yours are exposed to the public view, these calumnies will immediately vanish, which methinks should be a

motive not the least considerable. Lastly, if I do not speak reason, I will at present take my leave of you, and only desire you to hear what your ingenious acquaintance at London says to the point, for I doubt not you have many solicitors, there, whose judgements are much more solid than mine. I pray God Almighty have you in his good keeping, and desire you to believe me.

My dear brother,  
Your most affectionate kinsman and friend  
ENOCH WATTS"

This moment of insight into their conversation reveals that, though Hogarth engraves his sleeping congregants in the decades that follow, the Wattses share in the sentiment behind the engravings. Enoch appeals to what must be their shared frustration with the state of worship at the turn of the century, claiming that Isaac needs to publish his hymns “to elevate us even above ourselves” and “to raise our fancies and kindle the fires of our passions.” In other words, Isaac Watts and Enoch Watts see the hymn movement as a call to revivify Christian fervor by stripping away the “ragged ornaments” of the old methods of worship and renewing them by incorporating new poetic hymns written in an effortless, though elevated, literary style. Certainly to Enoch’s delight, *Hymns and Spiritual Songs* was printed just seven years later.

Simplicity. Earnestness. Engagement. Above all else, engagement. Watts explicitly claims for his poetry each of these characteristics in his 1707 Preface to *Hymns and Spiritual Songs*. His spiritual poetry challenges many accepted religious practices popular in early eighteenth-century worship and reflects his own Dissenting values. But at the center of this effort, his main motivation for composing these lyrics is to correct “the dull Indifference, the negligent and the thoughtless Air that sits upon the Faces of a whole Assembly, while the Psalm is on their Lips” (iii). In short, Watts wrote these didactic, simple, earnest hymns with one goal in mind: inducing spiritual connection. But how can we resolve

the seeming incongruity here? Davie would have readers see Watts as the staid, stolid, axiomatic counterpart to Wesley: “Since the truths of the Christian Revelation are axiomatic, there is no need – and indeed it would be impertinent – for them to be, in the words of a Romantic poet, ‘proved on the pulses.’ An axiom is just that, axiomatic; it does not have to be re-experienced, not in poetry nor anywhere else except (ideally) in the act of worship. To push the matter a little further, for Christian poets like Dryden and Watts, poetry is distinctly not worship” (31-2). This view, however, directly contradicts Watts’s stated goals: to impassion worshipers through his verse so that “a charitable Observer” would not be tempted “to suspect the Fervency of [congregants’] inward Religion” (iii). To achieve these goals, Watts set a new standard for religious poetics, justifying and implementing a number of distinctive guidelines and strategies that would not only impact religious poets throughout the period but would also revolutionize the way his fellow Britons engaged in worship.

Perhaps Watts’s most telling and most explicit iterations of this new paradigm come via the prose prefaces to his *Horae Lyricae: Poems Chiefly in the Lyrical Kind* (1706) and his *Hymns and Spiritual Songs in Three Books* (1707). In these two prefaces, Watts lays the groundwork for his model of ideal religious verse and ideal congregational worship through song. Each of his criteria complement one another and coalesce to create a method of worship that is at once public and private, communal and individual, outwardly focused and attuned sharply to the inward state of each congregant. Intersubjectivity is the glue that holds these seemingly paradoxical states together, and it is this juxtaposition of apparently contradictory states through intersubjectivity that generates the fervor that Watts hopes to reintroduce to English worship.

Watts intervenes in the *status quo* in three key ways, each challenging the Reformation standard that had rendered the “Minds of most of the Worshippers” “absent or unconcerned” (*Hymns and Spiritual Songs* iii). Watts argued for the creation and acceptance of new hymns, chose to simplify the language of the hymns, and excised potentially offensive language to appeal to the widest spectrum of Christians. Each of these decisions aimed to remove stumbling blocks that prevented congregants from engaging fully and emotionally with their acts of worship. One of the main tenets of Reformation-era worship was that it should only include the word of God as presented in the Bible. What this meant for hymns was that many congregations, and all Anglican congregations, only sang or recited the Psalms, if they included congregational singing in their practice at all. Watts found this stricture too narrow and argued that it was one of the main causes of rote worship rather than true engagement with the service: “But of all our Religious Solemnities Psalmodie is the most unhappily managed. That very Action which should elevate us to the most delightful and divine Sensations, does not only flatten our Devotion, but too often awakens our Regret, and touches all the Springs of Uneasiness within us” (iv).

Watts believed that because congregants lived in an evangelical, New Testament, messianic age, restricting their singing to Old Testament Psalms fettered their reactions in worship and prevented them from feeling the connection to God that worship required. Always attuned to the spiritual and psychological reaction of the individual, Watts explains:

Some Sentences of the Psalmist that are expressive of the Temper of our own Hearts and the Circumstances of our Lives may compose our Spirits to Seriousness, and allure us to a sweet Retirement



within ourselves: but we meet with a following Line which so peculiarly belongs but to one Action or Hour of the Life of David or Asaph, that breaks off our Song in the midst; our Consciences are affrighted lest we should speak a Falsehood unto God: Thus the Powers of our Souls are shocked on a sudden, and our Spirits ruffled (*Hymns and Spiritual Songs v*)

Central to this argument is the relatability of the hymns for congregants in a messianic age. If hymns regularly remind congregants that their subject matter is relevant to a specific time thousands of years before their own and a place thousands of miles away from them, they distance congregants from even the most applicable sentiments the Psalms express. Given that it impedes engagement and fervor, Watts would not suffer this sort of distancing.

To combat this sense of distance and threat of irrelevancy, Watts argues that new hymns based on the New Testament must be incorporated into worship and suggests that certain Psalms could be “fitted for the use of our Churches, and David converted into a Christian” (*Hymns and Spiritual Songs x*). He calls the Psalms:

The most artful, most devotional and Divine Collection of Poesy; [...] never was a piece of Experimental Divinity so nobly written, and so justly revered and admired: But it must be acknowledged still, that there are a thousand lines in it which were not made for a Saint in our Day, to assume as his own (vi)

“There are also many deficiencies of Light and Glory which our Lord Jesus and his Apostles have supplied in the Writings of the New Testament” that Watts explains, after years of being begged to do so, he has written the hymns that follow (vi).

At the same time, his volumes of religious verse are also ecumenical; he attempted to remove from his poetry and psalm translations any unnecessary or offensive language that might affront other Christian groups. He explains, “The

Contentions and distinguishing Words of Sects and Parties are secluded, that whole Assemblies might assist at the Harmony, and different Churches join in the same Worship without Offense" (vii). He focuses on "the General State of the Gospel, and the most common Affairs of Christians" (vii). His goal is to reach Christians from every social stratum and background and to supply them with images and ideas that will support their spiritual development, piety, and engagement during worship. Accordingly, he wrote the hymns included in *Hymns and Spiritual Songs* with those goals in mind:

The most frequent Tempers and Changes of our Spirit, and Conditions of our Life are here copied, and the Breathings of our Piety expressed according to the variety of our Passions; our Love, our Fear, our Hope, our Desire, our Sorrow, our Wonder and our Joy, all refined into Devotion, and acting under the Influence and Conduct of the Blessed Spirit; all conversing with god the Father by the new and living Way of Access to the Throne, even the Person and the Mediation of our Lord Jesus Christ. (*Hymns and Spiritual Songs* vii)

While his lyrics were hymns meant to be sung during worship, Watts's literary critical turn in this Preface demonstrates that he considered them to be spiritual lyric poems.<sup>9</sup> He was concerned with the poetic-ness of the hymns, and he claimed religious poets could deliver truth through poetry, dismissing centuries of critics' concerns over the ability of "fictive" literature to convey any truth whatsoever. Many of Watts's poetic ideals were shared by other poets we might envision when we think of "Augustan" verse, poetic tactics we observed in the lines of Addison and Rowe. Watts "aimed at ease of Numbers and Smoothness of Sound," and he "seldom permitted a Stop in the middle of a Line,

---

<sup>9</sup> As we saw in Chapter Three, J. Paul Hunter, in *Before Novels*, explains how the seventeenth century witnessed a growth in the individual's maintenance of her own spiritual growth through reading and analyzing spiritual texts like hymns, pamphlets, sermons, and verse translations from the Bible.

and seldom left the end of a Line without one" (viii). He strove for simplicity in his word choice both to support this metrical smoothness and to open the meaning of his texts to the greatest variety of readers. He believed all of these characteristics could join together so that poets might create verse that "breath[es] the Life of Angels into the Hearts of Men, and rear[s] their Minds Heavenward in warm and tuneful Devotion" and that "convey[s] Piety into resisting Nature, and melt[s] Souls of Iron to the Love of Vertue" (*Horae Lyricae* 11). However, this potential power to move readers through verse came with tremendous responsibility. "Our Wonder and our Love, our Pity, Delight, and Sorrow, with the long train of Hopes and Fears, must needs be under the Command of an Harmonious Pen, whose every Line makes a part of the Reader's Faith, and is the very Life or Death of his Soul" (15).

In crafting these prefaces, Watts attempted to justify further reformation of liturgical practices but to also appeal to his fellow poets to embark upon a new, evangelical poetic mission. Each of the criteria he delineated, each poetic characteristic he described was crucial to enabling the congregant to connect with God. Establishing and strengthening this connection between the individual and God was Watts's main purpose in writing his volumes of verse, a core principle in worship, both individual and congregational, and an essential responsibility of believers in individual, revealed religion. "While we sing the Praises of our God in his Church, we are employed in that part of Worship which of all others is the nearest a-kin to Heaven" (*Hymns and Spiritual Songs* iii). In singing, "our Souls are raised a little above this Earth" (iv). Singing is "that very Action which should elevate us to the most delightful [...] Sensations" (iv). It makes us feel "a sweet Retirement within ourselves" (v), a description that

emphasizes the hymn's paradoxical ability to join the public to the private. "If the Heart were first inflam'd from Heaven, and the Muse were not left alone to form the Devotion and pursue a Cold Scent, but only call'd in as an Assistant to Worship, then the Song would end where the Inspiration ceases; the whole Composure would be of a Piece, all Meridian Light and Meridian Fervor. And the same Pious Flame would be propagated and kept glowing in the Heart of him that reads" (*Horae Lyricae* 17).

This sort of attention to the self, to the psychological impact verse might have on the individual, in the form of thoughtful theorizing on the part of the poet and in the form of self-reflection on the part of the penitent and pious congregant, is the first essential step to the kind of intersubjectivity that we find vividly coursing through Watts's lyrics. This intersubjectivity is not one dimensional but is multi-faceted, refracting through Watts's volumes of verse and demonstrating the many types of subjective interaction available to congregants and central to the individual as she examines and charts the course of her relationship with God and her experiences as a Christian. Some of Watts's best-known hymns represent and enact a complex web of intersubjective relationships meant to provide the reader with the necessary distance on herself to reflect upon and modify her reaction to and relationship with God.

Readers' potential familiarity with his texts through their own experiences in church, coupled with Watts's vehement disavowals of poetic genius, perhaps is a reason for the relative lack of serious scholarly attention to his hymns as poetry. Regular, or even sporadic, attendees of worship services at any number of Christian denominations have very likely heard or sung "When I Survey the Wondrous Cross." It is a staple in the hymnals of Baptist, Methodist,

Presbyterian, and Church of Christ congregations as well as in many Sacred Harp song collections. But when we do our best to approach this hymn and others like it from a fresh perspective, thinking of them not just as words we half-heartedly hear or sing at church but as poetry worthy of the same level of attention we would devote to a poem by Pope or Crashaw or Milton or Donne, our efforts are quickly rewarded. Far from being overly simplified verse meant to appeal to the “most vulgar capacities,” as Watts’s Prefaces might insinuate, this hymn – and many others like it – actually relies on a number of complex poetic techniques. And the success of Watts’s poetically complicated lyrics hinges on his multivalent use of intersubjectivity. This special spiritual engagement enables Watts to evoke fervor in congregants in spite of – perhaps because of – his poetic complexity.

“Crucifixion to the World by the Cross of Christ,”<sup>10</sup> now commonly known as “When I Survey the Wondrous Cross,” typifies this melding of poetic complexity and multivalent spiritual intersubjectivity. On first glance, it seems to be a simple hymn of reflection on the crucified body of Christ. However, more sustained attention to Watts’s poetic decisions reveals the relational complexity that instigates the spiritual enthusiasm Watts hoped to achieve.

<sup>1</sup>When I survey the wondrous cross  
On which the Prince of Glory died,  
My richest gain I count but loss,  
And pour contempt on all my pride.

<sup>2</sup>Forbid it, Lord, that I should boast,  
Save in the death of Christ my God,  
All the vain things that charm me most,  
I sacrifice them to His blood.

---

<sup>10</sup> Watts “Crucifixion to the World by the Cross of Christ.” *The New Oxford Book of Christian Verse*. Donald Davie, ed. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1981. 146.

<sup>3</sup>See from His head, His hands, His feet,  
Sorrow and love flow mingled down,  
Did e'er such love and sorrow meet,  
Or thorns compose so rich a crown?

<sup>4</sup>His dying crimson, like a robe,  
Spreads o'er His body on the tree;  
Then I am dead to all the globe,  
And all the globe is dead to me.

<sup>5</sup>Were the whole realm of nature mine,  
That were a present far too small;  
Love so amazing, so divine,  
Demands my soul, my life, my all.<sup>11</sup>

The initial lines set up the *corpus christi* image and situate the position of the speaker, Christ, and reader, an arrangement that Watts will manipulate throughout the five stanzas that make up the lyric. At the center of the hymn is Christ crucified. And bearing witness to that scene is the speaker, whose task is to analyze what he sees and to convey a proper reaction to the scene. Readers, then, must observe and learn from the speaker's reflection and representation. As an evangelical and didactic tool, this lyric has each of the components necessary to enact the sort of intersubjectivity that we have noted previously. However, unraveling precisely how the *corpus christi* image enacts this reorientation of the self via intersubjective interaction with the other subject positions available to us in and around the text some close analytical work.<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> Marshall and Todd see Watts's innovations mostly the "dramatic qualities of his hymns" (34). They explain: "Like drama, hymns are a public genre, dependent for their survival on their broad appeal. They must reach out to capture the attention and involve the interest of the audience-congregation" (34). Further, they note "Watts's inclination to paint little scenes and to create little plays [within his hymns ....] The singers of hymns play the roles for their own delight and edification. They describe the setting, recite the lines, and respond feelingly, all at once, learning each step of the way" (35). However, they also maintain that hymns are and were meant to be impersonal, a view of these texts that focuses a little too intently on their communal role (7). While my attention to Watts clearly owes a great deal to Marshall and Todd, our views do not completely align.

Perhaps unsurprisingly, this reorientation, the central lesson of the lyric, relies on intersubjective positioning, repositioning, reflection, and correction to succeed. Watts details each of these steps throughout the remainder of the verse. At its center, Watts's didactic and evangelical goals in "When I Survey the Wondrous Cross" operate on intersubjectivity between the speaker and Christ, between the speaker and the reader, and, through that interaction, between the reader and Christ. Indeed, the complex web of subject relationships is the key to Watts's ability to induce fervor in congregants past and present.

Stanzas one and two, besides revealing the rhetorical positioning of the subjects within the hymn, also establish the central message of the poem: viewing Christ on the cross reorients the speaker's priorities, reminding him to let go of his attachment to worldly conceptions of success and to replace it with gratitude and allegiance to Christ, His sacrifice, and His intercession. This reorientation occurs as a result of the speaker surveying the crucified Christ. Seeing or visualizing Christ on the cross prompts the speaker to beseech God to help him maintain his contempt for "the vain things that charm [him] most" and instead "sacrifice them to [Christ's] blood" (7, 8). But simply seeing the *corpus christi* image is not enough to prompt a wholesale renunciation of past behavior. By reflecting upon the image, by empathically imagining the mental and physical anguish of Christ in great detail, by, in a sense, embodying the crucified Christ, the speaker gains a perspective on his own behavior. The extreme pain and

---

<sup>12</sup> Davie notes Watts's goal of reorienting his readers, which Davie traces back to the first verb in the hymn, "survey": "Watts *idealizes* the Crucifixion, not in the sense that he prettifies it or denies its monstrousness, but in the sense, etymologically correct, that he raises the monstrosity to the level of *idea*. As we have seen, he signals that such is his intention when he announces that he 'surveys' the Cross" (*The Eighteenth-Century Hymn in England* 44). For Davie, however, this reorientation achieved by surveying the cross, through its distancing the reader from the Crucifixion, prevents any sort of "vicariously experienc[ing]" any part of it (44).

sorrow and love and mercy that the speaker, by intersubjectively engaging with Christ, imagines juxtaposed with the speaker's perception of Christ's view of his behavior prompts the speaker to recommit to a life not of worldly worship but of devotion to Christ. Even the act of sacrifice is transposed in the final line of the second stanza – "I sacrifice them to His blood" – further reflecting the spiritual intersubjectivity prompted by the speaker's reflections (8).

While this intersubjectivity implicitly happens either in the first few lines of the lyric or in the antecedent action of the hymn, the third and fourth stanzas provide some insight into the details of the speaker's reflection on the image of Christ. The visual power of these images is central to the intersubjective moment between the speaker and Christ. Watts draws our gaze directly to the brutalized body of Christ, unwilling to let our eyes pass over the physical signs of His torment and love too quickly. Both the third and fourth stanzas follow a similar pattern: the first couplet of the stanza focuses our attention on Christ's wounds, while in the second couplet, the speaker provides us with the proper interpretation of what we "see." The rhetorical techniques embedded within these two stanzas underscore Watts's desire for us to linger and reflect upon Christ on the cross: "See from His head, His hands, His feet / Sorrow and love flow mingled down" (9-10). The measured regularity of the anaphoric iambs in line 9 not only draw our "eyes" from the top to the bottom of Christ's battered body; the monosyllabic words force us to read and therefore "see" very slowly, accomplishing metrically and syntactically the elapsing of time necessary to begin the proper degree of reflection.<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>13</sup> Incidentally, the rhythm of the hymn when sung to the Hamburg arrangement completed in 1824 by Lowell Mason – the arrangement most often used today – intensifies this sense of



The ninth and tenth lines introduce Watts's eighteenth-century manipulation of Crashavian, religious baroque.<sup>14</sup> At the end of the ninth line, after we have "seen" and contemplated Christ's wounds, we expect to have those wounds described in very explicit physical detail. Instead, though, Watts thwarts our expectations. Rather than bloody tears or ruby pearls streaming down Christ's body, Watts steps back from physical description: "Sorrow and blood flow mingled down" (10). In this eighteenth-century version of the baroque metaphysicality of Crashaw, the surprise of the image is this deliberate stepping back from the actual thing being described; where Crashaw deploys

---

lingering. Mason adds a syllable to both the second and third "His" in the ninth line so that musically the slow tempo of our movement along Christ's body is progressively exaggerated with each successive phrase of the line. "See," a direct command from Watts to us as readers and singers, gets two full beats in Mason's arrangement. "From" and the first "His" each get one beat, moving us relatively quickly to the individual mutilated parts of Christ's body. Each of the words that follow – "head, His hands, His" – are sustained beyond their syllabic length to two beats each. And finally, as we reach the bottom of Christ's body, Mason gives us a full measure, four entire beats, to consider Christ's feet and reflect on his body as a whole, everything it represents to Christians, how such wounds would feel, how Christ might view our own potentially wayward behavior, and how we should correct it.

<sup>14</sup> See especially Crashaw's "On the Wounds of our Crucified Lord" (1646):

O these wakeful wounds of thine!  
 Are they mouths? or are they eyes?  
 Be they mouths, or be they eyne,  
 Each bleeding part someone supplies.

Lo! a mouth, whose full-bloomed lips  
 At too dear a rate are roses.  
 Lo! a bloodshot eye! that weeps  
 And many a cruel tear discloses.

O thou that on this foot hast laid  
 Many a kiss and many a tear,  
 Now thou shalt have all repaid,  
 Whatsoe'er thy charges were.

This foot hath got a mouth and lips  
 To pay the sweet sum of thy kisses;  
 To pay thy tears, an eye that weeps  
 Instead of tears such gems as this is.

The difference only this appears  
 (Nor can the change offend),  
 The debt is paid in ruby-tears  
 Which thou in pearls didst lend.

metaphoric imagery to burn his version of the sight into your mind's eye, Watts pushes past the seventeenth-century ultra-physical imagery and replaces it with his own interpretation of the symbolic meaning of Christ's blood. In so doing, Watts has it both ways: he evokes the physicality of the baroque through allusion, draws it up allusively, then makes the image even more compelling by focusing our attention on the meaning of Christ's blood rather than on the spectacle of it alone. As readers, then, we must accept and reflect upon the pain these wounds would have caused, the sorrow and love that motivated Christ to undergo that pain, the realization that He did so for us, the concern over our own unworthy behavior, and the steps we should undertake to reform ourselves so that we come closer to deserving Christ's sacrifice. Through this eighteenth-century baroque image, Watts initiates a moment of intersubjectivity between readers and Christ and leads readers through the various steps necessary to convey his didactic lesson and, through rendering in sharp relief the difference between readers' sinful nature and the sort of life they should lead, convince readers that they should modify their behavior.<sup>15</sup>

The concluding couplet of the stanza – “Did e'er such love and sorrow meet, / Or thorns compose so rich a crown?” – seems to offer readers a momentary reprieve from the intersubjective intensity of the previous two lines. But if this is the case, the relief it offers is very transient. To underscore the lesson of the previous stanza, Watts repeats the moves he made in stanza three:

---

<sup>15</sup> Though they do not explain the way that Watts achieves these effects, Marshall and Todd explain that “the calculated effects of many of Watts's hymns seem to proceed from a new variety of spiritual stress. This disparity between sinners and their heavenly context, between our nature as depraved worms and the distant realms of glory, is extremely difficult to handle, devotionally or theologically” (46). I would add that, first, this sort of didactic goal was at least shared by earlier poets who translated the psalms into lyric texts, and second, that the way that Watts achieves these effects is through readerly intersubjectivity and the new perspective on the self that it provides readers and singers.

stanza four is comprised of another take on the baroque and another lesson for the reader. The opening couplet of the fourth stanza – “His dying crimson, like a robe, / Spreads o’er His body on the tree” – echoes the rhetorical manipulation of the baroque that is so shocking in lines nine and ten (13-14). Rather than make Christ’s blood exaggeratedly explicit in the leading image of the stanza, Watts alludes to the physicality of the scene, and again, this allusive baroque serves to make the image of Christ covered in blood somehow more vivid rather than less. Not only does this image highlight the most important physical characteristics of the *corpus christi* scene – the redeeming blood Christ shed to atone for humanity – but it also evokes the sense of Christ’s blood as a covering, a covering both for Christ’s body – which Watts, the speaker, and we as readers had viewed as a spectacle in the pseudo-blazon of the third stanza – as well as a metaphorical covering of the sins of the world. The intersubjectivity in this stanza parallels that of the third: as readers who fill the role of the speaker, we are asked to see the exposed blood and body of Christ, to empathize with His position as best we can, and to reflect on ourselves from Christ’s perspective. And in the final couplet of the stanza, Watts reiterates to us through our intersubjective engagement with the speaker – primed by our interaction with Christ in the preceding couplet – the didactic lesson of the hymn: “Then I am dead to all the globe, / And all the globe is dead to me” (15-16). Our reflection on the *corpus christi* demonstrates to us that Christ is dead, but His sacrificial death represents – or should represent – the speaker’s and therefore our own metaphorical death to the world, our refusal of the World, and our allegiance to Christ. By relating these images so clearly, Watts shares this lesson with readers and opens up this intersubjective experience to us as well. As with the lyrical psalms discussed in

Chapter Three, these hymns reveal a pedagogy of intersubjectivity as their writers' didactic aims are supported by their presentation and evocation of intersubjective interaction.

The recastings of the relationship between the speaker and God in Watts's hymns, and as we will see in Wesley's hymns as well, clearly reflect a model of spiritual connection that is intersubjective. At the center of intersubjectivity is the notion that you can know the other's mind fully enough to create an image of yourself upon which you may base your actions. Intersubjectivity then is built on the reliability of our perceptions of another's perceptions of us. In other words, we pattern our actions based on our assumptions about others' judgments of us. Therefore, we must first imagine the other's perceptions of us, which we can do based on what we know about the other. We then measure the response we hope to attain through our interaction with the other against that imagined perception. And finally, we mold our behavior to best initiate the desired reaction in the other. It makes sense that an intersubjective model of interaction based on judgment, self-examination, and measuring and modifying one's behavior and actions would fit into Watts's and Wesley's religious programs.

Attention to the supreme clarity with which Watts depicts and initiates intersubjectivity demonstrates that his hymns are cohesive, his expansive lyrics include room for readers to bring their own voice and feelings to their interactions with God, and, though they may seem otherwise, his hymns are less prescriptive than Wesley's. Marshall and Todd describe Watts's hymns as "neat" and focused, and they imply that Watts's readers are passive spectators of an affecting tableau, led from reaction to reaction by a careful hymnist. (64).

Watts certainly was careful in his depictions of scenes and in his positioning of spectators, both within the hymns themselves and outside of them, but rather than prescribe reactions for his readers or allow them to sit and be shown the way to a closer relationship with God, his meticulous care in constructing his hymns requires readers to be active participants in the scene he sets and provides them with the space – much like in the 1611 23<sup>rd</sup> Psalm – to react as individuals. Two popular hymns, “Alas! And did my Savior bleed!” and “Come, holy Spirit, heavenly Dove” illustrate these characteristics of many of Watts’s hymns.

In “Alas! And did my Savior Bleed!” Watts presents the *corpus christi* image yet again. He walks us through the scenario he presents, implicitly guiding our responses, but, by and large, leaving the responsibility for reacting properly up to us as readers:

<sup>1</sup> Alas! And did my Savior bleed!  
And did my Sovereign die?  
Would he devote that sacred head  
For such a worm as I?

<sup>2</sup> Thy body slain sweet Jesus thine,  
And bathed in its own blood,  
While all exposed to wrath divine  
The glorious Sufferer stood!

<sup>3</sup> Was it for crimes that I had done  
He groaned upon the tree?  
Amazing pity! Grace unknown!  
And love beyond degree!

<sup>4</sup> Well might the sun in darkness hide,  
And shut his glories in,  
When God the mighty Maker, died  
For man the creature’s sin.

<sup>5</sup> Thus might I hide my blushing face,  
While his dear cross appears;  
Dissolve my heart in thankfulness,  
And melt my eyes to tears.

<sup>6</sup> But drops of grief can ne'er repay  
 The debt of love we owe;  
 Here, Lord, I give my self away;  
 'Tis all that I can do.

In this hymn, Watts carefully crafts an implicit set of steps leading readers to a greater understanding of their relationship with Christ; however, he does not require a specific reaction or degree of response from readers. The diction he uses, the way that he shifts both the possessive pronouns he uses and the way he addresses Christ, and the inclusion of unanswered and self-referential questions provides room for us as readers to engage personally and individually as Watts tries to subtly guide our reactions to the images he presents to us.

Watts sets out to subtly mold our interaction from the outset of the text. Our speaker's, and, through the speaker, our, first word – "Alas!" – sets the parameters of our response, signaling to us that what we are about to see and consider should induce sorrow or pity. This opening interjection situates readers so that they can consider the two questions that make up the first stanza from the proper perspective. The questions themselves establish the self-referential stance that Watts guides us toward. The way that Watts addresses Christ in this stanza continues his subtle steering of our reactions. By using the third person pronoun to refer to Christ while still using the first person possessive pronoun to claim him as "mine" – his speaker's and therefore ours—Watts further solidifies the positions he wants us to take up before he reveals the *corpus christi* image in stanza two, moving us closer to the image itself and guiding our reflection on ourselves. In stanza two, Watts continues to guide our reflection with a soft touch. He presents a scene that we cannot help but react to, but he provides no explicit indication of how we ought to react. This second stanza focuses entirely

on Christ, drawing our attention to Christ's body and his sacrifice. Rather than talk about Christ, Watts has his speaker – and through his speaker, us as readers – address Christ directly. This shift moves us even closer to Christ, to the scene, and positions us so that we *can* connect with Christ intersubjectively and therefore reflect on our sinfulness. Watts, however, does not force that reflection, choosing instead to pose the reflection he would like to initiate in the form of another unanswered question. Watts places the image in front of us, framed in such a way as to draw the proper reaction from us; the responsibility to react, however, is solely ours. Watts continues to try to guide our reaction by reminding us in stanza four of how the world reacted to Christ's crucifixion, a parallel he continues in stanza five. Though it might seem that stanza five provides a rather explicit description of the reaction Watts hopes to induce in us as readers – “Dissolve my heart in thankfulness, / And melt my eyes to tears” – the fact that this description is rendered in such extreme figures makes them somehow less real, more like abstractions. Having led us, subtly, through the steps necessary to have a reaction of grief, thankfulness, shame, and intimacy with Christ, Watts ends the lyric in stanza six with his lesson: we can never repay with our “drops of grief” – whether these drops of grief signify drops of blood or tears or both – the debt of love we owe to Christ. Our only recourse should be to give our lives to him. This is the lesson Watts hopes to convey to his readers and singers, a lesson made clear through intersubjectivity.

Watts's tendency to lead readers along cleverly and subtly rather than explicitly, his affinity for implying his speakers' reactions to the scenes he sets before them – and through them, us – causes us as readers to have to fill in the spaces Watts leaves with our own answers and our personal feelings. The

implicit direction Watts provided in “Alas! and did my Savior bleed!” and the sense of expansiveness it lends to the hymn also characterizes another of Watts’s famous lyrics, “Come, holy Spirit, heavenly Dove”:

Come, holy Spirit, heavenly Dove,  
With all thy quickening powers,  
Kindle a flame of sacred love,  
In these cold hearts of ours,

Look, how we grovel here below,  
Fond of these trifling toys;  
Our souls can neither fly nor go  
To reach eternal joys.

In vain we tune our formal songs,  
In vain we strive to rise;  
Hosannas languish on our tongues,  
And our devotion dies.

Dear Lord! and shall we ever lie  
At this poor dying rate?  
Our love so faint, so cold to thee,  
And thine to us so great?

Come holy Spirit, heavenly Dove,  
With all thy quickening powers;  
Come shed abroad a Saviour’s love,  
And that shall kindle ours.

We see similar subtle control of our responses and reactions in this hymn in which the speakers beg for intersubjectivity with God. As in “Alas! and did my Savior bleed?” Watts’s diction, pacing, and implicit direction make the hymn seem expansive, providing readers with the opportunity to bring themselves to the text and respond as they choose rather than micromanaging their responses or forcing them to react in a specific way. The characteristic that sets this hymn apart from the others we have looked at so far is its “we”s. The reader-speaker intersubjectivity that we have been tracing this time situates us as readers within an imagined group of like-minded people, and it is this group’s view of itself as



described by Watts that subtly conducts us through the steps of beseeching God for a greater intimacy with him.

But what is the purpose of this expansiveness? Perhaps Watts means to give readers the space they need to truly examine themselves and react sincerely to Watts's doctrinal positions. As a Calvinist, Watts would have believed in predestination; an individual reader's ability to connect with God, to have a "proper" response to the scenarios that Watts presents would depend on whether the individual were a member of the elect. But also, this expansiveness forces us as readers to be receptive, beguiling us through narrative into reflecting on ourselves more honestly than we might have otherwise been willing to do, helping us see ourselves more candidly or experience facets of our relationship with God we might be reluctant to do. The expansiveness and implicit direction that characterizes Watts's hymns makes them less prescriptive than we might assume at first glance. By not including within his hymns every mental twist and turn he hopes readers take, Watts may seem to proffer a more certain view of Christianity and of our relationship with God than he actually does. While the doctrinal messages are very certain because Watts controls the presentation of the tableaux in his hymns and leads the reader step by step through whatever reaction the reader might have, the individuality of a given reader's response means that the relative certainty or doubt that a reader feels while engaging with the text is her own certainty or doubt, not feelings that Watts forces her to have but feelings of her own that Watts enables her to experience.

The prefatory material to Watts's volumes of hymns, lyrics, and verse translations demonstrates that he was very attuned to the emotional impact of his verse on readers and singers. Through singing and reading, he explains that

we attain “a sweet Retirement within ourselves,” “our Souls are raised a little above this Earth,” and we “are employed in that part of Worship which of all others is the nearest a-kin to Heaven” (*Hymns and Spiritual Songs* v, iv, iii). He was clearly well aware of the psychological consequences of his rhetorical strategies. While he may not have conceived of these consequences as intersubjectivity by that name, his poetry does, nonetheless, work within that model of interaction, ventriloquization, reflection, and correction. Through intersubjective engagement between the speaker and the Divine, between the reader and the speaker, and, consequently, between the reader and the Divine, Watts successfully achieves his goals: he helps readers experience a sense of fervor, teaches them through his verse, and does so while working within and manipulating the poetic paradigms of the early eighteenth century and the fervent religious poetry of the preceding century.

Like Watts, John and Charles Wesley saw the act of crafting religious verse as a potential opportunity to instigate greater passion and devotion within readers and congregants. And Charles Wesley, like Watts, used simple and accessible language within his verse to appeal to the broadest Christian audience. Both John and Charles Wesley share similar didactic goals to those of Watts as well, and Charles Wesley used many dimensions of intersubjective engagement within his lyrics to convey his spiritual lessons. However, unlike Watts – whose Calvinist beliefs would have made the self-reflection he instigates more a means of determining whether the individual were part of the elect – the self-reflection and feeling induced by Charles Wesley’s hymns would have been at the service of evangelical conversion. Lyric intersubjectivity manifests itself in Charles

Wesley's lyrics as both a poetic re-creation and recasting of the supplicant-deity relationship to illuminate essential characteristics of human subjectivity and of our relationship with God and to move readers and speakers to have a conversion experience. Further, by crafting within his hymns a relational structure built on intersubjectivity Charles Wesley, like Watts, invites readers to join in the religious experience he describes and exemplifies in his verse. By relying on intersubjectivity to structure interaction between the speaker and the deity, Charles Wesley at turns reassures, complicates, radically destabilizes, and then reestablishes the spiritual relationship at the center of his lyrics.

John Wesley provides a very clear explanation of and justification for the program Charles undertakes as a religious poet in his preface to the 1780 *A Collection of Hymns for the Use of the People called Methodists*. John Wesley explains at the beginning of this Preface that he has collected this volume of hymns after being "importuned" "for many years" to arrange a hymn book that is "not so large enough to be either cumbersome or expensive and [...] large enough to contain such a variety of hymns, as will not soon be worn threadbare" (iii). His goal was to reach as many congregants as possible, demonstrating through this collection "all the important truths of our most holy religion, whether speculative or practical; yea, to illustrate them all, and to prove them both by Scripture and Reason" by including hymns "carefully ranged under proper heads, according to the experience of real Christians, [providing] a little body of experimental and practical divinity" (iv). This collection of hymns, and, we might safely presume, each of his numerous prior collections, serves first and foremost as a didactic tool. In it, Wesley explains, readers will find a "distinct and full [...] account of scriptural Christianity," a clear "declaration of the

heights and depths of religion, speculative and practical," "strong cautions against the most plausible errors," and "clear directions for making [one's] calling and election sure" and "perfecting holiness in the fear of God" (iv).

Like Watts, the Wesleys believed one of the best ways to deliver lessons to congregants was through poetic representations of difficulties faced by typical Christians in their everyday lives. And like the poets we have looked at in this and the preceding chapter, Charles strove for simplicity, elegance, strength of emotion, and accessibility in his verse:

In these hymns there is no doggeral; no botches; nothing put in to patch up the rhyme; no feeble expletives. Here is nothing turgid or bombast, on the one hand, or low and creeping, on the other. Here are no cant expressions; no words without meaning. [...] We talk common sense, both in prose and verse. [...] Here are, allow me to say, both the purity, the strength, and the elegance of the English language; and, at the same time, the utmost simplicity and plainness, suited to every capacity. (iv-v)

Here John Wesley situates Charles Wesley's verse within the poetic traditions of the eighteenth century, claiming many of the 'Augustan' poetic goals while revising others. Poetic genius, according to John, shines through most clearly in direct, elegant, simple language and syntax. Tortured sentence structure, obscure word choice, and empty phrases only call attention to the artificiality and constructed nature of a lyric, standing in the way of the message the poet wishes to convey.

This risk is even more dangerous for religious poets because their responsibilities are so great. Such poets do not discuss lighter matters like love or politics, John Wesley explains; they deal in salvation and damnation, issues greater even than life or death. Consequently, religious poets more than any others must adhere to simplicity and let the truth of their message shine through.

They are divine servants. God's voice takes precedence over their own. Religious lyrics, then, more than any other sort of verse, must reflect "the true spirit of poetry, such as cannot be acquired by art and labor, but must be the gift of nature" (v). "By labor, a man may become a tolerable imitator of Spenser, Shakespeare, or Milton; and may heap together pretty compound epithets, as pale-eyed, meek-eyed, and the like; but unless he be born a poet, he will never attain the genuine spirit of poetry" (v). Accompanying this innate poetic genius must be "the spirit of piety," a spirit that Wesley indicates must join poetic genius and "breath" through hymns in order for them to reach readers and assure the success of their didactic goals (v).

While it would be accurate to say that Charles Wesley hoped to show readers what he believed to be the ideal experiences of "real Christians" in the hymns, that statement overly simplifies both the complex web of relationships Charles Wesley illustrates in his verse and the rhetorical steps inherent in the way that he describes them. This collection should be "a means of raising or quickening the spirit of devotion; of confirming his faith; of enlivening his hope; and of kindling and increasing his love to God and man" (v). In this short, deceptively simple sentence, John Wesley reveals the relational goals of the collection and alludes to the intricate ways that they are each connected to one another through intersubjective engagement. Poetry and piety come together in Charles Wesley's hymns to increase readers' and singers' spirits of devotion as they ventriloquize the subject positions and opinions within the hymns, considering themselves from the perspective of God and considering God from their own positions as petitioners. Similarly, as the singers and readers embody the speaker's voice and gain a new perspective on themselves and on God via the

speaker, they cannot help but measure themselves against the picture presented in the hymn and apply correctives where necessary. This sort of intersubjective embodiment provides the speaker within the lyric itself and the readers outside of the lyric with a space to truly examine their relationship with God to increase their love of God and understanding of their relationship with him through the intersubjective interaction that the lyrics initiates. Finally, Charles Wesley hopes to increase not only congregants' love of God but their love of mankind via intersubjectivity through communal singing.

We can begin to trace the ways that the above goals work within Charles Wesley's lyrics by looking closely at "Thou Hidden Love of God" (1780).<sup>16</sup> Originally written in German by Gerhard Tersteegen in 1729, Wesley crafted this English verse translation in 1736 and published it first in *A Collection of Psalms and Hymns* in 1738. In this lyric, we see the speaker wrestling with attaining an understanding of his relationship with God, questioning this relationship, and begging for a greater intimacy within this relationship. Wesley represents this process in such a way as to invite readers into this center of this spiritual exercise, allowing them to see and feel the speaker's doubt and faith. While the personal struggle we witness and experience Wesley hails the reader into in "Thou Hidden Love of God" does not represent the only spiritual position depicted in Wesley's hymns, the fact that Wesley allows readers to navigate the doubt his speaker describes tacitly implies that doubt is an integral part of modern faith. The moment of doubt becomes, in Wesley's hymn, a moment of within the spiritual life of every Christian, doubts will arise, sometimes God will not seem to answer, and Christians must meet these moments from a position of

---

<sup>16</sup> John Wesley. *A Collection of Hymns for the Use of the People Called Methodists* (London: 1780)

faith and self-reflection. Wesley teaches this lesson by depicting poetically his speaker's intersubjective relationship with God and the precise steps involved in his speaker's self-reflection. By giving readers access to a moment such as this, Wesley provides them with a sort of trial run for their dealing with their own moments of doubt, a model of communication with God that relies on intersubjectivity and faith.

Hymn 335: Thou Hidden Love of God

<sup>1</sup> Thou hidden love of God, whose height,  
Whose depth unfathom'd no man knows,  
I see from far thy beauteous light,  
Inly I sigh for thy repose;  
My heart is pain'd, nor can it be  
At rest, till it finds rest in thee.

<sup>7</sup> Thy secret voice invites me still,  
The sweetness of thy yoke to prove:  
And fain I would: but tho' my will  
Seem fix'd, yet wide my passions rove;  
Yet hindrances strew all the way;  
I aim at thee, yet from thee stray.

<sup>13</sup> 'Tis mercy all, that thou hast brought  
My mind to seek her peace in thee;  
Yet while I seek, but find thee not,  
No peace my wand'ring soul shall see;  
O when shall all my wand'rings end,  
And all my steps to thee-ward tend!

<sup>19</sup> Is there a thing beneath the sun  
That strives with thee my heart to share?  
Ah! tear it thence, and reign alone,  
The Lord of ev'ry motion there;  
Then shall my heart from earth be free,  
When it hath found repose in thee.

<sup>25</sup> O hide this self from me, that I  
No more, but Christ in me may live;  
My vile affections crucify,  
Nor let one darling lust survive;  
In all things nothing may I see,  
Nothing desire or seek but thee.

<sup>31</sup> O Love, thy sov'reign aid impart,

To save me from low-thoughted care:  
 Chase this self-will thro' all my heart,  
 Thro' all its latent mazes there:  
 Make me thy duteous child, that I  
 Ceaseless may Abba, Father, cry!

<sup>37</sup> Ah no! ne'er will I backward turn:  
 Thine wholly, thine alone I am!  
 Thrice happy he who views with scorn  
 Earth's toys, for thee his constant flame;  
 O help that I may never move  
 From the blest footsteps of thy love!

<sup>43</sup> Each moment draw from earth away  
 My heart that lowly waits thy call:  
 Speak to my inmost soul, and say,  
 I am thy love, thy God, thy all!  
 To feel thy power, to hear thy voice,  
 To taste thy love, be all my choice.

In the first lines of this text, we find ourselves privy to a religious exercise undertaken by the speaker. The entirety of the poem is addressed to God's love, a love that is said to be "hidden" (1), unfathomable by men (2), and suffused with "beauteous light" (3). It offers at once "repose" (4) but also pain and unrest for the speaker as a result of his unsatisfied desire to encounter and be subsumed into God's love: "My heart is pained, nor can it be / At rest, till it finds rest in thee" (5-6). God speaks directly to the speaker, His "secret voice invit[ing the speaker to prove] the sweetness of [God's] yoke" (7-8). While the speaker feels the pull of God's love and wants above all else to enjoy the peace it promises, the speaker cannot yet accept it; "tho' my will / Seem fix'd, yet wide my passions rove; [...] I am at Thee, yet from Thee stray" (9-10, 12). Thwarted by his own worldliness, which he recognizes as a result of the perspective he gains on himself as he imagines himself through God's eyes, the speaker tries to understand how, if he knows and wants an intimate spiritual relationship with God, he cannot seem to take the necessary steps to ensure that he can attain and enjoy it. Rather than be



upset about the pain and unrest this unsatisfied desire has caused him, however, the speaker is grateful that God's love brought about this desire in him; he explains, "'Tis mercy all, that thou has brought / My mind to seek her peace in thee" even though "while I seek, but find thee not, / No peace my wand'ring soul shall see" (13-16). This self-awareness and the desire to correct bad behavior on the part of the speaker are familiar patterns and consequences of intersubjective interaction within religious lyrics.

One of the most intriguing characteristics of this poem is the sheer variety of the images utilized to clarify and illuminate the speaker's relationship with God. The poem is a lyric exploration of this relationship, a relationship that the speaker continually defines then redefines as he struggles to bring together the abstract and the concrete, God and man, the physical, spiritual, psychological, and intellectual. The third stanza ends in a wrenching, forlorn, desperate question that captures the speaker's unsatisfied desire: "O when shall all my wand'rings end / And all my steps to thee-ward tend?" (17-18). The entire poem pivots around this question. Wesley reveals in no uncertain terms his speaker's emotional state, raw, desolate, lonely though aware of and supremely grateful for God's presence in his life. The five remaining stanzas chart the speaker's reflections on himself and his relationship with God and divine love. This hymn's relational imagery is capricious precisely because the speaker's encounters with the divine highlight the complex, multifaceted nature of the intersubjectivity underlying the speaker's relationship with God. Wesley casts God in this lyric as at turns the beloved that must be courted, the monarch who demands attendance and service, and the parent who the speaker trusts (but also cannot fully trust) to eventually enact the caring, loving oneness the speaker

desires. Each of these different metaphors for the relationship between the speaker and God casts the speaker into a different role, forcing him to imagine himself very differently in each iteration of the relationship, allowing him to access and consider characteristics of this relationship and his feelings about it and toward God that he might not otherwise be able to consider.

Breaking down the inner workings of these metaphors clarifies the intersubjectivity inherent in them. The lover/beloved dichotomy actually reveals a lover who cannot attain his beloved and who reflects on his behavior in order to try to understand why his courtship has failed. We can see this self-reflection, refracted through the lens of God the beloved in lines 9 through 12:

but though my will  
Seem fixed, yet wide my passions rove;  
Yet hindrances strew all the way;  
I aim at thee, yet from thee stray

and in lines 19 and 20: "Is there a thing beneath the sun / That strives with thee my heart to share?" (19-20). Like a lover afraid of commitment but aware of how each successive romantic relationship fails, the speaker examines the unsatisfactory position he finds himself in again and again. The next lines, in fact, blur the boundaries between two of the speaker's relational metaphors, the failed but striving lover and the servant who, after reviewing his past misbehavior, determines that his mistakes can only be rectified and his future behavior only controlled through utter enslavement. This melding together of two disparate metaphors for the speaker's conception of God occurs in lines 19-22:

Is there a thing beneath the sun  
That strives with thee my heart to share?  
Ah! tear it thence, and reign alone,  
The lord of ev'ry motion there

The stanza's concluding couplet – "Then shall my heart from earth be free. / When it hath found repose in thee" (23-4) – and the image that begins the next stanza – when the speaker begs "O hide this self from me, that I / No more, but Christ in me may live" (25-6) – bring us back to the language of the amorous. The speaker pleads for a sort of literalized spiritual ecstasy, "a state of being 'beside oneself,'" open to and available for subjective incorporation. He begs to be hidden in, subsumed by Christ. This spiritual commingling and interanimation of selves recalls the amorous intersubjectivity of many seventeenth-century lyrics and hearkens back very clearly to the sort of religious intersubjectivity that drives many of Donne's religious lyrics.<sup>17</sup>

This image of subjective incorporation and the physical, sometimes violent diction that relates it – the speaker wants God to tear out whatever is striving in his heart and wants God to crucify the speaker's vile affections until not one darling lust survives – only hints at one part of what the speaker truly wants from this spiritual encounter with divine love. He does not simply want to be part of God. He wants to be one with God, but also, and as important, he wants God to be one with him. He wants God to "speak to my inmost soul, and say, / I am thy love, thy God, thy all!" (45-6). Pleading for a direct response from God, the speaker begs for interaction: "To feel thy power, to hear thy voice, / To taste thy love, be all my choice" (47-48). He wants to be subsumed by God and also to consume and subsume God, to see clearly that this intersubjectivity is not

---

<sup>17</sup> In Chapter Two, if you will recall, we focused on seventeenth-century models of love as they reacted to and revised the Neoplatonism they inherited. One of the most popular tropes of amorous intersubjectivity in lyric texts that engage these models of ideal love was the mixing of lovers' souls as a result of their intersubjectivity. Donne, especially, provides a very compelling version of this trope in his "The Extasie."

one-sided.<sup>18</sup> Built into the self-reflection at the center of the lyric is the presumption that the speaker can know the mind of God, can fathom the love of God (said to be hidden, unfathomed, unknown, and secret in the first two stanzas), and can command the actions of God. In an intersubjective examination of the self such as this one, the speaker doesn't look at himself through his own eyes but attempts to view himself -and his soul - through the eyes of the Divine.

While the didactic aims of Watts's hymns reflect a poet certain of the proper relationship with the divine and sure of his attainment of it, Wesley's hymns often seem more equivocal than Watts's, inviting readers into the process of trusting God, testing faith, and imagining a fervent spiritual life. But the process of spiritual intersubjectivity and its attendant self-reflection in Wesley's hymns are much more complicated than that. His hymns follow, almost stream-of-consciousness style, the immediacy of the speakers' interactions with God. This characteristic has led Marshall and Todd to conclude that Wesley's hymns are less rational, more spontaneous, and less realistic than Watts's. I would suggest, though, that the dramatic pacing, the immediacy, and the minute steps Wesley represents in his speakers' reactions actually reflect a greater level of control over the reader's response to each hymn than Watts cared to exert. The intersubjectivity that guides Wesley's speakers' interaction with God is much more transparent and more minutely described in his hymns than in Watts's. But the decision to represent the speakers' reactions in such a way allows Wesley to control more carefully the details of readers' reactions to the scenarios in his

---

<sup>18</sup> This moment in the hymn echoes the brutalizing force Donne begs God to use on him in the Holy Sonnet that begins "Batter my heart, three person'd God." And as with that particular Holy Sonnet, in this hymn, traces of amorous models of interaction surface here and there.

hymns. While this access to the inner-workings of the speakers' reactions at first seems like it would more easily admit the revolutions of the reader's mind into her experience of the hymn, in fact, the emotional response described in the hymn – the one we as readers experience through intersubjectivity or at the very least intimacy, perhaps enthusiasm, or even conversion – in us.

In his "Hymn of Thanksgiving to the Father," Wesley leads readers through the prodigal son speaker's excitement and joy at being forgiven of his transgressions and accepted again by his father to reassure the reader through the reader's intersubjectivity with the speaker:

<sup>1</sup> Thee, O my God and King,  
My Father, Thee I sing!  
Hear well-pleased the joyous sound,  
Praise from earth and heaven receive;  
Lost, I now in Christ am found,  
Dead, by faith in Christ I live.

<sup>2</sup> Father, behold Thy son;  
In Christ I am Thy own.  
Stranger long to Thee and rest,  
See the prodigal is come:  
Open wide Thune arms and breast,  
Take the weary wanderer home.

<sup>3</sup> Thine eye observed from far,  
Thy pity look'd me near:  
Me They bowels yearn'd to see,  
My Thy mercy ran to find,  
Empty, poor, and void of Thee,  
Hungry, sick, and faint, and blind.

<sup>4</sup> Thou on my neck didst fall,  
Thy kiss forgave me all:  
Still the gracious words I hear,  
Words that made the Saviour mine,  
"Haste, for him the robe prepare;  
His be righteousness Divine!"

<sup>5</sup> Thee then, my God and King,  
My Father, Thee I sing!  
Hear well-pleased the joyous sound,

Praise from earth and heaven receive;  
 Lost, I now in Christ am found,  
 Dead, by faith in Christ I live.

Marshall and Todd describe this hymn as “disjointed” and “shift[ing]” because of “the alternation of tenses in this hymn”<sup>19</sup> (65). In Wesley’s poetry, they claim, “the precision of Watt’s vision is missing” (66). However, I would argue that Wesley is extremely precise, seeming disjointed or shifting too often to reflect the exuberant mental state of the prodigal son speaker – who we identify with intersubjectively – so as to induce a similar degree of exuberance in us as readers. Wesley leads us quickly from the speaker’s joyous praise in the first two stanzas to a painful moment in the speaker’s past in the third stanza to the more recent moment of forgiveness in stanza four before bringing us back to the present and its enthusiasm and joy. The speed with which we traverse these far removed emotional states is assisted by the rhythm of the lines and stanzas. Wesley’s stanzas begin with an iambic tetrameter couplet, followed by two lines of iambic pentameter that rhyme alternately. Additionally, Wesley’s lines are comprised mostly of single-syllable words. Each of these characteristics join forces with Wesley’s decision to give readers access to the feelings of the speaker to help make the hymn seem to move rapidly, seemingly spontaneously.

Wesley uses this technique, opens up the speaker’s mind to the reader, in order to complicate the relationship between the speaker – and readers – and God. By giving readers access to the speaker’s interiority, “Where shall my wondering soul begin?” leads readers to a more complex understanding of their

---

<sup>19</sup> They continue: “The tense of the first two stanzas, a dramatic present, jars with the past tense of the subsequent stanzas, recalling the moment of supreme acceptance and the preliminary misery” (65-6).

relationship with God through the complicated emotions that the speaker feels and that the reader experiences through her intersubjective relationship to the speaker:

<sup>1</sup> WHERE shall my wondering soul begin?  
 How shall I all to heaven aspire?  
 A slave redeemed from death and sin,  
 A brand plucked from eternal fire,  
 How shall I equal triumphs raise,  
 Or sing my great Deliverer's praise?

<sup>2</sup> O how shall I the goodness tell,  
 Father, which thou to me hast showed?  
 That I, a child of wrath and hell,  
 I should be called a child of God,  
 Should know, should feel my sins forgiven,  
 Blest with this antepast of heaven!

<sup>3</sup> And shall I slight my Father's love?  
 Or basely fear his gifts to own?  
 Unmindful of his favours prove?  
 Shall I, the hallowed cross to shun,  
 Refuse his righteousness to impart,  
 By hiding it within my heart?

<sup>4</sup> No! though the ancient dragon rage,  
 And call forth all his host to war,  
 Though earth's self-righteous sons engage  
 Them and their god alike I dare;  
 Jesus, the sinner's friend, proclaim;  
 Jesus, to sinners still the same.

<sup>5</sup> Outcasts of men, to you I call,  
 Harlots, and publicans, and thieves!  
 He spreads his arms to embrace you all;  
 Sinners alone his grace receives;  
 No need of him the righteous have;  
 He came the lost to seek and save.

<sup>6</sup> Come, O my guilty brethren, come,  
 Groaning beneath your load of sin,  
 His bleeding heart shall make you room,  
 His open side shall take you in;  
 He calls you now, invites you home;  
 Come, O my guilty brethren, come!

<sup>7</sup> For you the purple current flowed  
 In pardons from his wounded side,  
 Languished for you the eternal God,  
 For you the Prince of glory died:  
 Believe, and all your sin's forgiven;  
 Only believe, and yours is heaven!

Rather than the simple story of shame, forgiveness, thankfulness, and joy that we saw in the "Hymn of Thanksgiving to the Father," Wesley here describes a more complex relationship between his speaker, and beyond his speaker other individuals, and God. God is still loving and forgiving, but Wesley's speaker explores the facets and parameters of this forgiveness and love. As Wesley's speaker describes the reach of God's mercy, he calls out to the unconverted and begs them to accept peace in God. As he does so, he darts from image to image, from metaphor to metaphor, perhaps trying to land on the best expression of how he feels in his relationship with God, perhaps trying to open up the possibilities of his audience members relating to any of the images he presents and in so doing, providing them with a sort of touchstone from which to experience the intersubjectivity the hymn initiates. But the quick shifts in his representations of himself and other sinners propels the hymn along and helps refine and expand the capacity of God to love and pardon the individual, complicating and enriching the story of forgiveness that is the basis of every Christian's relationship with God.

But Wesley does not only reveal to us the inner-workings of his speaker's mind to reassure us. This move also at times has the effect of destabilizing the relationship between God and the speaker, and, by extension, between us as readers and in so doing, maps out a relationship between the reader and God as well. By leading readers down a specific path, and in the case of "Thou hidden



love of God,” letting readers in on the doubts and struggles the speaker experiences as he tries to come to terms with his relationship with God, Wesley, unlike Watts, reveals to us the doubt that can manifest itself in spiritual relationships. Through intersubjectivity, we get to experience it as well. While the limits of the doubt are controlled, the fact that Wesley represents them, acknowledges them, and enables us to experience them sets his hymns apart from Watts’s, which move inexorably from image to image with a level of certainty that Wesley’s hymns imply is unrealistic.

One of the fundamental consequences of the intersubjectivity in “Thou hidden love of God” is a recasting of the power relations between the speaker and God. The degree to which power shifts in fact varies over the course of the poem, and we can chart it alongside the poet’s shifting imagery. The God as beloved/speaker as lover dichotomy casts the speaker as the active lover who must woo and God as the beloved who, though passive in the courtship process, nevertheless retains a measure of power to either accept or reject the lover’s attempts. Ultimately, in this pairing, however, the lover retains the ultimate power to pursue the beloved or not, and while the speaker at times doubts whether he will ever attain the peace of God’s love, he never questions God’s continuous presence. The master/servant dichotomy would seem more straightforward and would appear to maintain a more traditional hierarchy of power with God-the-master retaining power over the speaker-servant. However, this power structure requires action of both parties; it is a reciprocal loyalty in return for mutual service on the part of the servant-suppliant alone in return for a promise from the master-deity of interaction in the present and salvation in the future.

The intersubjective relationship Wesley describes requires the speaker – and, though the speaker, the readers – to ventriloquize the deity. Intersubjectivity requires us to imagine others' perceptions of us. In religious intersubjectivity, then, we construct our own version of God's perception of us. In and of itself, this action presumes we can know God and requires us as readers to put words into God's mouth and thoughts into His head. When this intersubjectivity moves into the textual realm, the divine ventriloquization it requires becomes even more apparent. It's almost as if by writing the spiritual interaction he craves, Wesley wills it into being, assuming the role of the deity outside the text as well. Wesley not only ventriloquizes God literally, putting words into His mouth and thoughts into His mind in the body of the text; he also writes the relationship he wants – and wants readers to have – with God, writing to initiate or create that encounter in a performative move parallel to God's speaking the world into being. God's words separate light from darkness, create the heavens and the earth. God's words are the ultimate performative utterances. In lyrics like this one, however, so are Wesley's. Wesley writes these moments of interaction with God. His words create and enact a divine encounter.

Further, this model of relationality humanizes and concretizes God in a radical and fundamental way. Because it channels God through the supplicant's own human understanding, it removes God from the abstract, rendering him necessarily human<sup>20</sup>, making God someone and something you can encounter psychologically, intellectually, and, through the act of writing and reading and on the page, physically and tangibly. In Wesley's intersubjective rendering, God

---

<sup>20</sup> Since the human is all we know.

has a heart to love the poet, a head and brain to perceive and judge the poet, eyes to see the poet, and hands to take up the poet. In one sense, then, intersubjective encounters require a sort of leveling between the two parties. Sometimes, when the leveling is very drastic, the power structure is reversed: the individual, by taking on the role of God in order to judge his own behavior and heart, dispenses his own divine judgments, emptying God of his power. All the power and agency that had been in the relationship, during the moment of intersubjective interaction, resides solely within the individual.

These subversive characteristics of intersubjectivity shine through a poem like Wesley's "Thou hidden love of God" in a way they do not in lyrics like Watts's because of the doubt that Wesley allows readers to experience through the speaker's own attempt to make sense of his religious struggles. Rather than assert or imply an assured view of the individual's relationship to God, Wesley provides detailed accounts of the speaker's shifting psychological states, ranging from image to image and metaphor to metaphor as the speaker attempts to work out the heavy burden of doubt, guilt, and confusion he clearly feels: "Inly I sigh for thy repose; / My heart is pain'd, nor can it be / At rest, till it finds rest in thee" (4-6). The speaker acknowledges that God must still care about his spiritual state, though he still does not understand why God would allow him to flounder in the world without more direct guidance from God:

'Tis mercy all, that thou hast brought  
 My mind to seek her peace in thee;  
 Yet while I seek, but find thee not,  
 No peace my wand'ring soul shall see;  
 O when shall all my wand'rings end,  
 And all my steps to thee-ward tend! (13-18)

And finally, though God does not appear to act in the speaker's life any more explicitly, the speaker reassures himself that God is nevertheless present in his life and reaffirms his own devotion to God:

Ah no! ne'er will I backward turn:  
Thine wholly, thine alone I am!  
Thrice happy he who views with scorn  
Earth's toys, for thee his constant flame;  
O help that I may never move  
From the blest footsteps of thy love! (37-42)

By providing explicitly an example of the steps a doubting and fearful Christian might undertake to reflect on her own spiritual state and use that doubt and fear to attain a sense of comfort and trust in God, Wesley gives doubting readers a model that they can experience through intersubjectivity and then use themselves at difficult moments in their own lives.

The images of intersubjectivity Wesley presented, in this particular context, highlight the fundamental paradoxes inherent in intersubjective relationality. Wesley moves from image to image, from metaphor to metaphor, striving to land on a human, concrete experience or expression that can represent the ineffable and create and re-create the sort of interaction with the divine he would like to initiate for readers through his poetic representation of it. This is as futile a prospect as trying to fully capture and represent any concrete thing textually; the word can call to mind the real thing, but the real thing defies language. However, this is not to say that such endeavors are not worthwhile or valuable as religious exercises. Intersubjectivity *seems* to provide a sort of profound closeness and intimate interaction with the other. We act on our perceptions as if they can readily stand in for opinions openly communicated. And by strengthening our own empathic responses, requiring us to imagine as

fully as possible the experience and perceptions of the other, intersubjective encounters can make us more open to communication. At the end of the day, though, intersubjectivity only approximates the intimacy it purports to enact. At its center, it is an individual act. It certainly relies on past actual interaction for its meanings and can color future interaction as well. But the moment itself is solitary, occurring solely within the mind of the individual, whether that individual is the poet imagining the interactions described in the lyric, the speaker undertaking those interactions within the lyric, or the reader recreating those interactions as she provides the speaker with a voice.

Solitary. Isolated and isolating. Interior. Private. Until, that is, these moments of intersubjectivity with the speaking voice within a lyric, and through that subject position with the deity, take place alongside other such moments as part of a group of individual voices singing as one, a chorus of "I"s that represent as many intersubjective encounters. Intersubjectivity works within these hymns in much the same way it does in Rochester's amorous lyrics or in Rowe's psalm translations, but of course what sets Watts's and Wesley's hymns apart is their extratextual setting. Like typical lyrics, they certainly were read to oneself, and, as we have seen, they work very well as poetry, but what shifts the intersubjectivity they initiate outside of the text is their performance.<sup>21</sup>

### III. "Let us our voices raise"<sup>22</sup>

---

<sup>21</sup> This is not to say that intersubjectivity is restricted to within the lyric or even within the mind of the individual, but it is typically a solitary experience.

<sup>22</sup> From Wesley's "Jesus, Thou Soul of All Our Joys," line 21. *Hymns and Sacred Poems* (London, 1749).

The paradoxical nature, the seeming intimacy of intersubjective encounters like the one that structures “When I Survey the Wondrous Cross” and “Thou Hidden Love of God,” becomes even clearer when we step away from the words and images that make up the lyrics. They are congregational hymns. So the speaker-God dichotomy is, in some sense, a very artificial one. Let’s imagine, for a moment, that we were members of Watts’s congregation, singing his hymns in our worship services, or Wesley’s congregants singing during a meeting, since hymns were not sung in Anglican churches, that we were singing one of Wesley’s hymns during a meeting, revival, or devotion. Now let’s think back to the reading experience of intersubjectivity as we charted it above. The experience of the reader, though of course contextualized by the text’s place within the public sphere, is largely an individual one; the intersubjectivity evoked by the texts occurs within the reader’s mind. Contrast that solitary experience with the experience of a congregant singing these hymns, experiencing individual intersubjectivity that is similar to that of the reader, though experienced corporately in a complex of many intersubjective encounters. The two distinct experiences of engaging the texts seem almost unrelated to one another, yet they are part of the lived experience of these hymns. One occurs in a communal setting; the other occurs within the mind of the reader. One seems very public; the other seems intensely private. The texts, though, as the means of these very different intersubjective experiences, yoke these seemingly incongruous encounters together.

Though there is within the world of the text one speaker crafting and manipulating an encounter with the divine, in the world outside of the text, the lone speaker becomes speakers, or rather, singers. The “I” of the poem becomes

a chorus of “I”s, each enacting its own personal spiritual encounter that is at the same time and of necessity a very public and communal encounter, not just between the lone “I” and God but also between the many “I”s of the congregation. Though we have thoroughly considered the intricate intersubjective relationships within hymns by Watts and Wesley and between the texts and their readers, tracing each of their goals through the many planes in which these relationships function, we haven’t yet addressed the great potential for intersubjective engagement that resides within the act of congregational singing itself: the potential for intersubjective communion with fellow congregants that can be enacted through singing these words as one, the engagement with fellow congregants that motivated Watts and Wesley to revitalize song in worship.

Both Watts and Wesley considered the psychological impact that the act of singing has on congregants, alluding to the unique intersubjective experiences of singing collectively in their Prefaces. For Watts, singing “employ[s congregants] in that part of Worship which of all others is the nearest a-kin to Heaven,” it “elevate[s] us to the most delightful and divine Sensations,” it raises our souls “a little above the Earth,” affords us “a sweet Retirement within ourselves” (iii, iv, v). For Wesley, singing brings about a “raising or quickening [of] the spirit of devotion,” confirms the faith of the singer, enlivens his hope, and increases his love of God and man (v). This public dimension and its communal nature is the distinguishing characteristic of the way intersubjectivity works in congregational hymns: to understand the final valence of intersubjectivity within this type of religious lyric, it must be sung with fellow congregants, not simply read aloud or silently ‘heard’ in the mind’s ear.

One key characteristic of speaker-reader intersubjectivity that we have traced in Watts's and Wesley's texts is its dependence on ventriloquization or empathy; the reader must be open to embodying the speaker, feeling the speaker's feelings, accepting and understanding the speaker's thoughts. Similarly, the act of singing a hymn as a group initiates a sort of intersubjectivity that is at once utterly public, writ large and open, but that is at the same time internal, personal, private, intimate. Experiencing intersubjectivity with the speaker within a hymn, reflecting on yourself as the speaker reflects on himself, while your fellow congregants undergo similar experiences of intersubjectivity with the speaker and consequent self-reflection is a highly communal act. It creates an environment in which our own actions are reflected by the individuals who surround us; as we are moved to reflect and correct our own behavior, another part of us assumes that our neighbor on the pew feels similarly moved. This shared outward expression of such an intimate experience compounds the power of the intersubjectivity within the text. Recall for a moment the powerful way that metaphor seems to reflect and affirm readers' beliefs. Moments of congregational intersubjectivity through song achieve a similar sort of affirmation rendered more powerful because of the multitude of fellow singers and the proof of public-ness and reality that echoes back at you in their voices. Intersubjectivity prompted by congregational hymns resides at the juncture of public and private, recalling the circumlocution, ambiguity, and expansiveness of the 1611 Psalm and Rowe's version of it.

This moment of lyric flourishing, the popularity and creative energy of these religious lyrics only seems transient and secondary in our versions of literary development in the eighteenth century. Margaret Doody is right: we



cannot understand the period without understanding the religious experiences of its inhabitants. Attending to the massive amount of very good religious poetry is one way literary scholars can do so. Rather than lumping together texts like those of Wesley, Watts, Rowe, and Addison and isolating them from the story we tell about the first half of the eighteenth century, we should approach them as lyric texts worthy of study on this basis as much as on their important place in the evolution of religious practices in the period. Doing so provides us with a new perspective on these sorts of lyrics and, more broadly, on the period itself. Rather than group verse translations of Biblical texts and congregational hymns solely on the basis of their Christianity, we should acknowledge that the religious lyrics that flooded the presses form a logical grouping because they rely on intersubjectivity to illustrate and enact the spiritual lessons they want to impart.

The intersubjectivity embedded in and evoked by these hymns not only reveals to us how Watts and Wesley envisioned their relationships with God; it also connects them to as the models of amorous intersubjectivity manipulated and revised by Rochester, Behn, and Phillips. The amorous verse of the seventeenth century, the lyric translations of psalms around the turn of the eighteenth century, and the congregational hymns of the first half of the eighteenth century join together to provide a new picture of lyricality in the long eighteenth century. Each moment stands on its own as part of a larger constellation of British lyric poetry. But when considered alongside the others, these moments of lyric flourishing demonstrate the importance of their shared lyric characteristic, intersubjectivity, a means of interacting with subject positions

within and around the individual texts, a new way of considering the lyric as a literary mode well beyond the limits of the long eighteenth century.

### Bibliography

- Abrams, M. H. *The Mirror and the Lamp: Romantic Theory and the Critical Tradition*. New York: Oxford UP, 1953.
- Addison, Joseph and Richard Steele. *The Spectator*. Dublin, Ireland: W. Wilson, 1778.
- Albright, Daniel. *Lyricality in English Literature*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska P, 1985.
- Backscheider, Paula R. *Eighteenth-Century Women Poets and Their Poetry: Inventing Agency, Inventing Genre*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 2005.
- Backscheider, Paula and Catherine Ingrassia, eds. *British Women Poets of the Long Eighteenth Century: An Anthology*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 2009.
- Baker, David, and Ann Townsend. *Radiant Lyre: Essays on Lyric Poetry*. Saint Paul, MN: Graywolf P, 2007.
- Barash, Carol. *English Women's Poetry, 1649-1714: Politics, Community, and Linguistic Authority*. Oxford, New York: Clarendon P; Oxford UP, 1996.
- Bateson, Frederick Wilse. *English Poetry, a Critical Introduction*. London, New York: Longmans, 1950.
- . *English Poetry*. 2nd ed. London: Longmans, 1966.
- Behn, Aphra, and Janet M. Todd. *The Works of Aphra Behn*. Columbus: Ohio State UP, 1992.
- Behrendt, Stephen C. *British Women Poets and the Romantic Writing Community*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 2009.
- Biester, James. *Lyric Wonder: Rhetoric and Wit in Renaissance English Poetry*. Rhetoric & Society. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1997.

- Blackmore, Sir Richard. *A collection of poems on various subjects. By Sir Richard Blackmore, Kt. M. D. Fellow of the Royal-College of Physicians.* London: printed by W. Wilkins, for Jonas Browne at the Black-Swan without Temple-Bar; and J. Walthoe, Jun'. over-against the Royal-Exchange in Cornhill, 1718. 318.
- Blasing, Mutlu Konuk. *Lyric Poetry: The Pain and the Pleasure of Words.* Princeton, N.J.: Princeton UP, 2007.
- Blevins, Jacob. *Catullan Consciousness and the Early Modern Lyric in England: From Wyatt to Donne.* Aldershot, Hampshire, England; Burlington, VT, USA: Ashgate, 2004.
- . *Dialogism and Lyric Self-Fashioning: Bakhtin and the Voices of a Genre.* Selinsgrove, Pa.: Susquehanna UP, 2008.
- Bloom, Harold, ed. *Poets of Sensibility and the Sublime.* NY: Chelsea House Publishers, 1986.
- Braudy, Leo. "Remembering Masculinity: Premature Ejaculation Poetry of the Seventeenth Century." *MQR* 33.1 (Winter 1994): 177-201.
- Brooks, Cleanth. *The Well Wrought Urn; Studies in the Structure of Poetry.* New York: Reynal & Hitchcock, 1947.
- Brown, Marshall. *Preromanticism.* Stanford, Calif.: Stanford UP, 1991.
- . "Negative Poetics: On Skepticism and the Lyric Voice." *Representations* 86 (2004): 120-140.
- Burns, Edward, ed. *Reading Rochester.* New York: St. Martin's P, 1995.
- Campbell, Gordon. *The Grove Encyclopedia of Decorative Arts.* New York: Oxford UP, 2006.
- Carson, Anne. "Decreation: How Women Like Sappho, Marguerite Porete, and

- Simone Weil Tell God." *Common Knowledge* 8.1 (2002) 188-201.
- . *Eros the Bittersweet*. 1st Dalkey Archive ed. Normal, IL: Dalkey Archive P, 1998.
- Castiglione, Baldesar. *The Book of the Courtier*. Trans. George Bull. NYC: Penguin Books, 1967.
- Claydon, Tony. *William III and the Godly Revolution*. Cambridge Studies in Early Modern British History. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1996.
- Combe, Kirk. *A Martyr for Sin: Rochester's Critique of Polity, Sexuality, and Society*. Newark, DE: U of Delaware P, 1998.
- Corns, Thomas N. *The Cambridge Companion to English Poetry: Donne to Marvell*. Cambridge Companions to Literature. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1993.
- Crane, Ronald S. *Critics and Criticism, Ancient and Modern*. Chicago: University of Chicago P, 1952.
- Culler, Jonathan. "Reading Lyric." *Yale French Studies* 69 (1985): 98-106.
- Cullhed, Anna. *The Language of Passion: The Order of Poetics and the Construction of a Lyric Genre 1746-1806*. European University Studies. Series Xviii, Comparative Literature. New York: Lang, 2002.
- Cunningham, J. V. "Logic and Lyric." *Modern Philology: A Journal Devoted to Research in Medieval and Modern Literature* 51.1 (1953): 33-41.
- Curran, Stuart. *Poetic Form and British Romanticism*. New York: Oxford UP, 1986.
- . *The Cambridge Companion to British Romanticism*. Cambridge Companions to Literature. Cambridge [England]; New York: Cambridge UP, 1993.
- Davie, Donald. *Augustan Lyric*. London, UK: Heinemann Educational, 1974.
- . *The Eighteenth-Century Hymn in England*. Cambridge Studies in Eighteenth-Century English Literature and Thought. Cambridge: Cambridge UP,

1993.

---. *Essays in Dissent: Church, Chapel, and the Unitarian Conspiracy*. Manchester, UK: Carcanet P, 1988.

De Man, Paul. *The Rhetoric of Romanticism*. New York: Columbia UP, 1984.

DeMaria, Robert. *British Literature, 1640-1789: An Anthology*. Blackwell Anthologies. 2nd ed. Malden, Mass.: Blackwell, 2001.

Donne, John. *The Elegies and The Songs and Sonnets*. Helen Gardner, ed. Oxford: Clarendon P, Oxford UP, 2000.

Doody, Margaret Anne. *The Daring Muse: Augustan Poetry Reconsidered*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge UP, 1985.

Doughty, Oswald. *English Lyric in the Age of Reason*. London: Daniel O'Connor, 1922.

Dowling, William C. *The Epistolary Moment: The Poetics of the Eighteenth-Century Verse Epistle*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1991.

Drayton, Michael. *Poems*. London, England, 1606. Rpt. London, England: Scholar P., 1969.

Dryden, John. "A Discourse on the Original and Progress of Satire: Addressed to the Right Honorable Charles, Earl of Dorset and Middlesex, Lord Chamberlain of his Majesty's Household, Knight of the Most Noble Order of the Garter, etc." *Discourses on Satire and Epic Poetry*. Forgotten Books, 2009. 3-72.

---. *Selected Poetry and Prose of John Dryden*. Roy Miner, ed. New York: Modern Library, 1985.

Dubrow, Heather. *The Challenges of Orpheus: Lyric Poetry and Early Modern England*. Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins UP, 2008.

"Ecstasy." Defs. 1, 3.a. *OED Online*. Oxford UP. 20 March 2010

<<http://dictionary.oed.com>>

Erskine-Hill, David. *Poetry and the Realm of Politics: Shakespeare to Dryden*.

Oxford: Clarendon P, Oxford UP, 1996.

Farley-Hills, David, ed. *Rochester: The Critical Heritage*. London: Routledge, 1972.

Feingold, Richard. *Moralized Song: The Character of Augustan Lyricism*. New

Brunswick: Rutgers UP, 1989.

Feldman, Paula R. and Daniel Robinson. *A Century of Sonnets: The Romantic-Era*

*Revival, 1750-1850*. New York: Oxford UP, 1999.

Fisher, Nicholas, ed. *That Second Bottle: Essays on John Wilmot, Earl of Rochester*.

Manchester: Manchester UP, 2000.

Fountain, David Guy. *Isaac Watts Remembered*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1974.

Fowler, Alastair. *Kinds of Literature: An Introduction to the Theory of Genres and*

*Modes*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP, 1982.

Frye, Northrop, and David Cayley. *Northrop Frye in Conversation*. 1992.

Gardiner, Judith Kegan. "Liberty, Equality, Fraternity: Utopian Longings in

Behn's Lyric Poetry." *Rereading Aphra Behn: History, Theory, and Criticism*.

Heidi Hunter, ed. Charlottesville: U of VA P, 1993. 273-300.

Goffman, Erving. *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. New York: Doubleday,

1959.

Goldsworthy, Cephas. *The Satyr: An Account of the Life and Work, Death and*

*Salvation of John Wilmot, Second Earl of Rochester*. London: Weidenfeld &

Nicholson, 2001.

Greene, Graham. *Lord Rochester's Monkey: being the Life of John Wilmot, Second Earl*

*of Rochester*. NYC: The Viking P, 1974.

Greene, Roland Arthur. *Post-Petrarchism: Origins and Innovations of the Western Lyric Sequence*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton UP, 1991.

Greenslade, Basil. "Affairs of State." *Spirit of Wit: Reconsiderations of Rochester*. Jeremy Treglown, ed. Oxford: Basil Blackwell P, 1982.

Hall, Jean. *A Mind that Feeds Upon Infinity: The Deep Self in English Romantic Poetry*. London: Associated UP, 1991

Hammond, Paul. *The Making of Restoration Poetry*. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2006

Hampsten, Elizabeth. "A Woman's Map of Lyric Poetry." *College English* 34.8 (1973): 1075-1081.

"hart, n.". OED Online. December 2011. Oxford University Press. 19 February 2012. <<http://www.oed.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/view/Entry/84401?redirectedFrom=hart>>.

Harvey, Elizabeth D. and Katharine Eisaman Maus, eds. *Soliciting Interpretation: Literary Theory and Seventeenth-Century English Poetry*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1990.

"heart, n.". OED Online. December 2011. Oxford University Press. 19 February 2012 <<http://www.oed.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/view/Entry/85068?rskey=Cabao&result=1&isAdvanced=false>>.

Hogarth, William. *The Industrious 'Prentice Performing the Duty of a Christian*. 1747. *Hogarth's Graphic Works*. Ronald Paulson, ed. Santa Clara, CA: Print Room P, 1989.

---. *The Sleeping Church*. 1729. *Hogarth's Graphic Works*. Ronald Paulson, ed. Santa Clara, CA: Print Room P, 1989.

---. *The Sleepy Congregation*. 1736 and 1769. *Hogarth's Graphic Works*. Ronald Paulson, ed. Santa Clara, CA: Print Room P, 1989.



- The Holy Bible*, King James Version. New York: American Bible Society: 1999;  
Bartleby.com, 2000. [www.bartleby.com/108/](http://www.bartleby.com/108/). [8 Aug 2011].
- Horwitz, Henry. *Parliament, Policy and Politics in the Reign of William III*.  
Manchester: Manchester UP, 1977.
- Hošek, Chaviva, and Patricia A. Parker. *Lyric Poetry: Beyond New Criticism*. Ithaca:  
Cornell UP, 1985.
- Hühn, Peter, and Jens Kiefer. *The Narratological Analysis of Lyric Poetry: Studies in  
English Poetry from the 16th to the 20th Century*. Berlin; New York: Walter de  
Gruyter, 2005.
- Hunter, J. Paul. *Before Novels: The Cultural Contexts of Eighteenth-Century English  
Fiction*. New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 1990.
- . "Missing Years: On Casualties in English Literary History, Prior to Pope."  
*Common Knowledge* 14.3 (2008): 434-444.
- Hutner, Heidi. *Rereading Aphra Behn: History, Theory, and Criticism*.  
Charlottesville: UP of Virginia, 1993.
- "Inspired." Defs. 1, 2, 4. *OED Online*. Oxford UP. 20 March 2010.  
<<http://dictionary.oed.com>>
- Iser, Wolfgang. *The Act of Reading: A Theory of Aesthetic Response*. Baltimore, MD:  
The Johns Hopkins UP, 1978.
- . "The Reading Process: A Phenomenological Approach." *Reader-Response  
Criticism: From Formalism to Post-structuralism*. Jane P. Tompkins, ed.  
Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins UP, 1980. 50-69.
- Jacob, Giles. *The Poetical Register*. London: E. Curll, 1719.
- Jay, Peter and Caroline Lewis. *Sappho Through English Poetry*. Oxford, UK: Anvil

P Poetry, 1996.

Jeffreys, Mark. "Ideologies of Lyric: A Problem of Genre in Contemporary Anglophone Poetics." *PMLA: Publications of the Modern Language Association of America* 110.2 (1995): 196-205.

---. *New Definitions of Lyric: Theory, Technology, and Culture*. Garland Reference Library of the Humanities. New York: Garland Pub., 1998.

Jevons, Frank Byron. *A History of Greek Literature: from the Earliest Period to the Death of Demosthenes: From the Earliest Period to the Death of Demosthenes*. New York, NY: C. Scribner's Sons, 1886 .

Johnson, James William. *A Profane Wit: The Life of John Wilmot, Earl of Rochester*. Rochester, NY: U of Rochester P, 2004.

Johnson, Samuel. *Essays from the Rambler, Adventurer, and Idler*. Walter Jackson Bate, ed. New Haven, CT: Yale UP, 1968.

---. *The Major Works*. Donald Johnson Greene, ed. Oxford; New York: Oxford UP, 2000.

---. *The Lives of the Most Eminent English Poets: With Critical Observations on Their Works*. Roger H. Lonsdale, ed. 4 vols. Oxford, New York: Clarendon P, Oxford UP, 2006.

Kramnick, Jonathan Brody. "Rochester and the History of Sexuality." *ELH* 69.2 (Summer 2002): 277-301.

Lewis, C. Day. *The Lyric Impulse*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP, 1965.

Lord, George de Forest. *Anthology of Poems on Affairs of State: Augustan Satirical Verse, 1660-1714*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1975.

Low, Anthony. *Aspects of Subjectivity: Society and Individuality from the Middle Ages to Shakespeare and Milton*. Pittsburgh, PA: Duquesne UP, 2003.

- Maclean, Norman. "From Action to Image: Theories of the Lyric in the Eighteenth Century." *Lyric Texts and Lyric Consciousness: The Birth of a Genre from Archaic Greece to Augustan Rome*. Ed. Paul Allen Miller. London; New York: Routledge, 1994. 408-62.
- Marshall, Madeleine Forell and Janet Todd. *English Congregational Hymns in the Eighteenth Century*. Lexington, KY: UP of Kentucky. 1982.
- Martin, Roberta C. "'Beauteous Wonder of a Different Kind': Aphra Behn's Destabilization of Sexual Categories." *College English* 61.2 (Nov. 1998): 192-210.
- Martz, Louis L. *English Seventeenth-Century Verse*. Vol. 1. NYC: W. W. Norton & Co., 1973.
- Masters, Mary. *Familiar letters and poems on several occasions*. London : printed for the author, by D. Henry and R. Cave, 1755. 135-138.
- McHugh, Heather. "Naked Numbers: A Curve from Wyatt to Rochester." *American Poetry Review* 31.1 (2002): 39-48.
- Mead, George Herbert. *Mind, Self, and Society: From the Standpoint of a Social Behaviorist*. Chicago: U Chicago P, 1967.
- Miles, Josephine. *Eras & Modes in English Poetry*. Berkeley: University of California P, 1957.
- Milton, John. *The Major Works*. Stephen Orgel and Jonathan Goldberg, eds. London, England: Oxford UP, 2003.
- Miner, Earl. "From Narrative to 'Description' and 'Sense' in Eighteenth-Century Poetry." *SEL: Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 9.3 (1969): 471-487.
- Mulroy, David D. *Early Greek Lyric Poetry*. Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P, 1999.
- Murfin, Ross. *The Bedford Glossary of Critical and Literary Terms*. 3rd ed. Boston,

- MA: Bedford/St. Martins, 2008.
- Neaves, Lord. *The Greek Anthology*. New York, NY: John B. Alden, 1883.
- Nelson, Nicholas H. *The Pleasure of Poetry: Reading and Enjoying British Poetry from Donne to Burns*. London: Praeger, 2006.
- Nicholson, Adam. *God's Secretaries: The Making of the King James Bible*. [New York: Harper Collins, 2005](#).
- Noggle, James. *The Skeptical Sublime: Aesthetic Ideology in Pope and the Tory Satirists*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2001.
- O'Donnell, Mary Ann, Bernard Dhuicq, and Guyonne Leduc, eds. *Aphra Behn (1640-1689): Identity, Alterity, Ambiguity*. Paris: L'Harmattan, 2000.
- Olson, Elder. "The Lyric." *Bulletin of the Midwest Modern Language Association*. Papers of the Midwest Modern Language Association, Number 1 (1969): 59-66.
- Ovid. *Metamorphoses*. Charles Martin, trans. New York, NY: W. W. Norton & Co, 2005.
- Pinto, Vivian De Sola. *Restoration Carnival: Five Courtier Poets, Rochester, Dorset, Sedley, Etherege, & Sheffield*. London: The Folio Society, 1954.
- Porter, Peter. "Professional Amateur." *Spirit of Wit: Reconsiderations of Rochester*. Jeremy Treglown, ed. Oxford: Basil Blackwell P, 1982.
- Pope, Alexander. *The Major Works*. Pat Rogers, ed. Oxford; New York: Oxford UP, 2006.
- Pope, Alexander, G. S. Rousseau, and Pat Rogers. *The Enduring Legacy: Alexander Pope Tercentenary Essays*. Cambridge, New York: Cambridge UP, 1988.
- Post, Jonathan F. S. *English Lyric Poetry: The Early Seventeenth Century*. London; New York: Routledge, 1999.

- Poulet, Georges. "Criticism and the Experience of Interiority." *Reader-Response Criticism: From Formalism to Post-structuralism*. Jane P. Tompkins, ed. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins UP, 1980. 41-49.
- . "The Phenomenology of Reading." *New Literary History* 1.1 (1969): 53-68.
- Prawer, S. S. "Lyric Structures'." *Modern Language Review* 56 (1961): 373-377.
- Prescott, Sarah, ed. *Women and Poetry, 1660-1750*. New York: Palgrave, 2003.
- Puttenham, George . *The Arte of English Poesie*. Frank Whigham and Wayne A. Rebhorn, ed. Ithaca, NY: Cornell UP, 2007.
- "restore, v.1". OED Online. December 2011. Oxford University Press. 19 February 2012. <<http://www.oed.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/view/Entry/163992?rskey=xzpttd&result=2&isAdvanced=false>>.
- "requited, adj.". OED Online. December 2011. Oxford University Press. 19 February 2012. <<http://www.oed.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/view/Entry/274303?redirectedFrom=requirede>>.
- Rennew, Ann. *Pious and holy breathings; or, a treatise of choice and precious hymns. Composed and branched out from divers chosen Texts of Scripture out of the Old and New Testament*. Cambridge: Printed for and sold by the author, 1714. 56-57.
- Rilke, Rainer Maria. *Letters to a Young Poet*. Joan M. Burnham, trans. Novato, CA: New World Library, 2000.
- Rochat, Philippe. *Others in Mind: Social Origins of Self-Consciousness*. New York: Cambridge UP, 2009.
- Rochester, John Wilmot. *The Works of John Wilmot, Earl of Rochester*. Harold Love, ed. Oxford; New York: Oxford UP, 1999.
- . *The Complete Poems of John Wilmot, Earl of Rochester*. David M. Vieth, ed. New

- Haven: Yale UP, 1968.
- . *The Debt to Pleasure: John Wilmot, Earl of Rochester: In the Eyes of His Contemporaries and in His Own Poetry and Prose*. John Adlard, ed. NYC: Routledge P, 2002.
- Rogers, Pat. *The Cambridge Companion to Alexander Pope*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge UP, 2007.
- Rowe, Elizabeth Singer. *The miscellaneous works in prose and verse of Mrs. Elizabeth Rowe*. London: printed for R. Hett, at the Bible and Crown in the Poultry; and R. Dodsley, at Tully's-Head in Pall-Mall, 1739. 210-211.
- Sanchez, Melissa. "Libertinism and Romance in Rochester's Poetry." *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 38.3 (2005): 441-459.
- Seigel, Jerrold. *The Idea of the Self: Thought and Experience in Western Europe since the Seventeenth Century*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2005.
- Selleck, Nancy. *The Interpersonal Idiom in Shakespeare, Donne, and Early Modern Culture*. New York: Palgrave, 2008.
- Sidney, Philip. *Defense of Poesy Otherwise Known as An Apology for Poetry*. Boston, MA: Ginn & Co., 1890.
- Sitter, John. *Arguments of Augustan Wit*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1992.
- . "Questions in Poetics: Why and How Poetry Matters." *The Cambridge Companion to Eighteenth-Century Poetry*. John Sitter, ed. Cambridge Companions to Literature. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2001.
- "Soul." Defs. I.1, I.2.a, II. *OED Online*. Oxford UP. 6 March 2010  
<<http://dictionary.oed.com>>
- Spacks, Patricia Meyer. *The Poetry of Vision: Five Eighteenth-Century Poets*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1967.

- Stapleton, Michael L. *Admired and Understood*. 2004.
- Starr, G. Gabrielle. *Lyric Generations: Poetry and the Novel in the Long Eighteenth Century*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 2004.
- Stewart, Susan. "Lyric Possession." *Critical Inquiry* 22.1 (1995): 34-63.
- Tan, Siu-Lan, Peter Pfordrescher, and Rom Harre. *Psychology of Music: From Sound to Significance*. New York: Psychology P, 2010.
- Tillotson, Geoffrey, Paul Fussell, and Marshall Waingrow. *Eighteenth-Century English Literature*. New York: Harcourt, 1969.
- "Toleration Act." *Encyclopædia Britannica*. *Encyclopædia Britannica Online Academic Edition*. Encyclopædia Britannica Inc., 2012. Web. 01 Mar. 2012.  
<<http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/598612/Toleration-Act>>.
- Tompkins, Jane P., ed. *Reader-Response Criticism: From Formalism to Post-structuralism*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins UP, 1980.
- Towne, Frank. "Logic, Lyric, and Drama." *Modern Philology: A Journal Devoted to Research in Medieval and Modern Literature* 51.4 (1954): 265-268.
- "Transport." Def. 3. *OED Online*. Oxford UP. 20 March 2010  
<<http://dictionary.oed.com>>
- Treglown, Jeremy. "'He knew my style, he swore.'" *Spirit of Wit: Reconsiderations of Rochester*. Jeremy Treglown, ed. Oxford: Basil Blackwell P, 1982.
- Turner, James Grantham. *Libertines and Radicals in Early Modern London: Sexuality, Politics, and Literary Culture, 1630-1685*. NY, Cambridge UP: 2002.
- Vendler, Helen. *The Art of Shakespeare's Sonnets*. Belknap Press, 1997.
- . *Invisible Listeners: Lyric Intimacy in Herbert, Whitman, and Ashbery*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton UP, 2005.

- . *Poems, Poets, Poetry: An Introduction and Anthology*. Boston: Bedford Books of St. Martin's P, 1997.
- Vickers, Brian. *Classical Rhetoric in English Poetry*. London, New York: Macmillan; St. Martin's P., 1970.
- Vieth, David and Dustin Green, eds. *Rochester and Court Poetry: Papers Presented at a Clark Library Seminar 11 May 1985*. Los Angeles: William Andrews Clark Memorial Library, 1988.
- von Hallenberg, Robert. *Lyric Powers*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 2008.
- Warren, Rosanna. *Fables of the Self: Studies in Lyric Poetry*. New York: W.W. Norton, 2008.
- Watson, J. R. *Pre-Romanticism in English Poetry of the Eighteenth Century: The Poetic Art and Significance of Thomson, Gray, Collins, Goldsmith, Cowper, and Crabbe: A Casebook*. London: Macmillan P, 1989.
- Watts, Isaac. *Horæ lyricæ. Poems, chiefly of the lyric kind. In two books. ... By I. Watts*. London: Printed by S. and D. Bridge, for John Lawrence, 1706.
- . *Hymns and spiritual songs. In three books. I. Collected from the Scriptures. II. Compos'd on Divine Subjects. III. Prepared for the Lord's Supper. With an Essay Towards the Improvement of Christian Psalmody, by the Use of Evangelical Hymns in Worship, as well as the Psalms of David. By I. Watts*. London: printed by J. Humfreys, for John Lawrence, at the Angel in the Poultry, 1707.
- Webster, Jeremy. *Performing Libertinism in Charles II's Court: Politics, Drama, Sexuality*. New York: Palgrave, 2005.
- Weinbrot, Howard D. *The Formal Strain; Studies in Augustan Imitation and Satire*. Chicago: University of Chicago P, 1969.



- Wesley, Charles and John Wesley. *A Collection of Hymns for the Use of the People called Methodists*. 1780.
- . *Hymns and Sacred Poems*. London, 1749.
- White, James F. *Protestant Worship: Traditions in Transition*. Louisville, KY: John Knox P, 1989.
- Wilders, John. "Rochester and the Metaphysicals." *Spirit of Wit: Reconsiderations of Rochester*. Jeremy Treglown, ed. Oxford: Basil Blackwell P, 1982.
- Williams, Anne. *Prophetic Strain: The Greater Lyric in the Eighteenth Century*. Chicago: University of Chicago P, 1984.
- Woodcock, George. *Aphra Behn: The English Sappho*. Montreal: Black Rose Books, 1991.
- Woodman, Thomas. *Early Romantics: Perspectives in British Poetry from Pope to Wordsworth*. New York: St. Martin's P, 1998.
- Zeitz, Lisa M. and Peter Thoms. "Power, Gender, and Identity in Aphra Behn's 'The Disappointment.'" *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 37.3 (Summer, 1997): 501-516.