

The Invisible Spy, by Eliza Haywood, edited by Carol Stewart, London, Pickering and Chatto, 2014, 544 pp., £70 (hardback), ISBN 978 1 84893441 2

Between 1993 and 2005, 25 of Haywood's 72 works were made available in full in scholarly editions. As a search of *Google Scholar* suggests, the availability of many of Haywood's best-known works in a form readily adapted to undergraduate teaching and non-specialist research has significantly boosted the number and scope of critical studies of Haywood. Although scholarly works have multiplied and diversified as a result of these earlier editorial labours, only five more of Haywood's works have been edited—in only three separate volumes—since 2005. Carol Stewart has edited three of these texts, and Pickering and Chatto have published two of these volumes in the Chawton House Library series. Haywood scholars are, then, particularly indebted to Stewart—and to the collaboration between Chawton House and Pickering and Chatto—for much of the little editorial work that has recently appeared. It is to be lamented, then, that since the purchase of Pickering and Chatto by Routledge (a Taylor and Francis imprint), links to the Chawton House Library series (and many other works) no longer seem to work. The fate of the series remains undetermined, with no information forthcoming from the new owners. I imagine Haywood scholars will be enormously grateful for the present edition of *The Invisible Spy* (which supersedes Paula R. Backscheider's edition of selections from *The Invisible Spy* in *Selected Fiction and Drama of Eliza Haywood*);¹ it is a pity, then, that one of the key supporters of this sort of editorial work has not been treated better by Taylor and Francis.

Turning to the edition itself, it is curious that, in the introduction to *The Invisible Spy*, Stewart makes no aesthetic claim for Haywood's novel—i.e. as literature or fiction. Indeed, the strongest aesthetic or literary claim appears in the blurb on the back cover, where the novel is characterized as one of Haywood's "later, more sophisticated work[s]". Although Stewart describes the novel as "the last major work by Eliza Haywood" (xii) in her introduction, what it is that makes the novel "major", "significant" (xix) or "sophisticated" is not discussed in terms of literary quality, technique or appeal. Instead, after a very brief survey of the novel's reception (xii), Stewart turns to political readings of Haywood (xii), the "politically loaded" aspects of her authorial persona in *The Invisible Spy* (xiii), the context and setting of the novel (xiii–xv), other Patriot writings (xix) and a possible relationship to Henry Fielding's "social pamphlets" (xvi–xviii). Stewart briefly acknowledges that she may have "fail[ed] to engage with the stuff of the narrative, its seductions and arranged marriages" (xix), but concludes with a plea for the relevance of the "political context" (xix) she has focused on. If we are to judge from Stewart's focus on the "political context" of *The Invisible Spy*, what makes the text a "major" or "significant" novel is the degree to which a sociopolitical analysis of the text is productive or "illuminating" (xiii), rather than its aesthetic qualities.

In the "Note on the Text", the reader is informed that the "copy-text" for *The Invisible Spy* is a copy of the first edition held by the British Library. "The first edition", we are told, "was [...] misbound, with almost all of Vol. II appearing as Vol. III" (xxv). What Stewart means is that the British Library copy of the

first edition (alone) is misbound—something that is not relevant to the reliability of the text or this edition as a whole. Presumably, Stewart transcribed the text of the British Library copy of the first edition since this is the only copy on *Eighteenth Century Collections Online*. There is no indication that Stewart's transcript has been checked against any other copy or copies—either the set of the first edition at the University of California or the one at New York Public Library, both of which have been online since January 2007 (on the *Internet Archive* and *Google Books*, respectively). Nor is there any indication that the “copy-text” has been checked against later editions published in London, most of which are available on *Eighteenth Century Collections Online* and *Google Books*. Stewart dismisses the correction of “Exploralibus” to “Explorabilis” that appears in later editions (xxv, without explaining why), but refers to no other changes between the first and later editions. Since no attempt has been made to identify textual variants between copies or editions, or to differentiate substantive and accidental changes to the text, the British Library copy transcribed by Stewart is not, in any meaningful sense, a “copy-text”.

Since the text of *The Invisible Spy* is readily available online, the primary value of Stewart's transcript is in her “Editorial Notes” (469–97). Like the introduction, these notes focus on sociopolitical aspects of the text, but, unlike the introduction, they also contain some discussion of *The Invisible Spy* as fiction and of Haywood as a writer. So, for example, the reader is informed in note 4 that “[m]ost of Haywood's literary references”—by which Stewart means quotations—are “drawn from” Edward Bysshe's *The Art of English Poetry* (1702) and *The English Parnassus* (1714). Stewart identifies more than 30 examples of quotations that appear in both *The Invisible Spy* and the works of Bysshe, with at least one instance (n67) of an error that is common to Haywood and Bysshe. However, she also identifies many quotations, not in Bysshe, which she characterizes in various ways if they depart from the earliest printed editions, suggesting that Haywood has confused (n10), misquoted (n87) or adapted (n71) her material. There are also numerous quotations not identified (n222) or tentatively attributed to Haywood (n208). It is a commonplace among statisticians that “correlation does not imply causation”, so some analysis of Haywood's use of quotation and paraphrase is obviously called for to support Stewart's claim (especially since Haywood's dependence on Bysshe would undermine support for the view that Haywood was intimately acquainted with the stage and frequently quoted plays from memory). Since Stewart clearly could not do so in a footnote, it is unfortunate that she chose not to address this question in her introduction.²

Despite the limits placed on textual and literary investigation in this volume, Stewart's edition of *The Invisible Spy* is a very useful addition to Haywood scholarship, and should find a place in every research library.

Notes

1. Paula R. Backscheider, ed., *Selected Fiction and Drama of Eliza Haywood* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1999).

2. For more on Haywood's use of sources, see Douglas Duhaime, "Digital Approaches to Intertextuality: The Case of Eliza Haywood", *Douglas Duhaime Blog*, 3 Jan. 2014, <<http://douglasduhaime.com/blog/digital-approaches-to-intertextuality-the-case-of-eliza-haywood>> and "Textual Reuse in the Eighteenth Century: Mining Eliza Haywood's Quotations", *Digital Humanities Quarterly*, 10.1 (2016), <<http://www.digitalhumanities.org/dhq/vol/10/1/000229/000229.html>>.

Patrick Spedding
Monash University

 patrick.spedding@monash.edu  <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-8901-5887>

© 2016 Patrick Spedding
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09699082.2016.1179839>