

UNIVERSITY OF SALAMANCA

FACULTY OF LANGUAGES AND LITERATURE

*Department of English Studies*



**VNiVERSIDAD  
D SALAMANCA**

CAMPUS DE EXCELENCIA INTERNACIONAL

**THE SATIRICAL RECEPTION OF THE NEW  
LEARNING IN ENGLISH LITERATURE, 1592-1743**

PHILIP JENKINS

2019



UNIVERSIDAD DE SALAMANCA

FACULTAD DE FILOLOGIA

*Departamento de Filología Inglesa*

Tesis Doctoral

LA RECEPCIÓN SATÍRICA DE LA NUEVA ERUDICIÓN EN LA LITERATURA INGLESA,  
1592-1743

Vº Bº DEL DIRECTOR

Trabajo presentado por Philip Jenkins  
para la obtención del grado de Doctor en  
Filología bajo la dirección del Dr. Pedro  
Javier Pardo García.

Dr. Pedro Javier Pardo García



*This doctoral thesis is dedicated to the memory of my mother, Mrs Barbara Jenkins.*



## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank the following people for their help and support while I was writing this doctoral thesis. Firstly, I would like to thank my supervisor, Dr Pedro Javier Pardo García of the University of Salamanca.

Secondly, I am also grateful to my father Anthony Jenkins for his support throughout the writing of the thesis.

Thirdly, I would like to express my gratitude to Dr Daniel Jolowicz for his help with my translations from the original Latin.

And finally, many thanks are due to Vince Woodley of University Information Services, University of Cambridge for his help with the formatting of this thesis.





## TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
<u>Part I. THE ANTIQUARIAN</u>	
1. THE SATIRICAL RECEPTION OF THE ANTIQUARY	7
1.1. Antiquarianism in England	7
1.2. Early Satirical Accounts of Antiquaries	14
1.3. Guilpin, Nashe and Lodge	16
1.4. John Donne	21
1.5. Character Sketches	23
1.6. Shackerley Marmion's <i>The Antiquary</i>	26
1.7. The Antiquary in the Interregnum	30
1.8. The Satirical Reception of Antiquarianism after the Restoration	33
1.9. Conclusion	37
<u>Part II. THE VIRTUOSO</u>	
2. THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUND TO THE FIGURE OF THE VIRTUOSO	39
2.1. Natural Philosophy and Early Modern Science	41
2.2. The Changing Scientific Worldview	42
2.2.1. The Shape of the Universe	43
2.2.2. Francis Bacon and the Baconian Method	45
2.3. The Venues of Natural Philosophy	48
2.3.1. Gresham College	48
2.3.2. The University of Oxford	49
2.3.3. The Royal Society	50
2.4. The Figure of the Virtuoso	52
2.5. The Range of Ideas Associated with the Virtuosi	55
2.6. The Negative Perception of the Virtuosi	56
2.6.1. Laughter	57
2.6.2. Puritanism	58
2.7. The Revaluation of the Virtuosi	59
2.8. The Telescope and the Microscope	62
2.9. Literary Responses	64
3. THE FIRST SATIRICAL ACCOUNTS OF THE VIRTUOSI: SAMUEL BUTLER	67
3.1. The Burlesque	67
3.2. Reading Butler	67
3.3. Dating Butler's Works	69
3.4. An Early Satirical Account of the Virtuosi	70
3.5. Perception and Error in Butler's Satirical Subjects	71
3.6. Butler's Prose Works	72
3.6.1. <i>An Occasional Reflection on Dr. Charleton</i>	72
3.6.2. <i>Characters</i>	77

3.6.3. <i>Prose Observations</i>	80
3.7. <i>The Elephant in the Moon</i>	81
3.7.1. Summary of the Poem	83
3.7.2. Identifying the Virtuosi	86
3.7.3. A Mouse and not an Elephant	89
3.7.4. The Telescope	91
3.8. <i>Satire upon the Royal Society</i>	94
3.9. Other Works	96
3.9.1. "An Heroical Epistle of Hudibras to Sidrophel"	96
3.9.2. <i>Hudibras, The Third and Last Part</i>	98
3.10. Conclusion	101
4. THOMAS SHADWELL AND <i>THE VIRTUOSO</i>	105
4.1. Literature Review	108
4.2. Who is the Satirical Butt of <i>The Virtuoso</i> ?	110
4.3. Shadwell's Satirical Technique	113
4.3.1. Going beyond the <i>Philosophical Transactions</i>	113
4.3.2. The Facetious Remark as Satirical Tool	113
4.3.3. Irony of Character	114
4.4. Pedantry of Language	115
4.5. Borrowings from Hooke's <i>Micrographia</i>	117
4.6. Conclusion	118
5. SUBSEQUENT SATIRICAL ACCOUNTS OF THE VIRTUOSO: BROWNE, BEHN AND KING	119
5.1. Curiosity and Collecting	119
5.2. <i>Musaeum Clausum, or Bibliotheca Abscondita</i>	119
5.2.1. Books	122
5.2.2. The Rarities in Pictures & Antiquities and Rarities of Several Sorts	124
5.3. <i>The Emperor of the Moon</i>	125
5.3.1. Behn's Use of Her Literary Sources	129
5.4. <i>The Transactioneer</i>	130
5.4.1. The Improbable: Case Studies	133
5.4.1.1. Chinese Ear-pickers	134
5.4.1.2. Poppy Pie	137
5.4.1.3. A Shower of Whiting	139
5.4.1.4. Sable Mice	141
5.4.2. The Excellency of Sloane's Style	142
5.5. <i>Useful Transactions in Philosophy, and Other Sorts of Learning</i>	145
5.5.1. The Tongue	147
5.5.2. The Eunuch's Child	150
5.5.3. Millers Are Not Thieves	152
5.5.4. Looking ahead to the Scriblerians	153
6. SCRIBLERIAN SATIRE: SWIFT, POPE AND OTHERS	155
6.1. The Scriblerus Club	155
6.1.1. The Members	155
6.1.2. The Creative Catalyst	156
6.1.3. The Name of the Club	158

6.1.4. The Political Dimension	161
6.1.5. How They Wrote	162
6.1.6. Who Brought What to the Table?	163
6.2. The <i>Memoirs</i> of Scriblerus	169
6.2.1. Summary of the Contents	170
6.2.2. The Satirical Reception of the Ancients and Moderns	175
6.2.3. Curiosity and the Unworldly Virtuoso in the <i>Double Mistress</i> Chapter	175
6.2.4. The <i>Memoirs</i> as a Sham	176
6.2.5. <i>Annus Mirabilis</i> as a Sham and a Parody	185
6.2.6. Scriblerian Satire	190
6.2.7. The Quixotic Character of the <i>Memoirs</i>	190
7. JOHN WOODWARD: THE COMPLETE SCRIBLERIAN VIRTUOSO	191
7.1. A Woodwardian Prelude	193
7.2. Woodward the Antiquarian: The Shield of Cornelius Scriblerus	196
7.2.1. <i>The Origine of Sciences</i>	198
7.3. The Smallpox War	202
7.3.1. The Question of Arbuthnot's Authorship	205
7.3.2. <i>The Life and Adventures of Don Bilioso de l'Estomac</i>	207
7.3.3. <i>An Account of the Sickness and Death of Dr. W---d---d</i>	212
7.4. <i>Three Hours after Marriage</i> :	212
7.4.1. Summary of the Plot	212
7.4.2. The Satirical Reception of the Virtuoso through Action and Dialogue	214
7.4.3. In the Cabinet of Curiosities	218
8. SWIFT'S VOYAGE TO LAPUTA: A SCRIBLERIAN POSTSCRIPT?	223
8.1. The Diversity of Interpretation of Swift's Satire	223
8.2. The Relationship between the <i>Memoirs</i> and the <i>Travels</i>	224
8.3. The Presence of Natural Philosophy in the <i>Travels</i>	224
8.4. The Academy of Lagado	225
8.4.1. Sources for the Academy's Practitioners	226
8.4.2. The Composite Nature of Swift's Satire	226
8.4.3. Swift's Use of the Adynaton	228
8.5. Swift and Sir Isaac Newton	228
8.6. Conclusion	229
<u>Part III. THE TEXTUAL CRITIC</u>	
9. ON TEXTUAL CRITICISM, RICHARD BENTLEY AND THE FIRST SATIRICAL RESPONSES TO HIS WORK	231
9.1. A Brief History of Textual Criticism	232
9.2. Richard Bentley's Reputation	235
9.3. Pedantry	238
9.4. Bentley in <i>The Battle of the Books</i>	243
9.5. Bentley, Horace and Hubris	246
9.6. The Satirical Responses to Bentley's Edition of Horace	248
9.7. <i>Virgilius Restauratus</i>	251

10. THE SATIRICAL RECEPTION OF TEXTUAL CRITICISM IN POPE'S <i>DUNCIADS</i>	257
10.1. The Verbal Critick in <i>An Essay on Criticism</i>	259
10.2. The Life and Work of Pope	260
10.3. Lewis Theobald	264
10.4. Richard Bentley	271
10.5. <i>The Dunciad in Four Books</i>	273
10.6. <i>The Dunciad Variorum</i> as a Parody of Textual Criticism	277
10.7. Paratexts	279
10.7.1. Precursors	280
10.7.2. The Notes of Scriblerus in the <i>Dunciad Variorum</i>	286
10.8. The Followers of Scriblerus	288
10.9. Conclusion	291
CONCLUSION	295
BIBLIOGRAPHY	307
APPENDIX. Selected Character Sketches	327

### **A Note on Orthography**

A few words are necessary on the quotations from historical texts in this doctoral thesis. I have used original spelling where possible and have used the term (sic) sparingly. In Elizabethan texts “w” was written “vv”. I have preferred the modern spelling as the old one now seems remote. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, italics were widely used for emphasis. And an apostrophized letter was not italicized, as in the example “*book’s*”. An eighteenth-century writer would always write “Dr. Woodward,” whereas today “Dr Woodward” is normal. I have written diphthongs as two separate letters.



## INTRODUCTION

This PhD thesis is concerned with the satirical reception of the New Learning between 1592 and 1743. By the New Learning I mean antiquarianism, natural philosophy and textual criticism. The earliest example I have found of the satirical reception of antiquarianism is Thomas Nashe's *Pierce Penilesse his Supplication to the Devil* (1592); the final work I look at in connection with textual criticism is Alexander Pope's *The Dunciad in Four Books* (1743). In each of the three different fields something new began to happen in the period in question. The antiquaries, or later, antiquarians took an interest in the physical remnants of the past in order to understand better what had gone before. The natural philosophers, encouraged by Bacon's scientific writings, embraced the empirical model of investigation and rejected Aristotle (384-322 BC) as stultifying and unproductive. The textual critics brought their faith in their own ability to correct faulty literary texts before a general readership, firstly in classical literature and secondly in Shakespeare. All three undertakings were contrary to the prevailing understanding of knowledge during the period, which was that knowledge came from texts and in particular from ancient classical literature. As a result of this, the antiquary, the virtuoso and the textual critic all attracted the attention of the satirists of the day, who remained loyal to the old ways of understanding.

The thesis takes as its starting point Pedro Javier Pardo's assertion that there is an identifiable body of work concerned with satirizing pedantry in the eighteenth century (*Satire* 1). He identifies the figures of what I call the textual critic and the virtuoso among others as the vehicles for this satire, regarding the *Memoirs of Scriblerus* (1741) as the epitome of the genre or mode. I have taken this perception back to the late 1590s by including the figure of the antiquary as another example of what is effectively a new form of learning which sought to displace the dominance of thinkers such as Aristotle and Galen (129-216 AD). By the sixteenth century, important contemporary thinkers were finding Aristotle's thought restrictive. The logical framework of the Ancients' way of looking at the world was provided by Aristotle's *Organon* (4<sup>th</sup> century BC), six treatises on logic, including the *Posterior Analytics*, which explored how to define truth and what could be said about it. It is

noteworthy in his *Posterior Analytics* that he specifies conclusions must be deducible from first principles in a scientific demonstration, surely meaning that the first principles determine the outcome of the experiment (*Oxford Classical Dictionary* 165-9). Aristotle regarded the syllogism as central to logic, a sequence of three statements the first two of which result in the third.<sup>1</sup> While the syllogism served philosophers, it also potentially restricted them, as Bacon thought, because of its inclusive structure. This could result in the so-called syllogism fallacy.<sup>2</sup>

The epistemological rupture which precipitated the development of natural philosophy in the seventeenth century along experimental lines is to be found, as has already been implied, in the work of Francis Bacon (1561-1626). Bacon wrote a *Novum Organon Scientiarum* (1620), the purpose of which is clear in the title given to a mid-nineteenth-century translation: *The Novum Organon: Or, a True Guide to the Interpretation of Nature*.<sup>3</sup> He argues that the old ways of thinking excluded man from nature, rather than allowing him access to it and the ability to understand it. He also regarded the syllogism as suspect, as it made use of words which in turn represented confused notions (*Instauratio II* 69). His solution was to prefer the technique of induction to the syllogism, based on observation and conclusions drawn from what has been observed.<sup>4</sup> Bacon's philosophy gathered its own followers and was arguably the first instance of Modern thinking. It was partly as a result of Bacon's writings that the Royal Society was founded in the 1660s, providing an institutional home for experimental science. The reaction on the part of the poets and the wits of the day to the experiments which were carried out there was one of incomprehension. This was because they were still comfortable with the Aristotelian status quo ante. It was this that led to the phenomenon of the satirical reception of natural philosophy. Early in the thesis I will show how the works of Bacon were important for this new development.

I shall present in this thesis the idea that the satirical reception of the New Learning in English literature between 1592 and 1743 represents, on the one hand, a satirical response to three new disciplines – antiquarianism, natural philosophy and textual criticism – and, on the other, a record of a literary misapprehension. This was satire written according to an old

---

<sup>1</sup> A well-known example is: "All men are mortal. Socrates is a man. Socrates is mortal."

<sup>2</sup> An example of syllogism fallacy is: "All crows are black, and the bird in my cage is black. So, the bird in my cage is a crow" ([www.literarydevices.net/syllogism](http://www.literarydevices.net/syllogism), par. 4 of 8).

<sup>3</sup> Francis Bacon. *The Novum Organon: or: a True Guide to the Interpretation of Nature*. Trans. Rev. G.W. Kitchin. Oxford: The University Press, 1855. Print.

<sup>4</sup> "For I regard *Induction* as that form of demonstration which upholds the senses, bears down on nature, and is bent on and almost tied up with works" (Bacon, *Instauratio II* 31).



way of thinking which was soon to give way to the new one which informed the satirical targets. Such satire preserves beliefs which are by now outdated and offers the historical lesson that he who mocks can, after the passing of a suitable amount of time, actually turn out to have mistakenly condemned a new form of knowledge because it was incompatible with the prevailing ideas of the day.

[Passage omitted]

There now follows a description of the structure of the thesis and a summary of its ten chapters. The thesis is divided into three parts which deal respectively with the figures of the antiquary, the virtuoso and the textual critic. Since the greater part of the evidence concerns the virtuoso, that part contains seven chapters, while the other two contain one and two chapters respectively. Chapter One is concerned with the satirical reception of the antiquary between 1592 and 1699. It begins with a discussion of the work of William Camden which highlights what is new about antiquarianism and collects together the various examples of satirical references to the antiquary. The first is Thomas Nashe's *Pierce Penilesse his Supplication to the Devil* (1592) and the chapter ends with an examination of William King's *A Journey to London, In the Year 1698* (1699). Important works of literature discussed in this chapter are John Earle's character sketch *The Antiquarie*, published in 1628, and Shackerley Marmion's comedy of the same name, performed earlier but first printed in 1641.

Chapter Two opens the second part of this thesis and gives an insight into the historical background to the figure of the virtuoso, an understanding of which is necessary to appreciate both the virtuoso and the satire written about the virtuoso. The chapter addresses the nature of natural philosophy as opposed to modern conceptions of science. It also explores the changing worldview of the 1600s, represented by Copernicus (1473-1543) and Kepler (1571-1630) in astronomy or Newton (1643-1727) in mathematics, and it stresses the importance of Francis Bacon's work in allowing scientific inquiry to detach itself from the thinking of Aristotle and move ahead by embracing induction. It also discusses the different types of virtuosi and the ideas associated with them. It then explores the reevaluation of the virtuosi in the twentieth century.

Chapter Three examines the first satirical accounts of the virtuosi in the works of the author Samuel Butler. Although much of what Butler wrote about the virtuosi was not published until long after his death in 1759, he does provide us with the first example of the satirical reception of the virtuosi in the second part of *Hudibras*, where he satirizes the

microscope (1663). His most accomplished satire on the virtuosi is probably *The Elephant in the Moon*, a work which attacks the use of the telescope to observe distant worlds supposedly teeming with life, according to the latest astronomical theories (probably 1676). Chapter Four concerns Thomas Shadwell (c. 1640-92). It was the character of Sir Nicholas Gimcrack in Shadwell's comedy *The Virtuoso* (1676), which proved the most effective literary creation in undermining belief in the virtuosi.

Chapter Five contains an examination of subsequent satirical accounts of the virtuoso by Sir Thomas Browne (1605-82), Aphra Behn (1640?-89) and William King (1663-1712) in works published from the 1680s onwards. In Browne's *Musaeum Clausum, or Bibliotheca Abscondita* (1683) we encounter a satirical reception of curiosity as a characteristic of the virtuoso. The first performance of Behn's comedy *The Emperor of the Moon* took place in 1687. The central character of Behn's comedy is Doctor Baliardo, who is obsessed with the moon. Behn's characterization of Baliardo is Quixotic as his obsession with the moon comes from reading books on the subject and the results show the comic consequences of becoming detached from the world. The source of several references to Rosicrucianism is examined. The chapter closes with a consideration of two works by William King. These are *The Transactioneer* (1700) and the *Useful Transactions in Philosophy, and Other Sorts of Learning: In Three Parts* (1708).

Chapter Six is concerned with Scriblerian satire by Jonathan Swift and Alexander Pope. In the first part of the chapter the focus is on the Scriblerus Club, whose members included Swift and Pope. In the second half of the chapter the *Memoirs of Scriblerus* (1741) become the focus. A summary of the contents of the *Memoirs* is given and the satirical character of the *Memoirs* described. There ensues a discussion of the different satirical styles the *Memoirs* draw on, ranging from satire, parody and burlesque, the latter both in the eighteenth-century and in the modern sense. The importance of Cervantes for the *Memoirs* is described. There then follows a discussion of the satirical reception of the Ancients and Moderns in the *Memoirs*.

Chapter Seven looks at satires written about Dr John Woodward (1665/8-1728), much of which was personal in nature. Woodward's interests were rather broad and included fossils, antiquarianism and the treatment of smallpox. Each of these interests were the subject of satirical treatments of Woodward. A version of Woodward as a virtuoso appears in John Gay's comedy *Three Hours after Marriage* (1717) in the form of the character Fossile. Woodward's iron shield, which he thought was Roman in origin, features in the satire on antiquarianism in Chapter Three of the *Memoirs of Scriblerus*. *The Life and Adventures of*

*Don Bilioso d l'Estomac* (1719) is an anonymous response to Woodward's approach to treating smallpox.

Chapter Eight seeks to answer the question as to whether Swift's *Voyage to Laputa* is a Scriblerian postscript. There follows at the heart of this chapter a discussion of the visit to the Academy of Lagado in the *Travels*, when Gulliver visits the flying island of Laputa and its dependent territory of Balnibarbi. The conclusion is that the visit to the Academy of Lagado in Balnibarbi is an example of the satirical reception of early modern science. And given that much of Swift's work considered in this chapter deals with follies in learning, the conclusion is reached that *Gulliver's Travels* (1726) can hold its place in any account of the evolution of the satirical reception of early modern science and of learning itself.

Part Three of this thesis deals with the satirical reception of the textual critic. Textual criticism became a subject for satire as a result of the publication of three books. Firstly, the edition of the poetry of the Roman poet Horace prepared by Richard Bentley was published in 1711 and soon became the focus of criticism because of Bentley's changes to the text of one of the main works of Roman literature. Lewis Theobald, a self-confessed disciple of Bentley, published his *Shakespeare Restored* in 1726. The purpose of the work was to demonstrate through the procedures of textual criticism the defects of a recent edition of William Shakespeare's plays edited by Alexander Pope. Thirdly, Bentley's edition of Milton's *Paradise Lost* was published in 1732 and flowed into the satirical current formed by Pope's *Dunciads* (1729, 1743). Chapter Nine explores the development of textual criticism in the world of classical scholarship. It then examines Bentley's intervention in the Battle of the Ancients and Moderns and his appearance as a character in Swift's *Battle of the Books* (1704). The next topic is the importance given to the conjectural emendation in Bentley's edition of Horace. The satirical responses to Bentley's work are considered.

Chapter Ten is concerned with Alexander Pope's reception of textual criticism in his *Dunciads* (1729, 1743). Textual criticism was seen by Pope as another misguided Modern critical practice and as such fair game for satirical treatment. The importance of the publication of Lewis Theobald's *Shakespeare Restored* (1726) is stressed for the writing of Pope's *The Dunciad Variorum* (1729). The chapter mentions that the fictitious author of the editorial apparatus of this work is Martinus Scriblerus, already familiar from the *Memoirs of Scriblerus*. The change in hero to the actor and writer Colley Cibber (1671-1757) for Pope's later *The Dunciad in Four Books* (1743) is discussed. A description of the life and work of Pope is also provided, which is necessary because the one informs the other. This is followed by a section on Pope's first target as a textual critic, Lewis Theobald. The latter's ideas about the

## INTRODUCTION

---

editor's responsibilities and his suitability for the role of textual critic are discussed. Several examples of his emendations to Pope's edition are presented and discussed, along with an examination of the portrayal of Lewis Theobald in *The Dunciad Variorum* (1729). The satirical reception of Richard Bentley in *The Dunciad in Four Books* (1743) is examined, followed by an analysis of the paratext in the work of the Scriblerians and of the notes of Martinus Scriblerus in *The Dunciad Variorum* (1729). Finally, there is a brief examination of later works by writers other than Pope which were inspired by the figure of Martinus Scriblerus.

In assembling the evidence for this thesis, I was largely guided by the search for literature about the virtuoso. Once the innovation of the virtuosi at the Royal Society became apparent, the choice of the antiquary and the textual critic as companions in the New Learning followed easily enough. The formal diversity used by the satirists to express their opposition is fascinating from a literary critical point of view. The matter is clear, construing the manner now follows.

## CHAPTER ONE. THE SATIRICAL RECEPTION OF THE ANTIQUARY

### 1.1. ANTIQUARIANISM IN ENGLAND

Antiquarianism was the first form of the New Learning to appear. An antiquary was someone who was interested in antiquities. The noun derived from the Latin word *antiquarius*, meaning “of antiquity”. Antiquaries were individual scholars who undertook research in written sources such as books, manuscripts and official documents. They also toured regions of the country that interested them in order to examine the countryside and buildings and to collect local information. The beginnings of English antiquarianism are to be found in the reign of King Henry VIII. As James P. Carley writes in his article in the *Oxford History of National Biography*, it was Henry’s interest in the monastic libraries of his kingdom which led him to send John Leland to make inventories of the books which were held there. Eventually published as the *Collectanea*, Leland’s book-lists were almost complete before the dissolution of the monasteries, which began in 1536 and was concluded in 1541 (online edition, par. 6 of 19).<sup>5</sup> Leland was the first antiquary of note in England. As previously stated, it was long thought that he was Henry VIII’s official antiquary, but it is now believed that Leland was using the Latin word “antiquarius” in line with humanist practice in Europe (online edition, par. 8 of 19). By around 1539 he had become more interested in local history and topography and spent six years touring England noting down the details of geographical features, cities, castles and monasteries. Although no printed works resulted from these travels, Leland’s efforts represent the beginning of the study of topography in England (online edition, par. 9 of 19). The topographer describes particular places, in contrast to the chorographer, who is concerned to represent a region or a district on a map. What Leland did through his tours of England was to set a precedent for later antiquaries who were interested in touring regions or districts or the whole country from a specific antiquarian point of view.

---

<sup>5</sup> Like other important works by Leland, the *Collectanea* were published in the eighteenth century: *Joannis Lelandi antiquarii de rebus Britannicis collectanea*, ed. T. Hearne, 6 vols. (1715).

In 1546 or 1547, Leland went mad. A variety of reasons were offered by friends and acquaintances. One striking suggestion was that Leland had realized he was not going to be able to realize the ambitious works he had proposed based on his travels around England. This was because he collected a lot of evidence and was unable to synthesize it into finished books (online edition, par. 11 of 19). In this respect he prefigures the later antiquary John Aubrey (1626-97), who also gathered much but published little during his lifetime. Yet Leland's notes were circulated and exercised an influence on antiquaries such as William Camden (1551-1623), inspiring him to undertake his own antiquarian journeys. Later generations saw Leland's madness as symbolic of the scholar's fate, a warning against applying oneself too much to obscure intellectual pursuits.

There now follows a description of a number of important antiquaries. Such men were very much in contact with each other but worked alone. Collectively what they wrote changed the understanding of the past in Britain completely. The first major antiquary to publish his findings was William Camden. Educated in London and Oxford, he became second master at Westminster School in 1575 and was headmaster from 1593 to 1597. While teaching there he also travelled to gather the materials for his most important work *Britannia*, which he wrote in Latin and which was first published in 1586. The translation by Philemon Holland (1552-1637), entitled *Britain*, appeared in 1610. This important work was an account of Britain as a Roman province and an attempt to determine where the Roman towns and camps had been (Parry, *Trophies* 23).<sup>6</sup> His fellow antiquary Robert Bruce Cotton (1571-1631) had been his pupil at Westminster as was the poet Ben Jonson (1572-1637), whose Epigram 14 was written in praise of Camden and includes the following couplet: "What name, what skill, what faith hast thou in things! / What sight in searching the most antique springs!" (Jonson 772). It is noteworthy that Jonson focuses on Camden's faith in things in his poem. In *Britannia* Camden no longer draws exclusively on written accounts of the Roman past but draws on the physical evidence which is available. It is this which is revolutionary for the study of history and which also leads to its satirical reception. Antiquarianism and its sister discipline of chorography – the description of the configuration and the features of a region – emerge in the second half of the sixteenth century as new forms of learning. Antiquarianism was described in similar terms in the *Life of Camden* which

---

<sup>6</sup> While headmaster of Westminster School he wrote a Greek grammar, which became standard over the next century. His health began to decline during this time and he was eventually recommended for the office of one of three heralds at the College of Arms. He endowed the first lectureship in civil history at the University of Oxford in 1620.

prefaced the 1695 edition of *Britannia*: “It was a sort of learning, that was then but just appearing in the world, when the heat and vehemence of Philosophy and School-Divinity (which had possessed all hearts and hands for so many hundred years) began to cool” (qtd in Parry, *Seventeenth* 167). Camden’s *Britannia* “became the fountain-head of antiquarian research for the next century and beyond” (Parry, *Trophies* 23). In searching for the actual physical location of the Roman settlements, he was extending intellectual enquiry directly into the physical realm, rather than remaining subject to written sources. In his historical account of Roman Britain, he made extensive use of local searches of his own as well as making use of coins and inscriptions from the collections of Sir Robert Bruce Cotton. There is a visual presentation of coins from the Roman period in the work (*Britain* 89-96). Camden was one of the first authors to write about coins while narrating history, and he remarks at one point: “I walke in a mirke and mistie night of ignorance” (*Britain* 97). Nevertheless, he is able to relate the coins to specific rulers such as Cunobelinus, king of the Britons (d. c. AD 40), whose seat was the oldest town in England, Camalodunum (now Colchester). Another coin was minted by the Verlamians in Hertfordshire. In his travels around Cornwall he comes across a site near Killigarth and Looe with several standing stones arranged four square and seven or eight stones an equal distance apart: “The neighbour Inhabitants terme them *Hurlers*, as being by a devout and godly error perswadeth, they had beene men sometimes transformed into Stones, for profaning the Lords Day, with hurling the ball” (102). These are probably standing stones and the mere fact that Camden records them and gives a contemporary explanation for their presence points the way forward to later researchers with an interest in pre-Christian societies. Camden was acutely aware of the way the past came into the present in the form of physical objects, as is evident from the following passage which precedes the narration of the story of the uncovering of the ancient vaults at Verulam before the building of a new monastery dedicated to Saint Alban (d. 209, c. 251 or 304) (411): “If I were disposed upon the report of the common people to reckon up what great store of Romane peeces of coine, how many cast images of gold and silver, how many vessels, what a sort of modules or chapters of pillars, and how many wonderful things of antique worke, have been digged up, my words would not carry credit: The thing is so incredible” (411). It was Camden’s achievement to make so much of this ancient history of Britain visible once again in words. And it was his work above all which established antiquarianism as a new discipline and made the historical artefacts which he wrote about familiar to the educated classes.

Richard Verstegan (c. 1548-1640) was a Catholic propagandist whose work, much to the despair of the English authorities, largely determined the image of Queen Elizabeth's policies in Continental Europe at the beginning of the seventeenth century. In his *A Restitution of Decayed Intelligence in Antiquities* of 1605 the author argues that Roman Catholicism is the true religion of England and shows the Saxon beginnings of the English in terms of "people, language and culture" (Miola 422). In this largely forgotten work Verstegan "innovatively treats language as historical artefact" (422). His starting point is the conversion of the Saxons by Pope Gregory the Great and Saint Augustine in the sixth century. While his thesis is partly bound up in proving that English Protestantism is a deviation from centuries of prior religious practice, by seeking to foreground the religious experience of what he calls the English-Saxon (the Anglo-Saxon), he contributes substantially to the trend in early antiquarian studies of putting the Anglo-Saxon back at the centre of English history. For example, he looks at Saxon vocabulary and Saxon surnames and comes to some interesting conclusions. The suffix "-brook" refers to "A waterish or moorish ground" resulting in a surname like "Brabrook". The suffix "-by" means "near" and in this context points to the proximity of the family's origins and the first semantic element of the name. In the case of "Willoughby" the family first settled near a willow tree. Through these linguistic demonstrations Verstegan joined other antiquaries of the time who were arguing in favour of the Anglo-Saxon influence in English history. They demonstrate that to be English is "to be Saxon, Catholic, and European, other historical traditions being founded in myth, mistake, and historical manipulation" (Hamilton qtd in Miola 423). If we let the Catholic apologist part of this argument fall away, we are still left with a clear idea of how the English language comes in part from Anglo-Saxon. The power of antiquarianism became apparent in the way that its findings discredited prevailing notions of British history which had been established in the Middle Ages. This was nowhere more the case than in the myth of Brutus, told by Geoffrey of Monmouth (d. 1154/5) in his *Historia Regum Britanniae*, which was written between 1135 and 1139. Geoffrey tells the story of how a Trojan Prince Brutus and his retinue had settled in Britain. Brutus was said to be the great-grandson of Aeneas, the hero of Virgil's *Aeneid*. Receiving an oracle to look for a new home at the edge of the world, he arrived at Totnes. Defeating the giants who remained from antiquity he and his followers founded Troynovant, or New Troy, as their main settlement. This became London, generating the powerful myth for subsequent rulers that they were descended from Roman aristocracy. Antiquaries such as Camden and Verstegan did much to disprove such stories and replace



them with the carefully argued case for the central role played by the Anglo-Saxons in English history.

Sir Robert Bruce Cotton was one of the foremost antiquaries and collectors of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. He assembled an important library. Neither James I (1566-1625) nor Charles I had a national library at their disposal and so Cotton's library became a de facto national resource, as its owner made its contents available to all interested parties. The library was in the New Exchange in The Strand by 1614. By 1622 it formed a part of the fabric of government, residing in Cotton House, which adjoined the House of Commons. This provided easy access for members of Parliament to consult its contents. Stuart Handley describes Cotton's library thus in the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*: "At his death Cotton's library consisted mainly of Anglo-Saxon manuscripts, monastic registers, biblical works, including lives of the saints and martyrs, genealogies and heraldic materials, and state papers relating to England's domestic and foreign affairs (not to mention the artefacts which were kept at Conington)" (online edition, par. 18 of 18). The library contained copies of the Magna Carta, the only extant copy of *Beowulf* and many Anglo-Saxon texts. Cotton also had important collections of coins and medals and even a fragment of the skull of Thomas à Becket (Parry, *Trophies* 93). His tour of Hadrian's Wall with Camden in 1600 brought many Roman items into his collection.

A work which had an important impact on the fledgling and related discipline of chronology was John Selden's *Marmora Arundelliana* (1628). Chronology, sometimes called technical or historical chronology, was the science of examining calendars and dates in ancient and medieval history and was closely related to antiquarianism because studying historical records in order to provide the dates of past events and establishing periods of time was very helpful to the antiquarian enterprise. Two of the fundamental works of chronology were by the French scholar Joseph Scaliger (1540-1609). Several ancient texts had reappeared during the Renaissance offering the possibility to work on ancient chronology. Scaliger's *De Emendatione Temporum* (1598) and *Thesaurus Temporum* (1606) gave accounts firstly of his principles of chronology and secondly ample chronologies of the ancient world (Parry, *Trophies* 146). The sudden and unexpected arrival of a consignment of Greek statues and inscribed stones in London was greeted by Thomas Howard, the future fourteenth earl of Arundel and his closest friends with considerable enthusiasm. Howard eventually succeeded to the title in 1646 on the death of his father and was well known as a collector of paintings. Among the pieces included in the consignment was the Parian Marble, which bore a substantial inscription containing much chronological information about

Athenian history. Hitherto scholars had found it difficult to establish with any degree of certainty a chronology for the individual nations of the ancient world, let alone to correlate the respective histories of the Jews, Greeks and Romans. It was difficult to compile a meaningful chronology for the Jews, despite the ample information given in the Old Testament. Greek history was well supplied with dates but not before 500 BC. And at that stage the Egyptian hieroglyphic language had not been understood, so the dynasties of the Egyptian pharaohs remained unknown. Any attempt to correlate events across the main cultures was made difficult by the fact that each one had its own way of measuring time, making the production of any kind of synchronized history very difficult. The information contained on the Parian Marble was of considerable help in establishing some synchronization between histories. Selden created a *Canon Chronicus* (92-109) which began in 1582 BC. He suggested a date of 1529 BC for the Flood of Deucalion, which he in turn believed to be the Greek account of Noah's Flood. Selden's book was received enthusiastically among a European audience of scholars and advanced the reputation of the Earl of Arundel as a collector and antiquary. In the absence of a projected catalogue of his collection of paintings, statues and inscribed stones, the *Marmora Arundelliana* remained the most important source of information about his collecting for scholar and virtuoso alike from the 1630s onwards (Parry, *Trophies* 126-7).

As Adam Fox writes in the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, a deeper understanding of Britain's pagan past came with the work of John Aubrey (1626-97). In January 1649 he first saw the megalithic temple at Avebury in the county of Wiltshire. In September 1663 he carried out a survey of Avebury for Charles II and looked at Stonehenge as well. What he wrote as a result of this turned into his *Monumenta Britannica, or, A Miscellanie of British Antiquities* (unpublished manuscript, 1693). Aubrey introduced a new understanding of Britain's megalithic remains in the first part of the work, the *Templa druidum*. He suggested that both Avebury and Stonehenge were probably druid temples. In the second part, entitled *Chorographia antiquaria* he wrote about Roman towns, castles and other aspects of the military infrastructure. Part Three is about roads, coins and funereal items. The fourth and last part includes an attempt to outline a series of architectural styles which Aubrey had written in 1671 (online edition, par. 8 of 20). Aubrey applied Baconian criteria in his work *The Natural History of Wiltshire*, which was not published until 1847 by

the Wiltshire Topographical Society and then reprinted in 1969.<sup>7</sup> In this work Aubrey was less interested in the traditional tools of the antiquary such as parish registers and inscriptions and more interested to describe the natural features of the county (Parry, *Trophies* 278). Aubrey writes about the air, medicinal springs, soils, minerals and fossils (278). He was elected as a fellow to the Royal Society in January 1663. He was highly regarded for his opposition to any kind of divisiveness in religion or politics and often remarked on the destruction carried out during the civil war. In general, Aubrey was undervalued for a long time. For Fox the “reasons for the overlooking or undervaluing of his importance are varied. As with so many people of genuine originality, much of what he achieved went unrecognized by contemporaries because unorthodox” (online edition, par. 18 of 19). Certainly, the breadth of Aubrey’s interests and the significance of his contribution to several different fields of study complicate any attempt to classify him (online edition, par. 5 of 19). However, his manuscripts lacked organization and so in his day they were rarely serviceable for publication (online edition, par. 18 of 19).<sup>8</sup> He was not the subject of any satires, probably because he brought little to completion during his lifetime.

Antiquaries were interested both in the physical remains of antiquity and in written records, so their interests were both material and textual. With the new emphasis on producing historical accounts based on physical objects, antiquarianism is the first example of a new form of learning which we encounter in this thesis and for which there was a satirical reception. Before the advent of antiquarianism, the previous history of Britain had been little more than a shadow cast by the ignorance of the living. By engaging with the past through its material remnants, antiquaries brought into focus the societies which had preceded their own. By the end of the seventeenth century it was accepted that society before the Romans was primitive (Parry, *Trophies* 359). It was also widely accepted that the Roman invasion and settlement had been important and that a Roman reality lay behind the fabric of seventeenth-century England and that its remains lay both above and below the

---

<sup>7</sup> John Aubrey, *Aubrey’s Natural History of Wiltshire. A Reprint of the Natural History of Wiltshire* (Newton Abbot: David & Charles, 1969).

<sup>8</sup> “[Aubrey] may with justice be said to be the founding father of three academic disciplines in Britain, being the author of the first English books entirely devoted to archaeology, place names, and folklore. At the same time he pioneered a new kind of fieldwork in the study of natural phenomena and anticipated many of the interests of modern historical scholarship. In his *Brief Lives*, moreover, he penned one of the great literary works of his age. Its intimate and minutely observed biographical sketches of many of the great personalities of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries are unrivalled and represent a unique source for much of the personal and anecdotal information which they contain” (Fox, *ODNB* par. 5 of 19).

ground. And it was antiquarianism which discredited the story of Brutus, the legendary settler of London. Antiquarianism became a powerful source of knowledge about the past and how the past had come into being.

#### 1.2. EARLY SATIRICAL ACCOUNTS OF ANTIQUARIES

Antiquities are Historie defaced, or some remnants of History,  
which have casually escaped the shipwrack [sic] of time.

Sir Francis Bacon, *Of the Advancement of Learning* (2000), 65.

The satirical reception of the New Learning in English literature begins with the responses of poets and dramatists to antiquarianism as represented by the historical figures we have just examined.<sup>9</sup> In particular, the perception by the unsympathetic satirist was that the antiquary was concerned with a fatuous area of study and the meaningless accumulation of physical objects, which were often in a state of marked physical decay. These were common accusations in the satirical accounts of the antiquaries written in the late sixteenth century and early seventeenth century. Antiquarianism was regarded as fatuous by its critics because they could not see past the deterioration of the items which had been found by the antiquary to their historical importance. The satirists often wrote about the rust which resulted from a historical artefact or the dust on an old manuscript, both strongly reductive satirical strategies. The satirical reception of the antiquary in England is sporadic, but consistently harsh. This may be due in part to the difficult position of antiquarianism in the early seventeenth century. The first Society of Antiquaries had been founded in 1586. Records of the first meetings in the 1580s and the 1590s show a consistent concern with how national institutions and customs came into being. Among early topics discussed at the Society's meetings were the origin of sterling as a currency and the development of titles such as the Earl Marshal, a hereditary office of great importance in royal coronations. Research of such an apparently academic nature might seem selfless enough, but when James VI of Scotland became James I, King of England, things changed. James believed in the divine right of kings and in support of this position published *The True Law of Free*

---

<sup>9</sup> In these earlier literary examples writers use the word "antiquary," while the modern word "antiquarian," although in use in the seventeenth century, became more widespread from the later eighteenth century onwards. The Society of Antiquaries of London was founded in 1707 and despite this the word "antiquarian" flourished. Both mean the same thing, although an antiquary sometimes refers to someone who is an "official custodian or recorder of antiquities". This in turn may be related to a misunderstanding of John Leland's status under Henry VIII ("antiquary, adj. and n." *OED Online*. Oxford UP, December 2018. Web. 31 December 2018).

*Monarchies* in Edinburgh in 1598. It was reprinted after his accession to the English throne (Parry, *Trophies* 101). In fact after James's coronation topics for discussion at the Society of Antiquaries had become more political. In 1607 James spoke disparagingly of the Society, fearing that it might undermine his royal project and as a result the Society stopped meeting.

The assembly of the few complete poems and lines from poems, the character sketches and extracts from longer works that first satirized the figure of the antiquary is an activity reminiscent of those undertaken by the antiquaries themselves. Claire Preston has provided valuable bibliographical information on the subject (Preston, *Browne* 155-74). It has been argued that the body of late sixteenth and early seventeenth century satire of which these examples form a part shows a fundamental continuity despite appearing in a variety of forms, and that there is a far stronger presence in these works of the domestic medieval tradition of attacking the Seven Deadly Sins than of Classical literature (Leishman qtd in Guilpin 19). While it is perhaps fatuous to speak of "phases" or "eras," since there are not so very many examples to consider, I do nonetheless see the available evidence falling into four distinct types because of the different satirical butts in the respective works.

Firstly, we have the satires of the late Elizabethans, namely Thomas Nashe, Everard or Edward Guilpin and Thomas Lodge (1558-1625). The first of their satirical accounts comes in Thomas Nashe's *Pierce Penilesse his Supplication to the Devil*, a prose tract published in 1592. I see these satirists as referring to spurious antiquities which are described in terms which are not dissimilar to religious relics. It is likely that these items would in all likelihood have been encountered during visits to Europe, particularly to Rome. In the works of these Elizabethan satirists the figure of the Antiquary, sometimes capitalized, is sometimes interchangeable with that of the similarly characterized Liar. And this personification of the Liar is indeed reminiscent of the medieval morality play with its focus on the Seven Deadly Sins.

Secondly, the work of John Donne and John Earle makes reference to a figure typical of the group of real-life dedicated antiquaries which emerges in the late 1500s and the early 1600s, the most important being William Camden and Sir Robert Cotton. Donne wrote little on the subject, but there is an epigram and another reference in his "Fifth Satire" (*The Major Works*, ll. 83-91). There is also a passing reference to the antiquary in one of his *Essays on Divinity*, written either at the end of 1614 or the beginning of 1615 (56). Earle included an important character sketch of the antiquary in his *Micro-cosmographie*, first published in 1628. The comedy *The Antiquary* (1641) by Shackerley Marmion (1603-39) is the most substantial satirical and dramatic treatment of the subject. In terms of the antiquities that

form the butt of Marmion's satire, his choices are reminiscent of the earlier works under discussion and indeed he quotes directly from Earle's character. But the impetus to write the comedy surely came from the seizure of Cotton's library in 1629.

I will discuss, in the third place, three examples of satirical writing from the Interregnum. Robert Heath's poem "To Vetus an old Antiquary" was published in 1650. Heath (*bap.* 1620, d. in or after 1685) was a Royalist and so was continuing to give expression to the hostility of the Stuart court to the figure of the antiquary. Two other examples are "The Character of an Antiquarian" and a poem, "Against Antiquarians," which are to be found in the volume *Naps upon Parnassus* (1658), attributed to Thomas Flatman (1635-88) and others. As Nicholas Jagger states in his article on Austin in the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, the authorship is difficult to determine, but in general the volume was a burlesque on the poetry of Samuel Austin, who flourished between 1652 and 1671 (online edition, par. 3 of 4). What is interesting about the poem is that unlike most others on the subject it enumerates what might be called curiosities from religious history.

There are, fourthly, two works published after the Restoration of Charles II. These are firstly Thomas D'Urfey's comedy *Madam Fickle* (1677), which for its antiquarian content is indebted to Marmion's *The Antiquary*; secondly, the figure of the virtuoso with antiquarian interests makes an appearance in William King's *A Journey to London in the Year 1698*. In these works, we can observe a transition from the antiquarian to the figure of the virtuoso, who is the topic of the chapters that follow. But the incorporation of the figure of the antiquary into that of the virtuoso will be more fully illustrated when the satirical reception of antiquarianism is taken up again later in the second part of this thesis, in the discussion of the historical figure of John Woodward (1665/8-1728).

### 1.3. GUILPIN, NASHE AND LODGE

The whole world is set on mischiefe.

Thomas Lodge, *The Complete Works of Thomas Lodge* (1963), 4:7.

The antiquary is someone who gives great value to things from the past, things which to other people may appear to have no value at all. In the late sixteenth century this interest in old things was new. It attracted the hostility of those unable to share the antiquary's insight that an object from the past might illuminate the context from which it came. There were precedents in classical literature for satirizing these concerns. The type of the antiquary

was known to the Roman poet Martial (c. 40 AD-c. 103 AD), as we can see from the following prose translation of one of Martial's poems:

Nothing is so boring as old Euctus' originals (I had rather have cups shaped from Saguntine clay), when he rehearses the smoky pedigrees of his silver and turns the wine moldy with his chatter: "These goblets once belonged to Laomedon's table: Apollo built the walls with his lyre to get them. With this mixing bowl fierce Rhoecus commenced battle with the Lapiths; you see how the piece was damaged in the struggle. These two bases are valuable because of long-lived Nestor; the dove shines, polished by the Pylion thumb. Here we have a bowl in which Aeacus' grandson bade more and livelier wine to be mixed for his friends. In this dish fairest Dido pledged Bitias, when she gave dinner to the Phrygian hero." After you have much admired the antique embossments, in Priam's vessels you will drink—Astyanax. (*Epigrams*, VIII, 6)<sup>10</sup>

Euctus enjoys a special relationship with the antiquities he has collected. He has knowledge about them and the ability to interpret them. This is what Martial satirizes here. The poem opens with the premise that there is nothing more hateful than the antiques of Euctus when their owner talks incessantly of the fanciful pedigrees of his silver, talking at such length that the wine he has poured for his guests loses its lustre. Euctus describes most of the antiques in his own voice. What is important about his commentary is that he makes very real links between his antiquities and the heroes of classical mythology, even remarking features on his silver which resulted from physical contact with them. There are cups which Apollo won building the walls of Troy by playing the harp; there is a mixing-bowl damaged in the fight between the Lapithae and the Centaurs; two goblets handled by the elderly Nestor, tarnished by the rubbing of his thumb; a tankard in which Achilles asked for a stronger wine; a bowl owned by Dido. The poem closes with the notion that once you have appreciated

---

<sup>10</sup> Archetypis vetuli nihil est odiosus Aucti  
 (ficta Saguntino cymbia malo luto),  
 argenti furiosa sui cum stemmata narrat  
 garrulus et verbis mucida vina facit:  
 "Laomedontaeae fuerant haec pocula mensae:  
 ferret ut haec, muros struxit Apollo lyra.  
 hoc cratere ferox commisit proelia Rhoetus  
 cum Lapithis: pugna debile cernis opus.  
 hi duo longaveo censentur Nestore fundi:  
 police de Pylion trita Columba nitet.  
 hic scyphus est in quo misceri iussit amicis  
 largius Aeacides vividiusque merum.  
 hac propinavit Bitiae pulcherrima Dido  
 in patera, Phrygio cum data cena viro est."  
 miratus fueris cum Prisca toreumata multum,  
 in Priami calathis Astyanacta bibes. (Martial 160)

these antiquities you will drink something young and immature in the cups of Priam. This suggests a lack of social accomplishment on the part of Euctus, who serves an inappropriate drink to his guest. The words “furiosa . . . cum stemmata” introduce this list of treasures with the verdict that the stories that Euctus is telling are false.

This satirical characterization of the antiquary as mendacious, garrulous and socially inept may have provided an antecedent for the poets of late Elizabethan England who read Latin, but Martial’s poem seems much more sophisticated than the work of some of those poets. A poet like Edward Guilpin, who was born in around 1572 and flourished between 1598 and 1601, may have been influenced by Martial in his use of the epigram as a poetic form, but the form of his satires points to a reading of Juvenal. The work for which Guilpin is mainly known is the *Skialetheia. Or, A Shadowe of Truth, in certain Epigrams and Satyrs* (1598). A similar treatment of the antiquary as mendacious is found in his *Satyra prima*:

Like foppery

The Antiquary would persuade vs to:

He shewes a peece of blacke-iack for the shooe,  
Which old Aegeus bequeathd his valiant sonne:  
A peece of pollisht mother of pearle’s the spoone  
*Cupid* eate pappe with; and he hath a dagger  
Made of the sword wherewith great *Charles* did swagger.  
Oh that whip of fooles, great *Aretine*,  
Whose words were squibs, and crackers every line,  
Liu’d in our dayes, to scourge these hypocrites,  
Whose taunts may be like gobblins and sprights:  
To taunt these wretches forth that little left them  
Of ayery wit; (for all the rest’s bereft them)  
Oh how the varges from his blacke pen wrung,  
Would sauce the Idiome of the English tongue,  
Giue it a new touch, liuelier Dialect  
to hear this two-neckt goose, this falsehood checkt. (*Skialetheia* I: 136-52)

The antiquary here has three objects which might be encountered any day in Elizabethan England: a piece of a black leather jerkin used for polishing shoes; a polished piece of mother-of-pearl; and a dagger.<sup>11</sup> He displays these respectively as being something left by the Athenian king Aegeus to his son, the hero Theseus; a spoon used by Cupid to eat pap when young; a dagger made from the sword of the Holy Roman Emperor Charles VI (1500-58). Guilpin characterizes the antiquary and his kind as “these hypocrites” a few lines later, thus implying that they are sellers of false wares. But this mendaciousness is not really the

---

<sup>11</sup> Mother-of-pearl, n., int. and adj. “A smooth, shining, iridescent substance forming the inner layer of the shell of some molluscs, esp. oysters and abalones, and used in ornamentation.” (“Mother-of-pearl, n, int. and adj.” *OED Online*. Oxford UP, March 2019. Web. 14 March 2019.)



same as the sort which is satirized by Martial. Guilpin invokes the spirit of the Italian satirist Pietro Aretino (1492-1556) as a necessary aide in denouncing such things, calling him “the whip of fooles”. This reflects the late Elizabethan reception of Aretino as a fierce satirical scourge. For Guilpin, the perceived mendaciousness of antiquaries requires the sternest satirical response, something contemporary English writing lacks. He suggests that “the varges from his (Aretino’s) blacke pen wrung / Would sauce the Idiome of the English tongue,” resulting in a “liulier Dialect” with the result that “this two-neck’t goose, this falsehood” of the antiquary would be checked. The deception of the Elizabethan antiquary seems more shameless, rougher in its nature than the sort portrayed in Martial’s poem. Guilpin is denouncing the deception in moral terms and in a form deriving from Juvenal.

The first example of the satirical treatment of the antiquary that I have identified predates Guilpin’s poem by six years: *Pierce Penilesse His Supplication to the Divell* by Thomas Nashe.<sup>12</sup> Ostensibly an appeal to the devil, the work is in fact a satirical farrago directed at a wide range of targets. The passage which is given the title “The commendation of Antiquaries” in the margin occurs later in the work, which in the first edition consisted of 40 leaves and so ran to 81 pages. In keeping with the overall tenor of *Pierce Penilesse*, the passage is a diatribe, yet it is a well-constructed one. It consists of nine sentences, the first four of which deride the interests of the antiquary; the next three mock those who sell antiquities; the last two summarize and judge the antiquary. There is no attempt to engage with the antiquary’s reasons for taking an interest in antiquities, which are described in a hostile way. Nashe dismisses them as nonsensical by using caricature and mockery. Antiquarianism is described judgmentally as “this mustie vocation” (Nashe 1: 182).

Nashe opens his account ironically, asserting that the antiquary is an honest man, preferring to “scrape a peece of copper out of the durt, than a crowne out of *Ploydens* standish” (Nashe 1: 182).<sup>13</sup> Nashe then reports the conversation of “many wise Gentlemen” who are “out of loue with the times wherein they liue” in the course of which the stirrups of Alexander the Great are praised for having stronger leather and being better tempered iron than anything “made now adayes” (1: 182). The third item in Nashe’s inventory is described thus: “They will blow their nose in a boxe, & say it is the spettle that *Diogenes* spet in ones face” (1: 182). There follows an explanation of this as something which had happened at the

---

<sup>12</sup> I refer to the version published in the first volume (149-245) with notes in the fourth volume in *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, 5 vols. (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1958).

<sup>13</sup> Edmund Plowden (1518-85) was a jurist of the day (4: 112, n. 18).

antiquary's home over dinner, when Diogenes spat in his host's face because it was "the foulest place he could spie out in all his house" (1: 182). Here Nashe mocks the antiquary abusively through the conceit that Diogenes the Cynic is alive at the time of writing and can be invited to dinner and uses the convention of Diogenes's reputation for dealing in harsh truths to insult the antiquary. The fourth item specified by Nashe is a feather from a fan that has been given by a woman to the antiquary, and which he represents as "a plume of the Phenix, whereof there is but one in all the whole world" (1: 182-3). It is striking that in the description of the third and fourth antiquities, the antiquary is portrayed as mendacious. The next three sentences shift the focus to the providers of antiquities. Antiquaries possess "a thousand guegawes and toyes" purchased "with infinite expence," which their vendors have told them are "rare and pretious," while in fact they have been gathered "vpon some dunghill" or have been raked "out of the kennel by chance" (1: 183 et seq.). The next example is also intended to illustrate the mean deceptions perpetrated by vendors of antiquities. An old rope with four knots in it is sold for four pounds on the basis that it was "the length and breadth of Christs Tombe". The next example shows what a tinker can make of "a peece of brasse worth a half penie". The last two sentences provide judgement and condemnation. Antiquaries are dismissed as "newfangled humorists that know not what to doe with their welth". A "humorist" here is someone given to capricious behaviour. And the final verdict is that those preoccupied with such trifles have "a very rusty witte, so to doate on worme-eaten Elde". "Elde" here means "antiquity". Nashe's style in this passage is harsh, scabrous and slightly wild. Nashe is foremost among the later Elizabethan satirists for being drawn to Juvenal's style of satire. The figure of the satirist Juvenal who had no patron would have appealed to Nashe, as it did to Guilpin and others (Burrow 245).

The notion that the antiquities the late Elizabethan satirists were concerned with had their origin in Europe is at its clearest in Thomas Lodge's *Wits Miserie, and the Worlds Madnesse: Discovering the Devils Incarnat of this Age* (1596): "Who is this with the Spanish hat, the Italian ruffe, the French doublet, the Musses cloak, the Toledo rapier, the German hose, the English stocking, and the Flemish shoes? Forsooth a sonne of MAMMONS that hath of long time ben a travailer, his name is LYING, a Deuill at your commandement . . ." (4: 41). Here again the Liar and the Antiquarian are one:

Hée will tell you néere Naples of miraculous wels, and of a stone in Calabria that fell from heauen, and no sooner toucht the earth, but it became a faire chappell . . . hée hath oile of Saint IAMES, Saint PETERS forefinger, Saint Annes skirt of her neckerchiefe, Saint Dunstons walking staffe, The stone of the Deuill offered Christ to make bread on, the top of

LUNGES speare, the barke of the trée of life in Paradice, a stone of  
 TRAIANS Tombe, a piece of CAESARS chaire wherein hée was slaine in the  
 Senate house. (4: 41)

In his edition of Guilpin's *Skialetheia* D. Allen Carroll argues in favour of the similarity of the contents of this passage to lines in Guilpin's poem quoted above which detail some antiquities of which two have their supposed origins in classical mythology while another is associated with the Holy Roman Emperor Charles I. The inclusion of a piece of Caesar's chair from the Roman Senate in the passage from Lodge shows that the market for religious relics is one and the same as the one for secular relics.

#### 1.4. JOHN DONNE

The figure of the antiquary makes a modest appearance in the poetry of John Donne, but enough of one to merit comment. Arguably Donne's satires belong with those of his friend Guilpin, written as they were largely in the 1590s. We also know that Donne was in correspondence with Guilpin about satire, as is witnessed by the poem "To Mr E.G." included in *Satires* (64), as Annabel Patterson has explained (117). However, Donne strikes a slightly different note when he writes about antiquaries. The antiquary is one more contemporary figure among many in Elizabethan England and is not derided in the same terms. Donne gives the antiquary the name Hammon or Haman. The figure appears in "Antiquary," one of Donne's *Epigrams*, and towards the end of the "Fifth Satire".

There are various manuscript versions of the epigram. Firstly, here is one with the name Hammon:

If in his Studie Hammon hath such care  
 To'hang all old strange things, let his wife beware. (*Satires* 52)

And secondly, here is another which does not have the name:

If in his study he hath so much care  
 To hang all old strange things, let his wife beware. (*The Major Works* 34)

As a collection, the *Epigrams* show Donne taking part in the life of late Elizabethan and early Jacobean London with all its fervour and lusts (Bell 204). We may also be in the presence of the voice of the poet here, since according to poetic convention the epigram conveys the poet's voice directly to the world in which he lives and upon which he comments (204). Donne's collection was probably complete by the time Sir Robert Bruce Cotton began to seek official status for antiquarian studies in around 1602. And so the fuel of Donne's satire is the perception of antiquaries as strange dwellers in the past, newly fascinated with things old and musty and therefore in some way perverse and misguided, rather than any perception

that antiquarianism was a subversive discipline. From a formal point of view the epigram is obviously by its very nature concise. The critique, especially in an epigram consisting of only one couplet, is expressed by stating a general condition and then incorporating the subject or something related to the subject of the epigram satirically into the general condition and with a view to making a critique of the subject. This is exactly what Donne does here. He problematizes the activities of the antiquary by saying that he is concerned with hanging up “all old strange things” in his study. This is the general condition. Then in the clause “let his wife beware” the poet conveys the idea that the antiquary’s wife is also an old strange thing and that the antiquary may also hang her up in his study. Milgate suggests that Donne’s source is an old joke about an antiquary who, when asked for an example from his collection, shows his interlocutor “his wife who was foure score years of age” (qtd in Donne, *Satires* 200, n. 1.). The French original of this joke by H. Estienne is dated 1566 and appeared in print in an English translation in 1607, after the composition of Donne’s epigram. However, the joke may have been in general circulation.

The antiquary Hammon or Haman typifies another characteristic when he appears in Donne’s “Fifth Satire”. The poem is addressed to a corrupt official who is trying to sell a legal document for personal gain. Here, the antiquary is made to look foolish, since he loses money when he sells his antiquities, accepting less than he paid for them originally. In the following lines, Haman provides a comparison with the addressee of Donne’s satire:

Thou hadst much, and law’s Urim and Thummin try  
 Thou wouldst for more; and for all hast paper  
 Enough to clothe all the Great Carrack’s pepper.  
 Sell that, and by that thou much more shalt leese,  
 Than Haman, when he sold his antiquities.  
 O wretch that thy fortunes should moralize  
 Aesop’s fables, and make tales, prophecies.  
 Thou’rt the swimming dog whom shadows cozened,  
 And div’st, near drowning, for what vanished. (*The Major Works*, 83-91)

Milgate suggests the satire was probably written in 1598 and that it was addressed to Donne’s employer Sir Thomas Egerton, the Lord Keeper. Egerton was investigating the extortions of legal officials and so the satire exists to berate those who were abusing the legal system in this fashion. Donne’s “Fifth Satire” is difficult, containing several arcane references. In this respect Donne appears to have taken his stylistic cue from Persius, whose Latin satires were known for their difficulty.

As in Donne’s “Fifth Satire,” the antiquary appears in his *Essays in Divinity* in the form of a simile. While the antiquary is made to look foolish in the former, he is introduced

respectfully in the latter for his diligent scholarship. This is brought into play to counter the errors that are sometimes found in the text of the Bible. This occurs in a section entitled *Variety in the Number*. Donne begins with the general reflection that any error in numbering will destroy credibility. He then observes that the greatest danger to the Scriptures is “the appearance of Error in Chronology, or other limbs and members of Arithmetick” (56). Donne even provides God with a motive for creating confusion through inconsistent chronology: “To make men sharpe and industrious in the inquisition of truth, he withdrawes it from present apprehension, and obviousness” (56). And this is where Donne introduces the image of the antiquaries working joyfully on putting right the contradictions of Scripture:

For naturally great wits affect the reading of obscure books, wrestle and sweat in the explication of prophesies, dig and thresh out the words of unlegible hands, resuscitate and bring to life again the mangled, and lame fragmentary images and characters in Marbles and Medals, because they have a joy and complacency in the victory and atchievement thereof. (56)

This suggests a more informed, nuanced view of the antiquary, less the work of a younger man swift to condemn and more the work of a middle-aged divine who has developed an overview of how the spectrum of knowledge is formed.

#### 1.5. CHARACTER SKETCHES

John Earle wrote a notable character sketch of the antiquary which was published in 1628. To discuss the merits and demerits of this and other character sketches, it is necessary to document the origin of this genre which flourished in the seventeenth century in England. The English reception of the genre known as the character, or the character sketch, began with the publication of an edition by Isaac Casaubon (1559-1614) of Theophrastus’s *Characters* in 1592.<sup>14</sup> There is some debate among classicists about the nature of this work. In a modern edition of the *Characters* it has been argued that they were written for a *Poetic* and were intended to be of use to both poets and orators (Theophrastus 11-12). They were in this way intended to provide a basis for characterization, either in the context of writing a play or a speech. There is in these original characters a judgemental quality in the description

---

<sup>14</sup> Theophrastus. *Theophrasti Characteres ethici, sive Descriptiones morum Graece/ Isaacus Casaubonus recensuit, in Latinum sermonem vertit, et libro commentario illustravit* (Lyon, 1592). Isaac Casaubon’s edition of Theophrastus’s *Characters* was published relatively early in his career, although he had already established his reputation as a philologist by the time it appeared. It consisted of the Greek text of the 23 characters then known with a Latin translation. There were thirty-three editions before 1800. The philosopher Theophrastus (371 BC-287 BC) took over at the Lyceum in Athens after the death of Alexander the Great caused Aristotle to leave the city. The *Characters* are his most famous work.

of the various character types which is taken up by their English imitators. This appears to be inevitable given that the characters are all concerned with deficiencies in or excesses of character. They were probably intended as a repertory of stock characters for comic portrayal on the stage. In formal terms the writer of character sketches adheres strictly to the subject. Each character sketch is therefore monothematic, generally describing a character type or a profession, such as a country gentleman or a justice of the peace. The sardonic tone varies slightly from author to author and each displays his own stylistic idiosyncrasies. The first writer of character sketches in English was Joseph Hall (1574-1656), whose *Characters of Vertues and Vices* appeared in 1608. Subsequent writers of character sketches were Sir Thomas Overbury (*bap.* 1581-1613), John Earle and Samuel Butler. Both Earle and Butler wrote character sketches of antiquaries.

The genre of the character sketch represents a rhetorical exercise in pejorative portrayal in a short space of text. It is not the place to look for complex and multifaceted characterization. Rather it is the home of sustained criticism of the subject with an air of decrying the iniquities of the era in which it is written. As a rhetorical exercise the interest lies in the verbal choices made by the writer for his critique. Let us examine here the choices John Earle makes in writing his character sketch of the antiquary. Earle's *An Antiquarie* is the eighth character sketch in his collection *Micro-cosmographie. Or, A Peece of the World Discovered; In Essays and Characters*, published in 1628. We have already seen in Donne's epigram the thematization of old age as an obvious vehicle for satirizing the antiquary and that trope is present here. Earle describes the antiquary as having "that vnnaturall disease to bee enamour'd of old age, and wrinckles" (n. pag. et seq.). There are many images of decay: the antiquary fetches out of the maw of time "many things . . . all rotten and stinking"; he "loves all things (as Dutchmen doe Cheese) the better for being mouldy and worme-eaten"; he will pore over a manuscript, especially if the cover is moth-eaten. The antiquary shows such devotion to a broken statue that it would almost make him an "Idolater". Many of the antiquary's interests are satirized here: ancient monuments, coins, manuscripts and animal parts. It is the rust of old monuments that interests him rather than the monuments themselves. As we shall see, rust is taken up by later writers as a way of satirizing the concerns of antiquarians. Earle enumerates some ancient monuments to dramatize the antiquary's distractedness. He writes that the antiquary will travel 40 miles to see a Saint's well or a ruined abbey, but if he sees a cross or a stone footstool along the way, he will tarry and examine it for so long "till he forget his journey". Of the coins Earle writes "his estate consists much in shekels, and Roman Coynes". This puts the emphasis on the coins as part of

an inheritance, questioning their value in that context. In a library he prefers spiders and their cobwebs to authors and their works. The antiquary is portrayed as gullible when Earle writes that “beggars coozen him with musty things” which they have “rak’t from dunghils”. His interest in the ancient and rare is portrayed when Earle writes that he would exchange all the rare books in his study for a book with a Roman binding or six lines of Cicero in his own hand. The antiquary’s chamber is usually hung “with strange Beasts skins, and is a kind of Charnel-house of bones extraordinary, and his discourse vpon them, if you will heare him, shall last longer”. The character then focuses on the figure of the antiquary himself and mocks him in terms of what is old and mortal. His attire is in a style which is most out of fashion. He only looks upon himself when he is gray-hair’d “and then he is pleased with his owne Antiquitie”. His grave holds no fear for him, since he has had many dealings with sepulchres. And finally, he is grateful to death for reuniting him with his ancestors. The structure of the character is well managed. It opens with the image of the antiquary being “strangely thrifty of Time past, & an enemie indeed to his Maw”. This neatly characterizes his attachment to the past and his efforts to wrest physical objects from the effects of physical disintegration. And appropriately the character concludes with the antiquary’s death, which Earle ironizes by saying that the antiquary happily accepts it.

Earle’s character sketch of an antiquary sets the tone for much subsequent writing on the subject. The range of imagery is largely restricted to decay and putrefaction, while the worship of a broken statue turns the antiquary into an idolater. The antiquary has an interest in holy wells and ruined abbeys and old coins. Cobwebs and manuscripts, especially manuscripts with a moth-eaten cover, will be popular recurring images to describe the antiquary. Earle’s one would exchange his entire library for six lines of Cicero in the orator’s own hand, indicating the importance to him of Roman literature. “The Character of an Antiquarian”, which was published in *Naps upon Parnassus* in 1658, is rather different in tone for having been written during the Interregnum. It is largely concerned with attacking the antiquarian as irreligious. The interest in physically removing inscriptions on tombs is denounced: “hence ‘tis he vexes the Tombs for almost mortified Inscriptions, and sacrilegiously steals that away from them, which did both cover and comprehend them” (*Naps upon Parnassus* n. pag). Marjorie Swann observes that during the Interregnum “antiquarians and chorographers attempted to salvage the physical remnants of an elite culture on the brink of destruction” (99). This appears to be the activity incurring reproach here.

Butler's character sketch *An Antiquary* by contrast extends the way in which the figure is portrayed by using unusual comparisons. Butler displays continuity with Earle in a passage such as the following: "He devours an old Manuscript with greater Relish than Worms and Moths do, and, though there be nothing in it, values it above any Thing printed, which he accounts but a Novelty" (77). A new note is struck by the comparison with those who value what is past and gone, "like the Madman, that fell in Love with *Cleopatra*" (76). With a peculiar variety of unkind humour Butler characterizes his antiquary in the following way: "He honours his Forefathers and Fore-mothers, but condemns his Parents as too modern, and no better than Upstarts" (76). All of his contemplations look backwards, "and his Brains are turned with them, as if he walked backwards" (77). This antiquarian has a veneration for words which have fallen out of use (76). In this way Butler takes his antiquary into the realm of philology and textual criticism: "When he happens to cure a botch in an old Author, he is as proud of it, as if he had got the Philosophers Stone, and could cure all the Diseases of Mankind" (77). I will discuss textual criticism in Chapters 8 and 9. Butler's character sketch of an antiquary shows that the antiquary and the textual critic have a common root in the interest in interpreting old manuscripts.

#### 1.6. SHACKERLEY MARMION'S *THE ANTIQUARY*

Shackerley Marmion's comedy *The Antiquary* (1641) is the most substantial example of a work which contains a satirical reception of the figure of the antiquary in the seventeenth century. It is the first of a series of comedies which I shall examine in this thesis which seek to portray and deride different aspects of the New Learning. Marmion is an all but forgotten dramatist who was a disciple of Ben Jonson and who was popular at the court of Charles I. He wrote three plays, the plots of which have been described in the *Dictionary of National Biography* as confused (12: 1077). This might be said of the plot concerned with romantic intrigue in *The Antiquary*, although it does form part of a wider strategy of deception which turns out in favour of the antiquary's nephew Lionell and his sister Angelia. I shall only concern myself here with the main plot in which Lionell's uncle, the antiquary Veterano, is the satirical butt. *The Antiquary* is thought to have been revived in 1718 to celebrate the reopening of The Society of Antiquaries, according to John Drakakis in the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (online edition, par. 5 of 8).

So, for our purposes the most important characters are Veterano, the antiquary, Petro, the Antiquary's boy, Lionell, nephew and heir to the antiquary, and the Duke of Pisa, in whose city the action of the comedy takes place, although references to The Rialto suggest



Venice as the actual location of the action. The main plot is concerned with Lionell's need to be given land or money by his uncle, who spends his time and resources on antiquities. This provides Lionell with sufficient motivation to deceive his uncle for financial gain. The character of Lionell provides the dramatic focus in the first act and speaks in the following negative terms of his uncle:

LIONELL.                      Now I must travell, on a new exploit,  
    To an old Antiquary, he is my Uncle,  
    And I his heir; would I could raise a fortune  
    Out of his ruins: he is grown obsolete,  
    And 'tis time he were out of date; they say he sits  
    All day in contemplation of a statue;  
    With ne're a nose, and dotes on the decays,  
    With greater love, than the self-loved *Narcissus*  
    Did on his beauty: how shall I approach him? (1.1.247-255)

The speech makes use of the rhetorical pattern which has already been established of satirizing an interest in antiquities through foregrounding their physical decay. Marmion refers to "ruins," a statue without a nose and the notion of doting "on the decays" more passionately than Narcissus had done on his own beauty. This portrays the antiquary negatively through the representation of his interests. Lionell then turns to thoughts of how to approach his uncle with a view to deceiving him. To gain his uncle's interest he thinks he might offer:

... Books that have not attain'd  
 To the Platonick year, but wait their course,  
 And happy hour, to be reviv'd again;  
 Then would I induce him to believe they were  
 Some of *Terences* hundred and fifty Comedies,  
 That were lost in the Adriatick Sea,  
 When he return'd from banishment: some such  
 Gullery as this, might be enforc'd upon him;  
 Ile first talk with his man, and then consider. (1.1.262-270)

The reference to the Roman dramatist Terence requires some comment. While it is possible that Terence's journey to Greece at the end of his life was a period of exile, there is no generally received notion that Terence lost so many comedies. Only six survive, so 150 would have represented a considerable increase in the number of attributable works. As a result, this must be a comic exaggeration on Marmion's part. And the notion of "Some of Terences hundred and fifty Comedies" establishes examples of Classical literature in book form as something which can be used to "gull" Veterano, that is to say, with which to dupe him in exchange for money.

Having been only the subject of comment and report in the first act, in the second act Veterano comes on stage and discusses the virtues of antiquarianism with his boy Petro, who acts as a sceptical foil. Veterano has entrusted Petro with some antiquities:

ANTIQUARY. Well, thou dost not know the estimation of what thou hast in keeping; the whole Indies, seeing they are but newly discovered, are not to be valued with them; the very dust that cleaves to one of those Monuments, is more worth than the oare of twenty Mines.

PETRO. Yet by your favour Sir, of what use can they be to you?

ANTIQUARY. What use? did not the Seignory build a state chamber for Antiquities, and 'tis the best thing that e're they did, they are the Registers, the Chronicles of the Age they were made in, and speak the truth of History, better than a hundred of your printed commentaries.

PETRO. Yet few are of your belief.

ANTIQUARY. There's a box of coins within, most of them brasse, yet each of them a Jewell, miraculously preserv'd in spite of time or envie; and are of that rariety and excellence, that saints might go a pilgrimage to them, and not be asham'd.

PETRO. Yet I say still, what good can they do to you, more than to look on? (2.1.357-372)

Tired of Petro's mocking, Veterano urges him to speak in favour of his antiquities:

PETRO. All you Gentlemen, that are affected with rarities, such, the world cannot produce the like, snatch'd from the jaws of time, and wonderfully collected by a studious Antiquary; come neer, and admire. (2.1.377-380)

The first items mentioned are paintings:

PETRO. First, those twelve pictures that you see there, are the portraitures of the *Sibels*, drawn 500 yeers since by *Titianus* of *Padua*, an excellent Painter, and Statuary.

ANTIQUARY. Very well. (2.1.383-386)

Then the collection enters classical territory:

PETRO. Then there's the great silver box that *Nero* kept his beard in.

ANTIQUARY. Good again.

PETRO. And after decking it with precious stones, did consecrate it to the Capitoll.

ANTIQUARY. That's right.

PETRO. And there hangs the Net that held Mars and his mistris, while the whole bench of bawdy Deities, stood spectatours of their sport.

ANTIQUARY. Admirable good. (2.1.394-401)

At the end of Act Two Lionell and the Duke resolve to conspire against the Antiquary. Lionell instructs Petro to tell Veterano about two valuable manuscripts as part of the plan to trick him. Marmion borrows directly from Earle's character of *The Antiquary* in the final speech in the following extract:

ANTIQUARY. Has he such rare things say you?

PETRO. Yes Sir, I believe you have not seen the like of them, they are a couple of old manuscripts, found in a wall, and stor'd up with the foundation, it may be they are the writings of some Prophetesse.

ANTIQUARY. What moves you to think so Petro?

PETRO. Because Sir the characters are so imperfect, for time has eaten out the letters, and the dust makes a parenthesis betwixt every syllable. (3.1.469-475)

The exact phrases from Earle's character are: "A great admirer hee is of the rust of old Monuments, and reads onely those Characters, where time hath eaten out the letters" and "but a *Manu-script* hee pores on euerlastingly, especially if the couer bee all Moth-eaten, and the dust make a Parenthesis betweene euery Syllable" (n. pag.). Marmion is using Earle's words as a way of burlesquing the figure of the antiquary.

According to Henry Peacham, who added a chapter about antiquities to the second edition of his book *The Compleat Gentleman*, published in 1634, the principal items of interest to collectors were "Statues, Incriptions and Coynes" (104). We have encountered a statue "with ne're a nose" contemplated by Veterano. There are no references to inscriptions in the play, an inscription being something difficult to satirize in a theatrical context and more suited either to prose or visual caricature in an engraving or drawing. There are certainly several references to coins and medals in *The Antiquary*. We have already noted the box of brass coins described by the antiquary as "of that rariety and excellence, that saints might go a pilgrimage to them, and not be asham'd" (2.1.369-371). Another example of a coin is "an old Harry groat" (2.1.530) given to Lionell by Veterano as a token of his affection. Veterano urges Lionell to treasure the coin, but Lionell, since it has no value in current terms, is unable to see the worth of it.

It is at first sight difficult to assess the degree to which the antiquities dating from classical times which are included in the play are intended to be satirical. There are a number of these. The net that held Mars and his mistress and which made “the whole bench of bawdy Deities” into “spectatours of their sport” is a notable one (2.1.399-400). Does Marmion expect the audience to take this at face value, or is the antiquity to be taken seriously? We need some insight into contemporary beliefs about such antiquities to be able to interpret Marmion’s comedy on this point. Houghton notes that the credulity of John Evelyn (1620-1706) three decades later was “untaxed by a great nail of Corinthian brass which he is told, came from ‘Nero’s golden house’” (2: 192). Marmion’s play also contains a reference to the silver box in which Nero kept his beard. Such articles were the Renaissance substitute for religious relics, which were no longer of interest to a Protestant antiquary (Houghton 2: 192). The trope becomes explicitly comic when Veterano falls under the influence of alcohol in Act IV and says: “Ile drink with all *Xerxes* army now, a whole river at a draught” (4.1.353). He also claims to be wearing Pompey’s breeches and Caesar’s hat as well as Hannibal’s spectacles. This irony of character undermines Veterano’s perceived pretensions and makes him look foolish. As noted above *The Antiquary* was written as a response to the closure of Sir Robert Cotton’s library in November 1629 on grounds of sedition. The decision by the Duke to confiscate Veterano’s possessions at the end of Act Three mirrors this event.

#### 1.7. THE ANTIQUARY IN THE INTERREGNUM

To Vetus an old Antiquary

*Vetus* upon a Manuscript doth pore,  
 Tiring himself in reading Hist’ry o’r;  
 What *Noah* eat before the floud, or how  
 Learning increas’d, is all his care to know:  
 Out of Troys ashes here he rakes a Storie,  
 Makes him admire its strength, & *Priams* glorie:  
 Tels you who *Athens* built, then talks of Rome,  
 How many Consuls she hath had, and whom;  
 The oldest books and writings him best please,  
 As many love to feed on mouldie cheese:  
 Thus he remembers things forgot, doth know  
 All that is past, but knows not what is now.  
 ‘Troth now ‘tis time to know thy selfe; go die!  
 Converse with th’ddead! here’s none can make reply.

This sonnet is an occasional poem by Robert Heath. It was collected in the volume *Clarastella* which was published in 1650. Heath came from a Royalist family and was educated at Corpus Christi Cambridge. He was appointed to the position of auditor of the court of wards by Charles I in Oxford in June 1643 and translated Virgil's *Aeneid* into English between March 1644 and September 1646. *To Vetus an Old Antiquary* draws on familiar rhetorical strategies in condemning the activities of the antiquary, here personified by capitalizing the Latin word *vetus*, meaning "old, ancient". The word also points towards *veteranus*, the Latin word for a veteran which can also mean a person with great experience or age. Veterano is the name of the antiquary in Marmion's play, so Heath's poem may take its cue from there. The poem focuses on books and manuscripts and is more an attack on learning than on the usual crumbling and decaying trophies of antiquarianism. While everything in the poem is selected to show that the antiquary's focus is fixed on the past, we are not in the presence here of broken statues or physical remnants, except for the manuscript mentioned in the first line. Vetus certainly pores over this manuscript for choice, rather than over a printed book, and is said to be solely concerned with the increase of learning. The concern with what Noah ate before the Flood shows a pedantic mind at work. The interest in classical mythology and history shown in lines five to eight are no more than Heath himself would have shared as a translator of the *Aeneid*, but the *topos* of the antiquary is by now well defined. The wording of the couplet "The oldest books and writings him best please, / As many love to feed on mouldie cheese" makes use of Earle's reference in his character sketch to mouldy cheese: "[The antiquary] loues all things (as Dutchmen doe Cheese) the better for being mouldy and worme-eaten" (Earle, *An Antiquarie*). The *volta* occurs near the end of the poem, a change in direction prompting the poetic voice to say that death is the best option for the antiquary: "Thus he remembers things forgot, doth know / All that is past, but knows not what is now. / 'Troth now 'tis time to know thyselfe; go die! / Converse with th'dead! here's none can make reply." Heath's *Clarastella* was published in 1650, as the Puritans were consolidating their control of the country. Charles I's death warrant had been signed in 1649, the Rump Parliament ruled from 1649 to 1653 before Cromwell took sole charge as the Lord Protector from December 1653 onwards.

Another sonnet "Against Antiquarians" is to be found in the volume *Naps upon Parnassus* (London, 1658), a collection of verse and prose. This poses another challenge. The volume is a burlesque response to the poetry of Samuel Austin, written by Thomas Flatman and others. Here is the sonnet in full:

Against Antiquarians

I Like not *time observers* of our age,  
 Who bring up *Adam* on the *Stage*;  
 And by their too long wasted crime,  
 Blab what was done before *his* time.  
 If you'l but crown their heads with *Bayes*,  
 They'l publish th' Acts of *Joan Popes* dayes:  
 They raise up Antiques from the Grave,  
 To fright away the wit they have,  
 They tell of Ixion in a fog  
 And a blinde tale of *Tobits Dog*.  
 They worship every *Ancients* shrine,  
 And kneel before the *Grecian* wine.  
 They've top'd so much old *Massick Ale*,  
 Their *running* wits are now grown *stale*.

The sonnet is concerned with what one might call several religious curiosities, which are located far from an implied religious orthodoxy. Having created the category of “time observers” in the first line, the poet gives as his first example the Pre-Adamites.<sup>15</sup> This is the first of several quite eclectic religious references which endow the trope of the antiquarian with an original turn, since the poem is not concerned with the usual range of references to broken-nosed statues, rusty monuments and dusty libraries which contain worm-eaten manuscripts, although it soon descends to the level of rebuking an interest in a variety of relatively unconnected references to the past. An interest in Pope Joan, the legendary medieval figure of the female Pope is yoked to Ixion, a figure from classical mythology; Tobit’s dog, from the apocryphal *Book of Tobit* gives way to the shrine of every ancient. The sonnet ends with the antiquarians kneeling before Grecian wine and in the penultimate line they are decried as having drunk too much “*Massick Ale*”.<sup>16</sup> But the poem has something, providing an itinerary of religious curiosities which give way to the idea of alcoholic excess after the volta, and the dismissal of the antiquarians as having stale wits.<sup>17</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup> This is a very topical reference to Isaac de la Peyrère’s work *Praeadamitae*, published in Latin in 1655 and published in English as *Men Before Adam* in 1656. De la Peyrère (1594 or 1596-1676) was born in Bordeaux and brought up as a French Calvinist. The *Praeadamitae*, according to de la Peyrère, was a race which predated the Biblical figure of Adam.

<sup>16</sup> This phrase would usually be “Massick Wine”, a reference to the wines from Monte Massico in Campania, Italy, which were prized in the poems of Horace and others. The word is changed here for the sake of the rhyme with “stale”.

<sup>17</sup> The rhyme scheme is AA-BB-CC-DD-EE-FF-GG, which shows that the poet was thinking in couplets. A Shakespearean sonnet would have quatrains rhymed ABBA-CDDC-EFFE or -EEFF. In fact, only the first line is an iambic pentameter, while the rest are iambic tetrameters. Like Ixion, the author is in a fog, this time an aesthetic one.

1.8. THE SATIRICAL RECEPTION OF ANTIQUARIANISM AFTER THE RESTORATION

Rust adds to an Antiquity, 'tis our Friend . . .

Thomas D'Urfey, *Madam Fickle* (1677), Act 3, Scene 1.

This review of the satirical reception of the antiquary will end with two examples of works in which rust is foregrounded as a satirical tool. These examples date from after the Restoration of the Stuart monarchy in 1660 and were identified as being of interest by Joseph M. Levine (*Dr. Woodward's Shield* 250). Earle's antiquary had certainly been "a great admirer . . . of the rust of old Monuments" but was also mocked for his love of spiders and cobwebs in libraries, and "many things all rotten and stinking" in general. Marmion does not make use of rust as a satirical weapon in *The Antiquary*, but a later comedy which is indebted to it and in which the playwright does make use of rust for satirical ends is *Madam Fickle: Or The Witty False One* (1677) by Thomas D'Urfey (1653?-1723). The focus of D'Urfey's first comedy is the character of Madam Fickle, who is the niece of the antiquary Sir Arthur Oldlove. Her credo is "To betray in me's a virtue, being first betray'd" (53). She has several suitors, despite being already married, and Sir Arthur and his collection of antiquities provide comic relief from the tight plotting of scenes with her various suitors. He describes the most precious item in his collection as follows: "Lastly, this last – tho' most precious and best of all my Reliques; this Vial is full of the tears of St. Jerom, in former years pendant upon the Spire of St. Sepulchres Steeple; but by my indulgent care and great charge redeem'd from thence when the City was on fire" (26). Harry, the son of Sir Arthur's friend Old Jollyman, knocks it over to the great annoyance of Sir Arthur. A Protestant audience in the later 1670s would have been greatly amused by the comic destruction of what is in fact a Roman Catholic relic. This anti-Catholic inflection in the treatment of the figure of the antiquary can be explained by the fact that D'Urfey was writing at the time of increasing anti-Catholic sentiment arising from the lack of a natural heir from Charles II's marriage to Catherine of Braganza (1638-1705). Charles's brother James, Duke of York, later James II (1633-1701) was a Catholic and his status as heir apparent was proving particularly divisive in the 1670s.

There is a slightly extended passage on rust in Act 3, Scene 1:

SIR ARTHUR.                      And this here is the fam'd Hero, Sir Lancelot du Lake's Sword.

TILBURY.                            I'll warrant this has been the death of many a Constable; but methinks, Sir Arthur, the Rust has been a little too bold with it.

SIR ARTHUR.                    Ah Sir! Rust adds to an Antiquity, 'tis our Friend: And we that  
are skill'd in these matters, can by the Rust on a Sword tell  
how long it has been durable. (3.1.32-37)

Many of the antiquities in *Madam Fickle* are borrowed directly from Shackerley Marmion's *The Antiquary*. These include the silver box containing Nero's beard and a bag of "old Harry-Groats". Like many later virtuosi Sir Arthur collects medals. In Act 4 Sir Arthur wants to banish Harry from his house for breaking the vial of St Jerome's tears and says: "'zlid shou'dhe come here, within a Week I should have my ancient Medals of the Romans plaid off at Gaming houses" (38). He envisages his collection of medals being gambled away by Harry in the capital. Despite these references, antiquarianism forms only a part of the subject of the comedy. The interest lies mainly in how the various suitors of Madam Fickle discover their rivals' interest in her and in how they relate to her.<sup>18</sup>

By the time William King wrote *A Journey to London in the Year 1698* (1699), the concerns of the antiquarian were also the concerns of the virtuoso. The work is a satirical response to Martin Lister's *A Journey to Paris in the year 1698* (London, 1698). Lister (*bab.* 1639-1712) was a physician and naturalist who was made a member of the Royal Society in 1671. He was an important figure in the worlds of natural philosophy and medicine in the second half of the seventeenth century and at the beginning of the eighteenth century. Lister published the *Historia Animalium Angliae Tres Tractatus* (1678-81), an important study of spiders and molluscs. He also worked on a series of publications of engravings of shells between 1685 and 1697, which were largely made by his daughters Susanna and Anna, culminating in the *Historia sive Synopsis Methodica Conchyliorum* of 1697. This work laid the foundations of the discipline of conchology, or the study of shells. He began practising as a doctor in York from 1670 onwards. In January 1685 he was elected vice-president of the Royal Society, only to stop attending meetings early the following year. He can with every justification be described as a prominent virtuoso of his day. He accompanied Lord Portland as physician on a diplomatic mission to Paris late in 1697 and during his time there met many prominent French intellectuals. His account of his visit to Paris covers a number of aspects of Parisian intellectual life, and antiquarianism is one of them. In the King's Library he notes the presence of a number of Ancient Roman and Egyptian antiquities including lamps, pateras

---

<sup>18</sup> It was thanks to *Madam Fickle* (1677), D'Urfey's first comedy, that he made the acquaintance of Charles II at the Dorset Garden theatre. The work contains the songs "Away with the Causes of Riches and Cares" and "Beneath a Shady Willow" and it was for his ability to write amusing songs that he became close to the King, as Jonathan Pritchard observes in the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (par. 2 of 11).



and other vessels used in sacrifices (111);<sup>19</sup> he also remarks the presence of a manuscript of three or four leaves written on actual Egyptian paper, which he takes to be the most ancient example of writing in the city (119); he is pleased to see the remains of the Cabinet of the French antiquary Peiresc (1550-1637) and mentions the early Roman coins made of brass in the collection (123); the cabinet of M. le Nostre contains a Roman Glass Urn (38); he also describes two rooms in the Louvre, one containing ancient marble statues and vases and “a 100 other things relating to Antiquity” (43); and he meets M. Vaillant, whom he believes is “the best Medalist in *Europe*” (99). He also meets the Cistercian Père Paul-Yves Pezron (1640-1706) and misconstrues his book *Défense de l’antiquité des temps* (Paris, 1691) as *Antiquities or Account of Time*, the author’s main interest in this work being that of chronology rather than antiquities (98).

As King’s eighteenth-century editor John Nichols put it, William King found Lister’s observations about “the state and curiosities” of Paris “minute and trifling” (1: 190). King’s response was to write *A Journey to London, In the Year 1698*, which he presented as having been written in French, attributing it to Samuel Sorbière and then translated into English. In the 1660s the real Samuel Sorbière (1615-70) visited England and in particular the Royal Society and wrote a negative account of his visit which became highly controversial. *A Journey to London, In the Year 1698* is the shortest and least sustained of King’s satires on leading figures in the intellectual life of his day. This can be ascribed to its preoccupation with the perceived triviality of Lister’s original account. That Lister had commented, for example, on the funghi he encountered in Paris, struck King as absurd. King parodies this in *A Journey to London* when he writes “but I was absolutely astonished to find, that as for ‘champignons’ and ‘moriglio’s [morels],’ they were as great strangers to them as if they had been bred in Japan” (1: 206). King uses the figure of the traveller Sorbière here to confront the Parisian preoccupations of Lister with a sense of the marginality of the mushrooms to English life. There is specific reference to the concerns of the antiquarian in the work. Sorbière visits a Mr Shuttleworth who has a collection of molluscs and other things of interest to a follower of natural philosophy. He also includes a “Sistrum, or Aegyptian rattle,” an Egyptian antiquity mentioned by Lister (111).

On the evidence of King’s response to motifs of antiquarianism we see how in the last years of the seventeenth century the concerns of the antiquarian were now also the

---

<sup>19</sup> Patera: “A broad flat saucer or dish, used esp.in pouring out libations at sacrifices” (“Patera, n.” *OED Online*. Oxford UP, March 2019. Web. 14 March 2019).

concerns of the virtuoso. In *A Journey to London* King contrasts the interest of Sorbière as a virtuoso in ancient coins and the concerns of the English with money in circulation and money raised for the new East India Company. He does this to characterize the virtuoso as unworldly and concerned with the minutiae of history in contrast to the energetic commerce of the English in raising money for the purposes of trade:

“. . . This money and credit have circulated so far, and are in so great a plenty, that, in a late subscription to a new East India Company, two millions Sterling were subscribed in less than two days time, and as much more excluded.”—I believe the man would have run on till evening, if I had not thus interrupted him. Sir, said I, I beg you to consider, that I am a Virtuoso, and that your present discourse is quite out of my element. Sir, you would oblige me much more, if you could find me any coin from Palmira, p. 97; more particularly of Zenobia, Oedenatus, or Vabalathus; and that I preferred a VABALATHUS VCRIMPR. Or a VABALATHUS AVG. p. 115, before twenty of the best pieces of gold coined in the Tower. (1: 199)

In his *Introduction to the Reader*, Lister writes: “This Tract was Written chiefly to satisfie my own Curiosity, and to delight my self with the Memory of what I had seen” (1). In his survey of life in Paris, Lister includes a passage on coffee-houses, dwelling in particular on the negative effects of chocolate as a drink (166-8). Lister ends the passage with a reflection on the Roman habit of taking chocolate after a meal as an emetic, although the idea is entirely anachronistic, since the Romans did not know chocolate:

The old Romans did better with their Luxury; they took their Tea and Chocolate after a full Meal, and every Man was his own Cook in that case. Caesar resolved to be free, and eat and drink heartily, that is, to excess, with Tully; and for this purpose Cicero tells his friend Atticus, that before he lay down to Table, Emeticen agebat, which I construe, he prepared for himself his Chocolate and Tea; something to make a quick riddance of what they eat and drank, some way or other. (Lister 171)

King makes use of Lister’s original text and introduces the material of the tea-dish and chocolate-pot to make a joke at the expense of antiquaries involving rust:

I met with a gentleman, that told me a secret, “That the old Romans, in their luxury, took their tea and chocolate after a full meal; and every man was his own cook in that case: particularly “Caesar,” that most admirable and most accomplished prince, “being resolved to eat and drink to excess before he lay down to table, emeticen agebat, prepared for himself his chocolate and tea,” p. 168. He presented me with a Roman tea-dish and a chocolate-pot; which I take to be about Augustus’s time, because it is very rusty. My maid, very ignorantly, was going to scour it, and had done me “an immense” damage. (King 1: 203)

King, although now largely forgotten, is an important writer for the purposes of this thesis. I will show later how King attacks Sir Hans Sloane (1660-1753) for his editorship of the *Philosophical Transactions* and his own way of writing. And another of King's targets, the classical scholar Richard Bentley, will be the subject of later chapters as well. Bentley, by the way, makes a cameo appearance in *A Journey to London*: "I would have seen a very famous Library, near St. James's Park: but I was told, that the learned Library-keeper was so busy in answering a Book which had been lately written against him, concerning Phalaris, that it would be rudeness any ways to interrupt him; though I had heard of his "singular humanity," BOTH IN France and other places" (1: 201). But for now let King point the way forward to another example of the satirical reception of the antiquarian, that of Cornelius Scriblerus and his shield in the *Memoirs* of Scriblerus. I shall examine this satirical response to Dr Woodward's shield in Chapter Seven of this thesis.

#### 1.9. CONCLUSION

What name, what skill, what faith hast thou in things!

Ben Jonson, *Epigrams, The Forest, Underwoods* (1936), 772.

As if in an opening gambit in a game of chess, the antiquaries were the first to offer absolute textual authority as a sacrifice to learn more from things.

[Passage omitted]

Antiquarianism is the first of the three disciplines examined in this thesis to grow out of a concern with things rather than taking textual authority as its starting point. The body of evidence is small and the figure of the antiquary is eventually absorbed into the figure of the virtuoso. However, the pattern is first discernible here in which a new approach to knowledge is derided in satire. Such writing is fundamentally conservative as it is unable to absorb a new approach with a new focus on physical objects. As we shall see, this pattern is repeated in the satirical reception of natural philosophy and textual criticism.



## CHAPTER TWO. THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUND TO THE FIGURE OF THE VIRTUOSO

And now I hope what I have here said will prevail something with the Wits and Railleurs of this Age. . . . I acknowledge that we ought to have a great dread of their power: I confess I believe that New Philosophy need not (as Caesar) fear the pale, or the melancholy, as much as the humorous, and the merry: For they perhaps by making it ridiculous, because it is new, and because they themselves are unwilling to take pains about it, may do it more injury than all the Arguments of our severe and frowning and dogmatical Adversaries.

Thomas Sprat, *The History of the Royal-Society of London. For the Improving of Natural Knowledge* (1667), 417.

Some verses, in the last collection, shew him to have been among those who ridiculed the institution of the Royal Society, of which the enemies were for some time very numerous and very acrimonious, for what reason it is hard to conceive, since the philosophers professed not to advance doctrines, but to produce facts; and the most zealous enemy of innovation must admit the gradual progress of experience, however he may oppose hypothetical temerity.

Samuel Johnson on Samuel Butler, *The Lives of the Most Eminent English Poets: with Critical Observations on their Works* (2006), 2: 4.

It was in 1667 that Thomas Sprat (*bap.* 1635, d. 1713), as if speaking on behalf of the members of the Royal Society, urged the “*Wits and Railleurs of this Age*” not to make natural philosophy look ridiculous and so damage it at the outset (417). And it was just over a century later that Samuel Johnson (1709-84) wrote in his life of Butler, first published in 1778, that he could not see the justification for the initial satirical reception of natural philosophy, since he saw the aim of its practitioners as being that of producing facts. As Sprat feared, the Wits did make natural philosophy look ridiculous because it was new, and because they were unwilling to make the effort to understand it. This chapter and the ones that follow seek to explore the reasons why the men of Wit and the men of the Royal Society did not understand each other, and to examine the satirical reception of natural philosophy.

In writing about literary satires of the virtuosi one immediately faces a number of problems. In the first place, any consideration of the subject leads straight to the fact that

science, or natural philosophy – a somewhat different but related concept – as it was known at the time, underwent a revolution in the seventeenth century. An attempt must be made to describe the nature of that revolution with the aim of illuminating the literary examples chosen.

Then there is the range of disciplines associated with that revolution: astronomy, chemistry and medicine, not to mention the extended range of ideas associated with the natural philosophers such as astrology, alchemy, chymistry and even Rosicrucianism.<sup>20</sup> This is equally a terrain that has been covered by many critics and historians before, both from the literary vantage point as well as that of the history of science. So, while feeling dwarfed by the range of reference required, anyone disembarking anew on these well-charted waters needs to be especially clear what he or she hopes to add to the sum of what has already been said on the subject.

There is the further question of who is the subject of the satirical responses in question. Critics readily reach for the word “virtuoso,” but this word is in itself something of a maze. I shall discuss the word at modest length in order to try to come to some conclusions about it before engaging with the satirical texts themselves.

A further consideration is that of how to group the evidence. Lawrence M. Principe in *The Scientific Revolution: A Very Short Introduction* provides three categories for his subject: the superlunar world, the sublunar world, and the microcosm and the living world. The superlunar world consists of the moon and everything beyond it, while the sublunar world consists of the Earth and everything up to the moon (39). The microcosm and the living world refer to the human body and the flora and fauna which surround it (93). While it is tempting to group all of the examples I shall discuss under these headings, I have chosen a chronological approach to authors in order to illustrate the evolution in satires of the virtuosi but will use Principe’s categories where they are helpful in the discussion of individual texts.

---

<sup>20</sup> For want of a way of distinguishing the activities involving chemistry and alchemy before the scientific revolution from what followed it, the archaic noun “chymistry” came into use in the late twentieth century: “Gold-making, or *chrysopoeia*, was a key part of *chymistry*, but there was nothing ‘magical’ (in the modern sense) involved, simply a practice based on theories different from our own. . . Besides the quest for gold, chymistry also included the broader study of matter and the production of articles of commerce such as pharmaceuticals, dyes, pigments, glass, salts, perfumes, and oils” (Principe 80).

## 2.1. NATURAL PHILOSOPHY AND EARLY MODERN SCIENCE

We look back today on the epicentre of the scientific revolution in the 1660s as the beginning of modern science. This might lead us to describe the activities of those pioneers as “early modern science”. Our notion of science today is one of a series of conceptual compartments which, while they may be linked, are essentially discrete. We speak readily of the scientific revolution of the 17<sup>th</sup> century and it is therefore a small step to speak of “early modern science,” but the practitioners of the mid-1600s would have understood what they were doing rather differently.

It is helpful here to draw on the writing of Lawrence Principe to convey the worldview of the mid-1600s. Principe contrasts the notion of compartmentalized science with what he calls “the connected world” (21). The latter consists of God, human beings and the physical universe all connected to each other, while compartmentalized science offers a number of discrete ways of analyzing the universe without the possibility of arriving at a synthetic understanding of the whole or discerning any wider meaning outside of the descriptive qualities it offers. For Principe the “concept of a tightly connected and purposeful world derives from many sources, but above all from the two inescapable giants of antiquity, Plato and Aristotle, and from Christian theology” (22). Plato (c. 429-347 BC) developed the concepts of the macrocosm and the microcosm:

These two Greek words mean, respectively, the ‘large ordered world’ and the ‘little ordered world’. The macrocosm is the body of the universe, that is, the astronomical world of stars and planets, while the microcosm is the body of the human being. The essential idea is that these two worlds are constructed on analogous principles, and so bear a close relationship to each other. (Principe 23)

By contrast under the aegis of compartmentalized science, there would not necessarily be any such identification between the physical universe and the human being. Human beings and their habitat would be examined according to biology, while the universe, the stars and planets would be investigated by experts in astronomy and astrophysics. Principe also mentions another important concept, a Neoplatonic one: “the idea of the *scala naturae*, or ladder of nature” (22). This was a hierarchical concept in which what was further from God was ever less like him, with the converse idea of rising from the material to the divine. The *scala naturae* was a concept associated with the Neoplatonists in which everything in the universe is organized in a seamless and vertical hierarchy. At the top of the ladder is the irreducible and eternal deity who gives existence to everything and everyone in the universe, while at the bottom we find matter without life. In between the top and bottom of the

ladder are the different types of the vegetable and the animal followed by human beings and then other beings in the spiritual realm (Principe 22).

It is as well to quote at length from what Principe has to say about natural philosophy:

This sense of connectedness both between disciplines and between various facets of the universe characterizes natural philosophy – the discipline practised by early modern students of the natural world. Natural philosophy is closely related to what we familiarly call science today, but is broader in scope and intent. The natural philosopher of the Middle Ages or of the Scientific Revolution studied the natural world – as modern scientists do – but did so within a wider vision that included theology and metaphysics. The three components of God, man, and nature were never insulated from one another. (27)

The purpose of natural philosophy was to explore the material world in a way which took account not only of the matter of which this world consisted, while always acknowledging the presence of the divine as well as the position of man in it. Science in the modern sense of the word only provides an account of the material context in which life occurs or does not occur as well as describing and accounting for different forms of life in a material sense but not in a religious one. Modern scientists might examine man and nature, but God no longer plays a part in their scientific thinking. Literary critics use certain terms to refer to the overall field of scientific activity in the seventeenth century. Juliet Cummins and David Burchell, for example, talk about “early modern science” (2), while William C. Horne uses the term “New Science” (12). The practitioners of natural philosophy were referred to in the 1600s as “natural philosophers,” a term which gave way to the word “scientist” in the nineteenth century. They were also referred to as virtuosi, a word they used to describe themselves, although we must enter into the maze this word represents in order to be aware of the nuances of its usage in the seventeenth century.

## 2.2. THE CHANGING SCIENTIFIC WORLDVIEW

The seventeenth century was a time of great change in the way men understood the universe in which they lived, the natural world around them and themselves. However, the responses of the poets and writers of the day to these changes were far from welcoming or positive, something which can still surprise the contemporary reader. I shall comment briefly here upon the changing scientific worldview by way of introduction, in order to give the context for the satires which are the subject of the second part of this thesis.



2.2.1. *The Shape of the Universe*

The first great change that came about in the seventeenth century was in understanding how the universe in which we live was put together. The astronomical *status quo* had been that the universe was geocentric and circular in disposition. In the fourteenth century Sir John Mandeville wrote: “For, as I said before, God made the earth quite round, in the middle of the firmament” (183). This understanding of the universe was derived from the work of the Egyptian astronomer and mathematician Ptolemy (c. AD 100-70).

Nicholas Copernicus published his *De Revolutionibus Orbium Coelestium (On the Revolutions of the Celestial Spheres)* in 1543, presenting the notion of a heliocentric universe. Acceptance of Copernicus’s idea was slow. It has been estimated by R.S. Westman that by 1600 in the whole of Europe there could not be found “more than ten thinkers who chose to adopt the main claims of the heliocentric system” (qtd. in Chartres & Vermont 7). It was Johannes Kepler whose work moved astronomy onwards towards the acceptance of the heliocentric universe through his discovery of the principles of planetary motion. Two important works in this respect were the *Astronomia nova (New Astronomy)* of 1609 and the *Epitome Astronomiae Copernicae (Epitome of Copernican Astronomy)* of 1618-21, a fuller exposition of the heliocentric worldview of Copernicus. And finally, a few years after his death, Kepler’s *Somnium*, his work on lunar astronomy, was published by his son in 1634. The full title of this work is *Joh. Kepleri Mathematici Olim Imperatorii Somnium, seu Opus Posthumum De Astronomia Lunari*. Indebted to medieval dream allegories and described by Dean Swinford as a “cosmological dream allegory” (99), Kepler’s *Somnium* was an account of a journey to the moon and of what the narrator discovers there. It was an imaginative attempt to bring the notion that the earth might be observed from another celestial body within the reach of the human imagination.

Among the first to bring the new astronomy into the English language was John Wilkins (1614-72). The titles of Wilkins’s books were rather lengthy, so I will give the short version of the title and then the full title in brackets. In 1638 he published *The Discovery of a World in the Moone (The Discovery of a World in the Moone. Or, A Discourse Tending To Prove, That ’tis Probable There May Be Another Habitable World in that Planet)*. The work was then revised and enlarged, this edition appearing in 1640. The edition I have consulted has the title *A Discourse concerning A New World and Another Planet in 2 Bookes* on the flyleaf and has *A Discourse concerning a New Planet (A Discourse concerning a New Planet. Tending to Prove, That ’tis Probable our Earth is one of the Planets. The Second Booke, now*

*First Published*) as the second book. Here Wilkins expounded further the new astronomy and the notion of the plurality of worlds, namely, Copernicus's idea of a universe which revolved around the sun rather than around the earth as had been previously thought and which probably contained more than one planet which bore life. While his writing can be reproached for not being rigorous enough, it represents a very early reception of the ideas of Galileo (1564-1642) and Kepler into English. Barbara J. Shapiro argues that Wilkins became "the chief English exponent of the idea of the plurality of worlds" (33), drawing most heavily in his work on the writings of Copernicus, Galileo and Kepler (36).

The 1640 edition contains the original thirteen propositions of *The Discovery of a World in the Moone* in the first book and adds one to make a first volume with the new title *The Discovery of a New World (The Discovery of a New World. Or, A Discourse Tending to Prove, That 'tis Probable There May Be Another habitable World in the Moone. With a Discourse Concerning the Possibility of a Passage Thither)*. The fourteenth proposition proved particularly fecund from a satirical point of view, being "That tis possible for some of our posteritie to find out a conveyance to this other world; and if there be inhabitants there, to have commerce with them" (1: 203). The original work and the revised version were received satirically in the literature of the later seventeenth century. Wilkins included in his revised work of 1640 his reception of Kepler's *Somnium*, which he must have read after 1638, as it is not mentioned in *The Discovery of a World in the Moone*. Wilkins's reception of Kepler's *Somnium* is of particular interest, as Samuel Butler took it up satirically in *The Elephant in the Moon*.

The wider ramifications of the heliocentric model of the universe did not immediately engage the satirists, but Wilkins brought the moon into their imaginative reach. Another work which had a satirical reception was *The Man in the Moone, or a Discourse of a Voyage thither by Domingo Gonsales*, published in 1638. The work was attributed to Domingo Gonsales on the title page and he is also the narrator of the work, although it was actually written by Francis Godwin (1562-1633), a cleric who was made Bishop of Llandaff in 1601 and then Bishop of Hereford in 1617.<sup>21</sup> The narrator of this romance is transported to the moon by birds called ganzas, which resemble wild swans. The book is of interest for the

---

<sup>21</sup> Published posthumously in 1638, it was long thought that *The Man in the Moone* was a work of Godwin's student days in Oxford (1578-83/4). More recent scholarship places the writing of the work somewhere between 1601 and 1629, largely based on the knowledge shown of the Jesuit missions to Peking which Domingo encounters towards the end of the work and how Godwin would have gained that knowledge.

way in which it portrays Gonsales's flight to the moon, the observations he makes of the earth during that journey and the society he encounters on the moon.

[Passage omitted]

Related to the changes in understanding of the configuration of the solar system was the discovery by Isaac Newton of the principle of the universal force of gravity. Newton's *Philosophiae Naturalis Principia Mathematica* (*Mathematical Principles of Natural Philosophy*) was published in July 1687.<sup>22</sup>

[Passage omitted]

Newton famously described the three laws of motion in this work and gave the world the law of universal gravitation. He also provided an account of how planets go around the sun in elliptical orbits, solving the astronomical conundrum of planetary orbit. The *Principia* was a work which with time found a satirical reception in the work of Jonathan Swift.

#### 2.2.2. Francis Bacon and the Baconian Method

No account of the scientific revolution would be complete without mention of Francis Bacon. Ennobled as Baron Verulam and Viscount St Alban, Bacon arguably did more to provide the impetus for the advance of natural philosophy in England than any other single intellectual figure. This is not the place to attempt to say anything new about Bacon, only to note his principal works and outline the ways in which he may have been responsible for inspiring a satirical response to early modern science.

Bacon published *The Advancement of Learning* in 1605 and in this work, he drew attention to the shortcomings of earlier systems of thought and recommended measures for improving all aspects of knowledge. This was the first of Bacon's philosophical works to be published and was the only one to be written in English. It consisted of two books, the first of which was a defence of learning as an important factor in all fields of human activity. The second book provided a survey of knowledge as Bacon saw it at the time of writing in which he highlighted what was lacking and offered proposals to improve matters. It is noteworthy that Bacon believed that a complete change in the way learning was perceived was necessary

---

<sup>22</sup> The work is often referred to with an abbreviated title, either *Principia* or *Principia Mathematica*.

to carry out his proposals, while also implying that a new method was necessary to obtain knowledge. In October 1620 he published a part of what he called the *Instauratio Magna*, or Great Instauration, a preface and two books of a second part called the *Novum Organum*. In the words of Brian Vickers, the Great Instauration was “designed to put the whole of natural philosophy on a new footing” (Bacon, *Major Works* xviii). It has been suggested that Bacon’s goal was to substitute the Aristotelian model of eternal truths long since discovered with a more dynamic notion of natural philosophy which would be much more active and would aim to discover the unknown. Bacon envisaged the amassing of accounts of natural phenomena which he called “natural histories,” which would be interpreted in the future in order to discover the fundamental principles which lay behind the workings of nature. The *Novum Organum* consists of two books. The first provides an account of the various obstacles to the acceptance of Bacon’s new system of inquiry, that of induction instead of the Aristotelian syllogism. Bacon calls these obstacles “idols”. Having cleared away the impediments, Bacon reveals the new method of induction in the second, incomplete book of the *Novum Organum*. Bacon’s *New Atlantis* was published posthumously in 1626 and was an account of his idea for a scientific research institution written as a utopia. It is noteworthy that during his lifetime Bacon had no institutional context for his ideas either on reforming knowledge or on the financial support of scientific research (Bacon, *Major Works* xxix). Bacon’s *New Atlantis* envisages an institutional context for natural philosophy. The island of New Atlantis is very remote and is home to a community which receives few visitors and has no contacts with the outside world. In the Solomon’s House scientific research is carried out for the benefit of mankind. Bacon provides a model here of scientific collaboration, envisaging science as a collective activity. It is also noteworthy that war is completely absent from the New Atlantis. It is tempting to see the institution described in the *New Atlantis* as a precursor of the Royal Society.

Bacon gives his name to the Baconian method. This was an experimental method which drew conclusions from facts which had been observed rather than from conclusions or theories which had been arrived at previously. This clearly runs counter to accepting the authority of past masters and brings authority into the present moment, deriving it from what is being observed. The fundamental concept developed by Bacon which revolutionized natural philosophy was that of induction, which is the inference of a general principle from discrete observations. Induction represented an approach which combined “reason and experience, contemplation and action” (Heilbron 75). In the *Instauratio Magna* Bacon wrote of induction as follows: “Now what the sciences require is a form of induction which will

unbind experience and separate it out, and reach necessary conclusions by proper exclusions and rejections" (Bacon, *Instauratio II* 33). His view of the natural philosophy of his day was that it had no proper intellectual basis and therefore any experiments conducted in accordance with current practices would have no lasting outcome.<sup>23</sup> Instead, in a famous formulation Bacon proposes that we learn from the lesson of the Creation of the World and follow God's example in first creating Light, as He did on the first day of creation, and so look for experiments which bear light and not fruit. This gives rise to the phrases "Experiments of Light" and "Experiments of Fruit," which respectively are experiments which reveal first principles and experiments which result in something useful. The former illuminate the practice, while the latter are initially a matter for aspiration. However, for the satirists of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, anyone carrying out experiments in natural philosophy would have been regarded like Atalanta as not running the race properly by becoming absorbed in a fruitless pursuit which would bring only darkness by running after the golden apples of delusion and frivolity. The Baconian method was arguably the first sally in the Battle of the Ancients and the Moderns, that is, between those who believed that it was the philosophy of the classical world that should shape intellectual inquiry and those who sought a new and contemporary way of doing things.

In what way did Bacon set the trail for satirical writing on science? In some respects, he put the experimental cart before the horse. While the goal of Bacon's thought was to discover the primary laws of nature, he believed that this discovery would only be made after a large amount of information had been accumulated. It was perhaps for this reason that Samuel Butler wrote of Bacon in his *Prose Observations*: "The Lord Bacon was not so much a Naturall Philosopher as a Naturall Historian: who of all others is the most fabulous . . ." (280). In his essay "The Background of the Attack on Science in the Age of Pope," Richard Foster Jones argues persuasively that Bacon's emphasis on compiling "a natural history which would include all the data that the earth and the fullness thereof could contribute" generated a problem, because he emphasized the gathering of the evidence and postponed the

---

<sup>23</sup> To illustrate this point Bacon drew on the myth of Atalanta and the Golden Apples. In the myth Atalanta will only agree to marry if she is beaten in a running race. Her fame as a huntress and athlete precede her but Hippomenes resolves to beat her by subterfuge and asks the goddess Aphrodite for some golden apples. These he throws from the track where they are running, and Atalanta loses sight of the purpose of the race which is to win and eventually loses because she goes in search of the golden apples. Bacon draws on this part of Atalanta's story in Paragraph 70 of the *Novum Organum* to illustrate the idea that anyone who strays from the path of scientific investigation without establishing fundamental principles and goes in search of some glittering reward which will justify the continuation of their scientific research, will also see victory slip from their grasp (Bacon, *Instauratio II* 110-13).

elucidation of the primary laws of nature (98). The natural philosophers of the day took on Bacon's priorities and began experimenting in order to accumulate evidence for this grand project. According to Jones, this resulted in "an exaggerated emphasis upon mere sense-observation and a corresponding distrust of reason" (99). Thus, it can be argued that the pursuit of the experimental method at the Royal Society without due attention to its ultimate purpose was among the factors which led to a negative perception of the virtuosi.

### 2.3. THE VENUES OF NATURAL PHILOSOPHY

There were three main venues in the practice of natural philosophy in the seventeenth century. These were Gresham College, the University of Oxford and the Royal Society.

#### 2.3.1. *Gresham College*

Referred to widely in the satirical literature of the time and still in existence as an educational institution today, Gresham College both requires and deserves an explanatory comment here. This account is largely based on Richard Chartres and David Vermont's *A Brief History of Gresham College 1597-1997*. The College was endowed in the will of Sir Thomas Gresham (1519-79). Gresham had been the highly successful agent of the crown in Antwerp from the early 1550s onwards and remained in that position for sixteen years (4). In 1565 he proposed the building of the Royal Exchange out of his own pocket and it became the centre of commerce in the City of London. He was therefore a widely experienced and wealthy man of trade and finance who had also – unusually for his day – spent a considerable amount of time in Europe.

He had contemplated founding a new college in Cambridge, where he had attended Gonville Hall (6). However, he decided newly to endow Gresham College in the City of London and chose subjects for instruction that would be of relevance to the world of trade. Indeed, the idea was that the professors would lecture to those who lived and worked in the City. There were seven professorships: Divinity, Astronomy, Geometry, Music (to be chosen by the Lord Mayor and the Corporation of London), and Law, Physic and Rhetoric (to be chosen by the Mercers' Company) (6). This arrangement was somewhat reminiscent of the traditional syllabus of the medieval university which consisted of the quadrivium (arithmetic, geometry, astronomy and music) and the trivium (grammar, rhetoric and logic). It was innovative of Gresham to include astronomy and geometry among the designated subjects, as there was a chair in neither at Oxford or Cambridge (7). Furthermore, each chair came

with an annual stipend of fifty pounds, an amount which exceeded that granted by Henry VIII to Regius professors in Oxford and Cambridge (7). There were also residential rights at Gresham's house in Bishopsgate, London (7). Important figures of early modern science lived in Gresham College. Sir Kenelm Digby was in residence from 1633 to 1635, and Robert Hooke lived there as Professor of Geometry from 1664 until his death in 1703. Gresham House housed Gresham College until 1768.

The first lectures were given at the end of 1597 (13). Chartres and Vermont observe that Gresham College "rapidly acquired an international reputation as a place of academic research, with Professors who were in some cases working at the heart of the intellectual revolution of the seventeenth century" (19). The endowment of chairs at Gresham College was "a boon to the scientific community in the early seventeenth century" (22). Interestingly, John Greaves (1602-52) was pursuing his research there as Professor of Astronomy at a time when Galileo was under house arrest. His patron William Juxon, the Bishop of London (*bap.* 1582, d. 1663), wrote to the Gresham Committee in 1637 in support of an expedition to the Middle East proposed by Greaves, the aim of which was to make astronomical observations: "This work I find by the best astronomers, especially by Ticho Brache and Kepler, hath been much desired as tending to the advancement of that science" (24). Greaves's freedom of movement contrasts markedly with Galileo's reduced circumstances.

### *2.3.2. The University of Oxford*

The University of Oxford was the venue of many advances made in natural philosophy in the 1640s and 1650s. The traditional view is that this was thanks to the circle around John Wilkins, who was made Master of Wadham College in 1648. This was a Puritan appointment made after the Parliamentary Visitation of the University, a fact usually suppressed in accounts of early modern science. The circle around Wilkins included Robert Boyle, Hooke (1635-1703) and Christopher Wren (1632-1723), to name but three. One recent estimate of Wilkins's achievement at Wadham reads thus: "Wilkins encouraged a group of like-minded young gentlemen to take on the new philosophy of the observation and testing of nature, as distinguished from theory alone" (Bragg 16). However, another view of Wilkins has him "on the international scale of science . . . a third-rate figure, at best a successful popularizer" (Hall & Hall 160-1). The same authors argue that those who gathered around Wilkins in Oxford were "professionals and budding professionals . . . [who] did not acquire their scientific competence or interests from either Wilkins or Bacon" (160-1).

Another important presence in Oxford was that of William Petty (1623-87). Petty had studied anatomy in Paris, where he knew Thomas Hobbes, and came to Oxford, where he was made a fellow of Brasenose College in 1650 at a time when he was taking over the teaching of anatomy at the University of Oxford. Petty taught by using a cadaver to illustrate his instruction, an innovation for the University of the day. He became famous in 1650 because of the case of Anne Green, a maid who had murdered her own child and was hanged in Oxford Castle. Her body was sent for dissection after hanging, but Petty found that she was still alive and revived her. This was considered to be “a great wonder” at the time (Aubrey 399).

### 2.3.3. *The Royal Society*

Gresham College began to assume a central role for the new science in London in the late 1650s and early 1660s and was intimately bound up with the birth of the Royal Society. Christopher Wren gave an important inaugural lecture as Professor of Astronomy in 1657, which was “also a kind of manifesto of the new science . . . Three years after this seminal lecture, the monarchy was restored and the scientific network which centred on Gresham College played a crucial part in the meetings which led to the formation of the Royal Society” (Chartres and Vermont 31-2). Andrade writes: “at Gresham College . . . on 28 November 1660, the celebrated gathering took place at which it was decided to form a Society for promoting Physico-Mathematicall Experimentall Learning, the three hundredth anniversary of which occasion was celebrated in 1960 as that of the foundation of the Society” (11). Twelve fellows attended the first meeting of the Royal Society at Gresham House on 28 November 1660. Christopher Wren had given a lecture before the meeting, being also the professor of astronomy at Gresham College. Robert Boyle, John Wilkins and William Petty were also present. Wren, Boyle, Wilkins and Petty had all known each other in Oxford in the 1650s. There were four important courtiers present, including Viscount Brouncker (c. 1627-88), who became the first president of the Society. There were another four men present who were from London, including the host, Lawrence Rooke (1619/20-62), who was the Gresham Professor of Geometry. These twelve men then made a list of forty who they thought should be asked to join. This group included John Evelyn, Sir Kenelm Digby and Elias Ashmole (1617-92). The first secretary to the Society was Henry Oldenburg (c. 1619-77), who became the first editor of the *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society*. This was followed by “the first Charter of Incorporation, granted by Charles II in 1662, which gave its name to the Society” (11). In the minds of many the two institutions were identical. This was



because the Royal Society held its early meetings at Gresham College, firstly from 1662 to 1666, when the College became overcrowded as a result of the Great Fire of London. The Society had very few salaried members of staff, one of whom was Robert Hooke. He was appointed curator of experiments at the Royal Society in November 1662 and became a fellow in June 1663. He was appointed geometry lecturer at Gresham College in June 1665. *Micrographia*, his ground-breaking work on microscopy, was published in 1665. By 1674 Hooke was interested in demonstrating that the earth moved around the sun and so when the Society returned to Gresham College in 1674, Hooke was given funds “to build a turret over his lodgings from which he could make astronomical observations” (34). The Royal Society moved to its own premises in Crane Court in 1711.

Associated with the Royal Society, but not actually published by it, was the learned journal the *Philosophical Transactions*, the complete title of which was the *Philosophical Transactions: Giving some Accompt of the Present Undertakings, Studies, and Labours of the Ingenious in many Considerable Parts of the World*. With time the spelling of the word “Accompt” gave way to “Account”. The first issue – or “tract” (de Andrade 13) – was published on 6 March 1665/6. The first editor was Henry Oldenburg and de Andrade regards the first period of the *Philosophical Transactions* as having come to an end with the death of Oldenburg in 1677 (19). A later editor of the *Philosophical Transactions* was Hans Sloane. It was Sloane’s editorship which engaged the satirical pen of William King and resulted in the writing of *The Transactioneer*, published in 1700. Subjects which were of interest to the members of the Royal Society in the 1660s can be gauged from an examination of the contents of the *Philosophical Transactions* in the first two years of its existence. These were 1665 and 1666, beginning 6 March 1665 and ending in February 1666. Many transactions are concerned with astronomical observations of comets, planets and eclipses. Scientific instruments are much discussed. A recurring subject is the making of “optick glasses” or lenses for telescopes, but there is also mention of other scientific instruments such as the the microscope and the baroscope or barometer. The latter was used to detect variations in the pressure and weight of air. There was an interest in how to produce low temperatures without using snow or ice. Some transactions were devoted to observations about tides and speculation as to what caused them, which was not understood at the time, as well as springs of water. There is an interest in the animal world, ranging from monstrous births of calves to the production of silk by silkworms. Blood transfusions between live animals are

also mentioned. A number of accounts of new scientific books are included, including Hooke's *Micrographia*.<sup>24</sup> Focusing on transactions attributed to Robert Boyle and Robert Hooke, two of the best known members of the Royal Society, Boyle's interests were in the measuring of air with the barometer, the measuring of the weight of water, cold, the sea and a way of preserving birds prematurely removed from eggs, a method of transfusing blood and a proposal for trials for blood transfusions and experiments concerning the relationship between light and air. Hooke's transactions were concerned by contrast with increasing the distance a lens might refract light, the construction of a new kind of barometer and several observations on eclipses and the planets Mars, Saturn and Jupiter.

#### 2.4. THE FIGURE OF THE VIRTUOSO

It would surely have appealed to at least some of the virtuosi of the seventeenth century that the very word then in use to describe them now requires a special explanation as that usage is now obsolete. The word can currently be either a noun or an adjective and is most likely to be found in writing about classical musicians. For example, a violinist of particular brilliance can be described as a "virtuoso violinist" or a "virtuoso". Here is the definition given in *The Oxford Companion to Music*:

Virtuoso (It., 'exceptional performer'). The term originally referred to several types of musician: performers, composers, and even theorists. By the later eighteenth century, however, it was generally used to dignify a singer or instrumentalist of great talent ('virtuosa' if the person was female). The term became more problematic in the nineteenth century and later, sometimes being used to describe a performer whose talent was 'merely' technical, unduly crowd-pleasing, and lacking in good taste; but the positive meaning of the term is still more in general use; its most common association being with such celebrated nineteenth-century soloists as Paganini and Liszt. (1346)

We can perhaps see in this definition the two currents of meaning that pass through the word "virtuoso" in its former or obsolete sense. On the positive side we have a sense of outward splendour and of conspicuous brilliance. The word "virtuoso" was originally used to refer to great collectors, combining material wealth with a broad interest in acquiring art,

---

<sup>24</sup> The alphabetical index supplied for the first two years of the *Philosophical Transactions* includes the following principle subjects: Air, animals, blood transfusion, artificial instruments or engines, books abbreviated or recited, cold, comets, earthquake near Oxford, insects, light, the colouring of marbles with liquor, micrography, mercury mines in Friuli, monsters, moons, mulberry trees, opticks, petrification, planets, sea-fluxes, silk worms and the silk trade, snow-houses, springs and tides (*Phil. Trans.* 1: 399-404).

sculpture and tapestries, up until around the middle of the seventeenth century. It was in the 1640s that Bacon's great project was first discussed, and the virtuosi found themselves to a certain extent at the centre of it as collectors of physical phenomena, but, more specifically where natural philosophy was concerned, as potential purveyors of natural histories (Houghton 1: 72). Natural philosophy quite simply became fashionable. From around 1650 onwards the virtuosi participated in the scientific revolution by witnessing or carrying out experiments, observing the stars and planets through a telescope or collecting examples of flora and fauna. On the negative or pejorative side, the historical use of the word often sought to indicate an appearance of outward brilliance that was somehow lacking in substance. Some virtuosi placed fashion before substance, particularly in the case of natural philosophy, where some of them showed no interest in the utility of what interested them.

The classic account of the phenomenon of the virtuoso is Walter Houghton's essay "The English Virtuoso in the Seventeenth Century". Houghton was at pains to emphasize that his main interest was in definition and analysis rather than in the history of the virtuoso and offered his widely cited essay as a redress for the lack of attention the virtuosi had received in contrast to the work done on professional scholars such as Scaliger and Lipsius (1547-1606). It was Houghton's view that "in the formation of modern culture, it may be wondered if the virtuosi had not ultimately an equal share with the scholars," something he thought was particularly the case with the spread of natural philosophy (1: 51). For our purposes, and bearing Houghton's ideas in mind, there were effectively three types of virtuosi. It is perhaps helpful to present each type by conveying the different meanings through a relevant example of each in the prose of the seventeenth century.

The first kind of virtuoso was a collector of valuable objects of historical interest. According to Houghton, the word was first used in England in 1634 by Henry Peacham in the second edition of his *Compleat Gentleman*, where Peacham was writing about classical antiquities, namely statues, inscriptions and coins: "The possession of such rarities, by reason of their dead costlinesse, doth properly belong to Princes, or rather to princely minds . . . Such as are skilled in them, are by the *Italians* termed *Virtuosos*" (qtd. in Houghton 1: 52). That is the sense of my first meaning. The quotation highlights a key factor in the shaping of the phenomenon, namely the possession of large amounts of material wealth, without which it would not be possible to collect anything. For Houghton such collections also had a social function, "because their knowledge or collection guarantees a social reputation" (1: 56). They were highly effective tools of class distinction in an age "notorious for intruding upstarts and ambitious merchants" (1: 63). This "snob-appeal," as Houghton calls it, still obtained at the

time of the Restoration (1: 63). Such collections were for enjoying and displaying to other virtuosi in a process of mutual verification. Although antiquaries also made collections which they shared among themselves, the emphasis was more on benefiting from the knowledge that resulted. Indeed, what an antiquarian collected usually contributed to a written account, usually a book, which sought to establish the nature of society in a particular county or region over a certain span of time.

Once science became the concern of the virtuosi, a complicating factor enters the equation for Houghton. The virtuosi who were wealthy gentlemen of leisure shifted their interest to the collection of items of interest to the natural philosopher, but “virtuoso” also became the word used to describe a member of the Royal Society. Aubrey uses the word in its sense of a natural philosopher in the following passage from his life of Sir William Petty. Himself a virtuoso, Aubrey is reflecting on Petty’s days as reader in anatomy at the University of Oxford and uses the word in the plural and in an alternative spelling – “Vertuosi” – to describe the protagonists of the early days of what he calls “Experimentall Philosophy”:

He [Sir William Petty] came to Oxon, and entred himselfe of Brasen-nose college. Here he taught Anatomy to the young Scholars. Anatomy was then but little understood by the university, and I remember he kept a body that he brought by water from Reding a good while to read upon some way soused or pickled. About these times Experimentall Philosophy first budded here and was first cultivated by these Vertuosi in the darke time. (Aubrey 399)

Houghton’s view of this linguistic phenomenon is corrective. As he puts it: “there were virtuosi and virtuosi – the amateurs or dilettantes, and the ‘sincere’ inquirers into nature, with or without the Baconian purpose of ultimate use” (1: 54). He observes that the word “virtuoso” was extended to include the latter about 1650, but that it should only be used to describe the amateurs and dilettantes. The term “natural philosopher” should be used to describe the genuine scientist (55). The student of history may note this, but the word was used historically to describe both types, perhaps even consciously by those genuine natural philosophers in an attempt to take their wealthy fellow travellers with them on the road of experimental inquiry.

The amateurs or dilettantes associated with the Royal Society were attacked in the following passage from the “Character of a Vertuoso (sic),” which Houghton attributes to Mary Astell (1666-1731), although later scholarship questions this (Levine, *Dr. Woodward’s Shield* 324, n. 34). The accusation is made that the activities of these gentlemen collectors are quite useless:

I know that the desire of Knowledge, and the discovery of things yet unknown is the Pretence; But what Knowledge is it? What Discoveries do we owe to their Labours? It is only the Discovery of some few unheeded Varieties of Plants, Shells, or Insects, unheeded only because useless; and the Knowledge, they boast so much of, is no more than a Register of their Names, and Marks of Distinction only. (Astell 102-03)

There was awareness among contemporary commentators of the difference between the two usages. This quotation from the same source puts the matter clearly:

You can be my witness, *Madam*, that I us'd to say, I thought Mr. Boyle more honourable for his learned Labours, than for his Noble Birth; and that the Royal Society, by their great and celebrated Performances . . . highly merited the *Esteem, Respect* and *Honour* paid 'em by the Lovers of Learning all *Europe* over. But though I have a very great Veneration for the *Society* in general, I can't but put a vast difference between the particular Members that compose it. (Astell 104-05)

The author is making a distinction firstly between men of brilliance like Robert Boyle, who advance natural philosophy by the excellence of their experiments and the ingenuity of their insight and secondly, between men who in the author's opinion acquire plants, shells or insects in a seemingly random way and without purpose. But as we shall see in the case of Shadwell's play *The Virtuoso*, the two meanings were not always kept apart.

## 2.5. THE RANGE OF IDEAS ASSOCIATED WITH THE VIRTUOSI

Douglas Bush writes cogently about the progress made in science in the seventeenth century in his *English Literature in the Earlier Seventeenth Century 1600-1660*. He points out that science was not valued in the earlier part of the century with men such as Raleigh (1554-1618), Bacon and Sir Kenelm Digby being regarded as peripheral to intellectual activity (259). By 1650 science was a major interest of the virtuosi (259) and yet:

Along with this great forward movement in the sciences, and sometimes represented by the same persons, we have the old pseudo-sciences which, with or without the help of occult mysticism, were flourishing with unabated vigour. . . . Judicial astrology was repeatedly attacked and defended. . . . Medicine, biology, and chemistry were still more or less mixed with astrology, fantastic pharmacology (the royal touch retained its virtue far beyond our period), animism and alchemy. . . . In general, the mixture of the fabulous or occult with the scientific was in part a natural legacy from medieval science, in part it was sustained by the persistent conviction, rational or mystical, of the unity between God and all His works. (259-60)

This plethora of interests was current among the fellow travellers among the virtuosi also because their criterion for being interested in something was different to that of a genuine

natural philosopher. Houghton regards *The Anatomy of Melancholy* by Robert Burton (1577-1640) as an important repository of ideas for the virtuoso, indeed calling it “the first document of the English movement” and “the fullest index I know to its range of taste” (64). The first edition of *The Anatomy of Melancholy* was published in 1621. Burton defined melancholy as “a kinde of dotage without a fever, having for his ordinary companions, feare and sadnesse, without any apparent occasion” (1: 162, ll. 25-6). The passage Houghton describes as a catalogue of the interests of the virtuosi really lists what must have been nearly all human activity in the early seventeenth century as a cure for idleness and melancholy (2: 84-95).

[Passage omitted]

## 2.6. THE NEGATIVE PERCEPTION OF THE VIRTUOSI

There were a number of factors which brought about a negative perception of the virtuosi and led to a satirical portrayal in the literature of the day. These ranged from the association of early modern science with the Puritan cause to the perception that members of the Royal Society were preoccupied with the frivolous. We shall see that the idea that members were interested in spectacle, rather than in deciphering the code in which mankind and the natural world was written – surely the ultimate purpose of experimental inquiry – was the most damaging. I shall discuss these perceptions here in the hope of shedding light on the satirical response of the writers of the day.

There is a natural conservatism about mankind which can often lead to the rejection of the radically new. And where knowledge is concerned, any innovation that renders the existing model redundant might meet opposition, particularly from those who feel threatened by the possibility that they might be in the wrong. This would be the case especially if they might as a result be undermined professionally. The natural philosophers would have faced this in the same way that William Harvey (1578-1657) did initially for his discovery of the circulation of blood in the human body, possibly the most important discovery of the century. Already lecturing on the subject in 1616, it was not until 1628 that his treatise on the subject – the *Exercitatio Anatomica de Motu Cordis et Sanguinis in Animalibus* (*Anatomical Dissertation concerning the Movement of the Heart and Blood in Living Creatures*) – was published. We know of the initial negative reaction from Aubrey’s account of Harvey in *Brief Lives*:

. . . after his Booke of the *Circulation of the Blood* came-out, that he fell mightily in his Practize, and that 'twas beleev'd by the vulgar that he was crack-brained; and all the Physitians were against his Opinion, and envyed [*grudged against*] him; many wrote against him. With much adoe at last, in about 20 or 30 yeares time, it was received in all the Universities in the world; and, Mr Hobbes sayes in his book *De Corpore* [Of the Body], *he is the only man, perhaps, that ever lived to see his owne Doctrine established in his life-time.* (289-90)

Harvey's case had a positive outcome. The case of the natural philosophers and the Royal Society took much longer to be resolved favourably.

[Passage omitted]

### 2.6.1. *Laughter*

Another basic human response that hampered acceptance was derision. The most famous example of this is the often-quoted account by Samuel Pepys (1633-1703) of Charles II's meeting with Sir William Petty on 1 February 1664: "Thence to White-hall, where in the Dukes chamber the King came and stayed an hour or two, laughing at Sir W Petty, who was there about his boat, and at Gresham College in general. At which poor Petty was I perceive at some loss . . . Gresham College he mightily laughed at for spending time only in weighing of ayre, and doing nothing else since they sat" (Pepys 5: 32-3). Pepys is writing in his diary of a meeting between Charles II and Sir William Petty. The encounter as Pepys describes it has great anecdotal value as he records the king's reaction in a way that would not have been done in an official document. Petty had invented a twin-hulled vessel or catamaran, in which the king was taking an interest. The king laughs at the Royal Society for its preoccupation with experiments concerned with the weighing of air. Fellows such as Boyle had been interested to examine the properties of air with the assistance of a barometer, and the king's formulation "weighing of ayre" is eminently dismissive of such experiments. Such an early perception on the part of its own patron that the Royal Society was engaged in pointless activities was something of an ill omen.

And if the king laughed, the members of the Society were equally aware that the Wits might do so as well. Another widely quoted passage, this time from Sprat's *History of the Royal Society*, shows an awareness of this:

And now I hope what I have here said will prevail something with the Wits and Railleurs of this Age, to reconcile their Opinions and Discourses to these Studies: For now they may behold that their Interest is united with that of the Royal Society; and that if they shall decry the promoting of

Experiments, they will deprive themselves of the most fertile Subject of Fancy; and indeed it has bin with respect to these terrible men, that I have made this long digression. I acknowledge that we ought to have a great dread of their power: I confess I believe that New Philosophy need not (as Caesar) fear the pale, or the melancholy, as much as the humorous, and the merry: For they perhaps by making it ridiculous, because it is new, and because they themselves are unwilling to take pains about it, may do it more injury than all the Arguments of our severe and frowning and dogmatical Adversaries. (417)

In this passage Sprat signals that he has tried to make the experiments of the Royal Society appeal to the Wits and that if they adopt the view that such experiments are not worthy of promotion, they will forego a very fruitful source of imagery for their literary creations. He goes on to stress that the Royal Society has the most to fear from the Wits since if they decide to make the new philosophy appear ridiculous with their humour, they will do it more damage than any of their ideological opponents. In this respect Sprat correctly anticipated the effect of some of the literary works we will encounter in this thesis.

### *2.6.2. Puritanism*

Richard Foster Jones writes lucidly of the prejudice suffered by the natural philosophers because of the association of their cause with the Puritans. After they secured political power in England, the Puritans eagerly embraced the philosophy of Francis Bacon and “enthroned him as leader of the scientific movement, a position he maintained throughout the century” (97). The relationship between the Puritans and natural philosophy also strengthened in the educational field. The Puritans’ hold on power had been increasing and the time came in 1648 for the reform of the University of Oxford. This was carried out by a visitation under the instructions of Parliament. It was as a result of this that John Wilkins was made warden of Wadham College. His wardenship was very favourable to natural philosophy. Oliver Cromwell (1599-1658), the Puritan leader, became Chancellor of the University of Oxford in 1650, a position he held until his death in 1657. In practice the University was run by a five-man committee on Cromwell’s behalf. Wilkins joined this committee in October 1652. In Cambridge, Parliament made the Earl of Manchester responsible in 1644 for appointing a committee to eject any college fellows deemed unsuitable for office. Vacant positions were filled by appointees of the Westminster Assembly of Divines and were appointed by Manchester. From October 1649 onwards heads of houses and college fellows had to swear allegiance to the Commonwealth. This was known as the Engagement.



The connection between the new scientific movement and Puritanism resulted in a negative perception of the latter after the Restoration. This hostility was also linked very much to the proposals which were made under Puritan rule by educational reformers to abolish the traditional curriculum of the universities and to give primacy to experimental science, with an emphasis on applied or utilitarian science. There was even a proposal made in *A Modell for a Colledge Reformation*, published shortly before the Restoration, that Christ Church be completely overhauled, and its revenues redirected to fund the teaching of experimental science (Jones 101). All of this could only be seen as institutionalized bullying on the part of those who had taught or been educated in the humanistic tradition, and, Jones writes of the era after the Restoration, “it is not difficult to imagine the resentment over the proposed educational innovations which burned in the hearts of the conservatives, nor to realize the odium that became attached to experimental science because of its association with them” (103). This was to a certain extent countered by the granting of a Royal Charter to the Royal Society by Charles II, who had come into contact with Cartesianism while in exile in France, but the problem did not go away immediately.

#### 2.7. THE REVALUATION OF THE VIRTUOSI

The word “virtuoso” was sometimes used historically in a rather dismissive fashion, even of men whose achievements were substantial. Recent biographical accounts of some of the major virtuosi have suggested that they had a range of interests so broad and out of the ordinary that they were for this reason not appreciated in their own day and that only now has the complexity of their achievements been recognized. We can see this tendency in the case of three men who were important figures in their day both in their own right and as members of the Royal Society. They are Robert Boyle, John Evelyn and John Woodward. I shall comment briefly on each of them here.

*Robert Boyle* was a virtuoso in the sense that he was a fellow of the Royal Society. His achievements were already regarded as substantial during his lifetime and he commanded a respect not always accorded to others. Boyle has for many years been considered as the father of modern chemistry and in conventional accounts of the subject his invention of the air pump is thought of as the beginning of modern science. Boyle constructed the air pump, which was in fact a vacuum chamber, with the help of Robert Hooke. The device successfully created a vacuum, something which allowed Boyle to show the effect of the absence of air on light and flame. The pump became a standard item in laboratories and also became widespread in Europe. The discovery that Boyle was so interested in alchemy shows that he

brought more of the old way of doing things into post-Restoration early modern science than had previously been thought. The research of Lawrence M. Principe has in recent years presented a new interpretation of Boyle's work. Far from solely representing the onset of a modern, experimentally based science which replaced alchemy, Principe presents Boyle as a man greatly concerned with *chrysopoeia*. It is Principe's assertion that this "branch of alchemy concerned with the transmutation of base metals into gold by means of the Philosophers' Stone . . . lay at the heart of Boyle's chymistry, a term embracing a variety of chemical and alchemical theories and operations" (Applebaum 472). This more recent way of looking at Boyle and his interest in alchemy renders obsolete the previous image of him as the father of modern science because of his invention of the air pump. It reveals a more transitional figure, on the one hand committed to the old ways of alchemy and on the other a protagonist of the scientific revolution.

Both Butler and Swift took works by Robert Boyle as satirical targets. However, these were not scientific works, but rather works of religious piety. Butler drew specifically on rhetorical features of two of Robert Boyle's best-known non-scientific works, *Some Motives and Incentives to the Love of God. Pathetically discours'd of, in A Letter to a Friend*, published in 1659 (a revision of a work written in 1648 and entitled *Seraphick Love*) and the *Occasional Reflections upon Several Subjects*, published in 1665. Swift's *A Meditation upon a Broomstick* (1710) adopts the language of the latter and applies it to a humble broomstick. Boyle and his assistant Robert Hooke were prominent in the literary satires of the day because of their high public profile in the scientific revolution, but Butler and Swift were attracted to Boyle's pious writing as a satirical target because of the cloying nature of his style. They would have known nothing of his interest in alchemy.

*John Evelyn* was a diarist and writer. A Royalist, he left England in 1643 and set off on the grand tour visiting France and Italy for nearly four years. He leased a large estate at Sayes Court in Deptford and began to lay out the garden there in 1652. This marked the beginning of his engagement with botany and the history of gardens. The result of this was the *Elysium Britannicum*, a compendious history of gardens and gardening. Although this was the work of Evelyn's lifetime it remained unpublished. Interestingly enough, he made an unpublished translation of an unattributed work on alchemy entitled *Coelum sanitatis* in accordance with his belief that translation could also serve Bacon's Great Instauration. He wrote on tree cultivation (*Sylva*, 1664) and soils (*A Philosophical Discourse of Earth*, 1676), works associated with the *Elysium Britannicum*. The former work was intended to promote the planting of trees after the devastation of the Civil War. He wrote the first book on pollution in England,

entitled *Fumifugium* (1661). Evelyn served on a number of committees devoted to public projects. In 1660 he agreed to serve as commissioner of the sewers and thereafter served on committees to regulate the Royal Mint and Gresham College (1663), rebuild St Paul's Cathedral (1666) and plan London anew after the Great Fire (1667). Evelyn was dismissed in his day as a dilettante concerned with the arts and sciences. Nowadays he is appreciated for his lifelong work on gardens and horticulture. As Douglas D. C. Chambers writes in the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, in the latter he was instrumental in bringing continental ideas into England and anticipated the English landscape garden of the mid-eighteenth century (online edition, par. 9 of 28). Evelyn became the subject of satires on the virtuosi, as will become apparent in the next chapter.

Finally, even a figure as unsympathetic as the physician, natural historian and antiquary *John Woodward* is more appreciated today, largely because of the work of the historian Joseph M. Levine. Woodward was famous in his day for his abrasive personality and for a shield among his antiquarian possessions which was supposedly Roman, yet which soon attracted doubts about its authenticity. He was also a great collector of fossils. Levine observes of Woodward in the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* that "the rules he subsequently developed for collection and curation of geological material by his collectors . . . remain hard to improve on. He was thus a real pioneer in the world of museology" (online edition, par. 4 of 7). He became Professor of Physick at Gresham College in 1692 and was also active in the Royal Society between 1694 and 1710. As a natural historian Woodward believed that the fossils he collected were the remains of creatures destroyed in the biblical flood. He began lecturing on this subject at Gresham College in 1693 and his work *An Essay toward a Natural History of the Earth* (1695) led to a lengthy controversy. Among his opponents was Dr John Arbuthnot, who wrote *An Examination of Dr. Woodward's Account of the Deluge* (full title: *An Examination of Dr. Woodward's Account of the Deluge, &c with a Comparison between Steno's Philosophy and the Doctor's, in the case of Marine Bodies dug out of the Earth*). This work was printed in the *Philosophical Transactions* by William Wotton in 1697. This detail is endowed with ironic overtones, given Wotton's later attacks on *A Tale of a Tub*, written by Arbuthnot's friend Jonathan Swift, but attributed by Wotton to Sir William Temple. Woodward was a favourite target of the Scriblerians and they created two memorable satirical portraits of him in *Three Hours after Marriage* and the *Memoirs of Martinus Scriblerus*. There were other satirical portrayals of him including the anonymous *Don Bilioso de L'Estomac* (1719).

## 2.8. THE TELESCOPE AND THE MICROSCOPE

As we have seen, the scientific revolution brought new ways of seeing things and, as a consequence, new tools with which to see. There were two in particular that caught the attention of the satirists, namely the telescope and the microscope. The former brought objects into range which had previously been too far away to see, while the latter brought into range objects which had previously been too small to be observed by the human eye.

Inventors first tried to patent the telescope in the Netherlands in 1609 but were unsuccessful. News of the existence of an instrument consisting of a tube which contained concave and convex lenses magnifying by a factor of three or four soon spread in Europe. It was the modifications made by Galileo Galilei to the telescope which led to a major breakthrough. In the space of about six months in 1609 he developed the telescope to the point where it could be used to observe the surface of the moon. Galileo made many discoveries, including four satellites of Jupiter. He published his *Sidereus Nuncius* in March 1610, a work which brought about a fundamental change in man's understanding of the universe.

The telescope clearly opened up the heavens to man's scrutiny in a new way. John Wilkins included this paean to Galileo and the telescope in *The Discovery of a World in the Moone* in 1638:

[Galileo] the inventour of that famous perspective, whereby we may discern the heavens hard by us, whereby those things which others have formerly guest at are manifested to the eye, and plainly discovered beyond exception or doubt, of which admirable invention, these latter ages of the world may justly boast, and for this expect to be celebrated by posterity. (87-8)

Another important early astronomer who made use of the telescope was Johannes Hevelius (1611-87). In 1641 Hevelius had an observatory built in his house and used it to observe both sunspots and the surface of the moon. His work on the latter led to the publication in 1647 of his *Selenographia sive Lunae Descriptio*, in which he named geographical features of the moon after the mountains and seas of the Earth. The reflecting telescope was invented by Isaac Newton in 1668, the image it provided of the observed object contrasting with the upright image conveyed by the eyepiece of Galileo's telescope.

Unlike the telescope, the invention of the microscope gave rise to a great deal of satire because of what became visible through it. The Dutchman Anton van Leeuwenhoek (1632-1723) is regarded as its inventor. He discovered the microorganism and made many of the first important observations through the microscope. He was an eager correspondent

with the Royal Society. Robert Hooke confirmed van Leeuwenhoek's discoveries and improved on the design of his light microscope. Hooke published his *Micrographia* in 1665, but John Wilders notes that Hooke had given many demonstrations to the Royal Society "in April 1663 and during the months immediately following" (394, n. to line 305). It was then that his work became a target for Samuel Butler in *Hudibras, The Second Part*. To understand the impact of the microscope it is helpful to go back to the review of Hooke's *Micrographia* that appeared in the *Philosophical Transactions*. It is entitled "An Account of Micrographia, or the Physiological Descriptions of Minute Bodies, made by Magnifying Glasses" (1 [1665-6]: 27-32). The following passage articulates the new world that the microscope had opened up:

. . . the Attentive Reader of this Book will find, that there being hardly any thing so small, as by the help of Microscopes, to escape our enquiry, a new visible world is discovered by this means, and the earth shews quite a new thing to us, so that in every little particle of its matter, we may now behold almost as great a variety of creatures, as we were able before to reckon up in the whole Universe itself. (27)

The anonymous reviewer comments on what this brings to natural philosophy thus: "whence may emerge many admirable advantages towards the enlargement of the *Active* and *Mechanick* part of knowledge, because we may perhaps be enabled to discern the secret workings of Nature" (27-8). In discussing the contents of the book the reviewer observes at one point: "And what he notes of a Flea, Louse, Mites, and Vinegar-worms, cannot but exceedingly please the curious Reader" (30). The doors of perception had been opened much more widely to the excitement of the virtuosi.

One opponent of the new experimental science was the cleric Meric Casaubon (1599-1671), who published a letter to Peter du Moulin (1601-84) under the title *A Letter of Meric Casaubon D.D. &c. to Peter du Moulin D.D. and Prebendarie of the Same Church: Concerning Natural Experimental Philosophie, and Some Books Lately Set out about It* in 1669. This was a response to a reading of Glanvill's *Plus Ultra*. Casaubon writes of the latest discoveries "that nothing can be in nature so mean or so vile but deserves to be taken notice of" (qtd. in Syfret 41). This will become an important *topos* of satire on the new science, readily discernible in the work of Butler, Swift and Pope. I shall call it the "*topos* of the vile". It is something that requires comment to draw out its significance, since that is now overlaid with the advances in perception which have occurred over the last three hundred years or so.

To understand just what it was that people found so repugnant about this "new visible world," we need to go back to the idea of the *scala naturae*. In opening up the

microscopic world of insects to the scrutiny of the virtuoso, the ladder of nature had been extended downwards by several rungs. Central to the notion of the *scala naturae* was the idea that what was further from God was less like him. And so this writhing mass of insect life that so fascinated Hooke and the virtuosi could only appear horrendous and unworthy of serious attention to those unable to countenance it. In many ways this divide lies at the heart of the battle of the Ancients and Moderns, recalling Swift's metaphor of the spider which only throws out its own repugnant web in which to catch flies in *The Battle of the Books*. If Pope later wrote in the Second Epistle of *An Essay on Man* that man was the fit subject of intellectual inquiry, he was saying the same thing in a somewhat more evolved fashion (2.1-2). In Butler it takes the form of raising a previously insignificant creature such as the louse to a much higher level of intellectual interest. At the end of *An Occasional Reflection on Dr. Charleton*, Butler derides Hooke's interest in the louse in *Micrographia* (*Hudibras I & II* 240). For Swift, the spider in *The Battle of the Books* comes to stand for the whole self-generating modern debacle of the New Learning. And the change of perspective in the second part of the *Travels*, the voyage to Brobdingnag, the country of the giants, allows Swift to indulge his disgust for certain aspects of the human form by making them so much larger for Gulliver to see and to comment on. Pope, finally, satirizes what he regards as insignificant, for example, the silkworm (*Dunciad* 3: 1.171-72). All these things had become accessible because of the microscope and the interest in natural philosophy in the second half of the seventeenth century. For the natural philosophers this was a positive development. For Butler, Swift and Pope, however, this must have seemed like opening a Pandora's box full of the ugly and the inconsequential.

[Passage omitted]

## 2.9. LITERARY RESPONSES

I will be dealing in this thesis with the impact on literary texts of the issues I have been discussing in this chapter. The first author in whose work there is a clear satirical reception of natural philosophy is Samuel Butler. The subject has a peripheral role in his long poem *Hudibras*, but we find here the first printed example of it in a passage of eighteen lines which is concerned with the microscope. There are several works which deal with the Royal Society which remained unpublished until 1759. Among these the poem *The Elephant in the Moon* is the most significant. The ideas contained in Kepler's *Somnium* as they are received in the work of John Wilkins form the basis for the satire in this poem, which concerns a session

spent observing the moon through a telescope. Other works of importance are *An Occasional Reflection on Dr. Charleton's Feeling a Dog's Pulse at Gresham College* by R. B. Esq. and *Satire upon the Royal Society* as well as some of Butler's character sketches. Butler knew the dramatist Thomas Shadwell and advised him on how to treat the subject of natural philosophy on the stage. The result was the comedy *The Virtuoso* (1676) which became the defining comic portrait of the gentleman who devotes himself to experiments in natural philosophy. Sir Thomas Browne wrote important works on early modern science as well as an exquisite meditation on an antiquarian theme called *Urne Burial*. The satirical reception of the virtuoso is to be found in one of his minor works. The virtuoso who is primarily interested in curiosities is satirized in a work of his called *Musaeum Clausum, or Bibliotheca Abscondita*, published posthumously in 1683. The comedy *The Emperor in the Moon* by Aphra Behn satirizes the obsession with the moon on the part of a virtuoso called Doctor Baliardo in a way that is explicitly quixotic. William King wrote two works which are satirical receptions of the *Philosophical Transactions* of the Royal Society, *The Transactioneer* (1700) and the *Useful Transactions in Philosophy, and Other Sorts of Learning in Three Parts* (1708). King is concerned in the first work with the historical figure of Sir Hans Sloane and criticizes him as an author for his poor use of language and as editor of the *Philosophical Transactions* for a seemingly lax editorial policy. In this work King stays close to his source texts. In the *Useful Transactions* King experiments more freely with satirical strategies on early modern science.

This literary trend culminates in the *Memoirs of Scriblerus*, begun in 1713/14 but not published until 1741. The central characters of the *Memoirs* are Cornelius Scriblerus and his son Martinus. The former is preoccupied with the concerns of the older generation of virtuoso, namely antiquarianism, while Martinus is interested in criticism and other Modern pursuits. I shall be dealing with all these works in the chapters which follow as well as examining Jonathan Swift's representation of the Academy of Lagado in *Gulliver's Travels*, which is generally considered to be Swift's satirical account of the Royal Society. I am concerned here with the satirical reception of the virtuoso and his interests. The satirists do not concentrate exclusively on the figure of the virtuoso in the examples of satires listed here, sometimes embarking on a satirical account of the microscope, an absorption in the moon or the *Philosophical Transactions*. So the satirical reception of the virtuoso is often realized indirectly through an attack on what it is that interests him. Already somewhat intermittent in character, this makes the representation of the theme in the literature of the time slightly diffuse. However, all of these satires are examples of the satirical reception of

natural philosophy, the most widespread of the three forms of the New Learning, which are for the purposes of this thesis antiquarianism, natural philosophy and textual criticism.



## CHAPTER THREE. THE FIRST SATIRICAL ACCOUNTS OF THE VIRTUOSI: SAMUEL BUTLER

Satirical representations of the virtuosi made their first conspicuous appearance in the works of Samuel Butler. They were only occasional in those works which he published during his lifetime, namely in *Hudibras*, the long poem in three parts, and in "An Heroical Epistle of Hudibras to Sidrophel," which follows the end of the Second Part. Several of his minor works, however, which were published posthumously in the second half of the eighteenth century, are important examples. The best known is *The Elephant in the Moon. An Occasional Reflection on Dr. Charleton's Feeling a Dog's Pulse at Gresham College by R.B. Esq.* is noteworthy and the unfinished *Satire upon the Royal Society* is also of interest. Although these works were not available to a wider public during Butler's lifetime, it seems likely that at least some of them were known to his circle of friends and acquaintances. His targets included the microscope, the telescope and some of the early experiments of the Royal Society. Butler's work is important as he was not only one of the first writers to satirize the virtuosi, but also because in the case of the experiments of the Royal Society he was writing as a contemporary.

### 3.1. THE BURLESQUE

[Passage omitted]

### 3.2. READING BUTLER

Butler was known principally during his lifetime for *Hudibras*, but as has already been noted, he left a number of unpublished works. The most substantial poem among them was *The Elephant in the Moon* and he also left an important collection of *Characters*. Both were published posthumously by Robert Thyer (bap. 1709-81) in two volumes in 1759 along with other works under the title *The Genuine Remains in Verse and Prose of Mr. Samuel Butler: Published from the Original Manuscripts, formerly in the Possession of W. Longueville, Esq. with Notes by R. Thyer*. For my current purposes the works of primary interest which derive

from this source are *The Elephant in the Moon*, a selection of the *Characters*, the *Satire upon the Royal Society* and *An Occasional Reflection on Dr. Charleton*. There are also Butler's miscellaneous prose observations, some of which Thyer was also the first to publish. A fuller edition of these miscellaneous observations was published much later in the twentieth century under the title *Prose Observations*. It remains an open question why much of this material was not published in Butler's lifetime. Writing solely of the *Characters*, their twentieth-century editor Charles W. Daves suggests that "the Character was not, in its pure form, a popular genre of the Restoration period" (26). It is Daves's view that, shortly after the Restoration of the monarchy in 1660, "the literary and psychological interest for such writing was being absorbed into the drama and the essay" (27). Collections of characters were no longer fashionable during the Interregnum and only single polemical characters were published. These two factors explain why the *Characters* remained unpublished in Butler's lifetime.

Reading Butler is no straightforward exercise, either in the sense of finding one's way among the various editions of his works or of negotiating the issue of the readability of *Hudibras*. In terms of modern editions of Butler's work there have been two substantial editorial projects in the twentieth century. The first consisted of the three volumes published in the Cambridge English Classics series. These were A.R. Waller's edition of *Hudibras* (1905), the same editor's *Characters and Passages from Note-books* (1908) and René Lamar's *Satires and Miscellaneous Poetry and Prose* (1928). The second similarly consists of three volumes. John Wilders edited *Hudibras* anew in 1967 for the Clarendon Press in Oxford. He also prepared *Hudibras Pts. 1 & 2 and Other Writings* with Hugh de Quehen for the same publishers in the Oxford Paperback English Texts series. This modernized edition of most of Butler's essential works – the first two parts of *Hudibras*, *The Elephant in the Moon*, the *Satire upon the Royal Society* and *An Occasional Reflection on Dr. Charleton* – was published in 1973. Hugh de Quehen's edition of the *Prose Observations* followed in 1979, also published by Oxford.

The editors of the Oxford volumes argue strongly against the earlier Cambridge ones on editorial grounds. Wilders rejects Waller's earlier edition of *Hudibras* claiming "there were apparently no good reasons for Waller's choice of copy-texts and his description of the early editions was very far from complete" (v). In his preface to the *Prose Observations*, de Quehen states his main objections to the other two Cambridge volumes as follows: "The omission, and silent rearrangement, of passages is most serious in Lamar's *Satires and Miscellaneous Poetry and Prose*; but Waller's *Characters and Passages from Note-Books* omits some

material and provides no systematic collation of parallel drafts” (vii). While this attention to bibliographical detail may appear overly pedantic, it has a very real bearing on the admissibility of a poem such as “Virtuoso,” consisting of six stanzas and 40 lines and printed in that form by Lamar in 1928. The first eight lines were printed by Thyer, but the poem as it stands appears to be an editorial collage by Lamar’s hand and as a result cannot be discussed as an original text by Butler in the current thesis.<sup>25</sup>

The question of the readability of *Hudibras* need not detain us here, since it refers to what is generally regarded as the main subject of the poem, namely the Puritans. This problem arises when a satirical work engages with a subject which is familiar to the author and his readership at the time of writing, but which with the passing of time becomes remote and incomprehensible to later generations of readers. Samuel Johnson was already concerned for *Hudibras* in this respect in the eighteenth century when the Puritans had already receded in time, remarking that “our grandfathers knew the picture from the life; we judge of the life by the picture” (2: 8). In the twentieth century James Sutherland trenchantly suggested that the “poem that the Restoration reader and his sons and grandsons so enjoyed has almost completely evaporated” (158). Since we are concerned here with Butler’s satirical representations of the virtuosi, who appear peripherally, the question of the evanescence of Butler’s central theme need not detain us.

### 3.3. DATING BUTLER’S WORKS

*Hudibras* was published in three separate parts. The respective official dates of license were 1663 for the First Part, 1664 for the Second Part and 1678 for the Third Part. *Hudibras* is a lengthy poem, but we will be principally concerned with the third canto of the Second Part, in which “Sidrophel the Rosicrucian” appears (*Hudibras I & II* 157). Sidrophel acts as a focus for all of Butler’s concerns about astrology, astronomy and natural philosophy. Also of interest is “An Heroical Epistle of Hudibras to Sidrophel,” which was written much later, and is wholly concerned with natural philosophy. It appeared for the first time in 1674,

---

<sup>25</sup> I therefore propose to use Wilders and de Quehen’s 1973 selection in modernized English, supplementing it with Wilders’s *Hudibras* (1967) where necessary. The latter contains “An Heroical Epistle of Hudibras to Sidrophel” and the Third Part of *Hudibras*. I shall also use Charles W. Daves’s edition of the *Characters* (1970), which includes further character sketches not published by Thyer in 1759. I shall refer to earlier editions, including Thyer’s, where necessary. It seems prudent to distinguish between the two principle editions for the purposes of parenthetical references with a key: *Hudibras I & II: Hudibras Parts I and II and Selected Other Writings*, ed. John Wilders and Hugh de Quehen (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1973); *Hudibras: Hudibras*, ed. John Wilders (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1967).

when it was added to the revised version of the First and Second Parts published in that year. I will also make passing reference to the Third Part of *Hudibras*, where the overall quality of Butler's writing is in decline, but he continues to target the natural philosophers.

John Wilders comments on the difficulty of arriving at a precise dating of the composition of the poem. Wilders suggests that "the most rewarding evidence is to be found within the poem itself, in Butler's allusions to political events and to published works, the dates of which are beyond dispute" (*Hudibras* xlv). He locates some of the writing of the third canto of the Second Part in 1663, since Butler makes comic use of the fraudulent Second Part which appeared in that year. And he suggests that "An Heroical Epistle of Hudibras to Sidrophel" was written between 1672 and 1674 (*Hudibras* 187-90). He derives the earlier date of 1672 from the mention in the poem of a discourse on eggs written by a Signor Malpighi which was read to the Royal Society in the February of that year (*Hudibras*, xlvii & 405 n).

In the other works by Butler under discussion here, his *Characters* also contain references to the virtuosi. It was Thyer's view that the *Characters* had been largely written between 1667 and 1669 (2: 4). Alexander C. Spence remarks the difficulty of determining an exact date for the writing of *The Elephant in the Moon* but offers 1676 or slightly earlier based on internal evidence (iv). He also mentions a controversy which may have inspired the details of Butler's satire (iv). It took place between 1670 and 1671 between supporters of the Royal Society led by Joseph Glanville (1636-80) and Henry Stubbe (1632-76), a physician resident in Warwick, who sought to cast doubt on the reliability of telescopes (iv). Marjorie Hope Nicolson puts the writing of the octosyllabic version rather earlier at 1666. She suggests this date due to the frequency of astronomical observations at the Royal Society in the mid-1660s (152). From the dating of the composition of all these works, it is evident that we are in the presence of an early reckoning with our subject.

#### 3.4. AN EARLY SATIRICAL ACCOUNT OF THE VIRTUOSI

Butler's first response was included in the Second Part of *Hudibras*. It concerns the newly invented microscope, which was making accessible to the human eye a world of hitherto invisible life forms and plant matter.

[Passage omitted]

3.5. PERCEPTION AND ERROR IN BUTLER'S SATIRICAL SUBJECTS

Although it is often difficult to know what any earnest satirist would propose as an alternative to their satirical targets, there may be a notion of truth in Butler's writing which serves that purpose. In his article "Samuel Butler: A Restoration Figure in a Modern Light" Ricardo Quintana examines Butler's prose observations closely.<sup>26</sup> It is here that Quintana finds a more fully rounded notion of truth. Religious truth for Butler resembled the shield that fell from heaven during the reign of Numa Pompilius, the second king of Rome. The Romans had several copies made of the shield (21, lines 15-19). Butler uses this story as a metaphor when he writes: "So although there be but one Truth that come's (sic) from Heaven, there are so many false Counterfets (sic) introduc'd by reasons of State that pretend to be it, that nothing is more difficult than to distinguish the true from the false and fictitious" (21, lines 19-22). For Quintana this is the central dichotomy of Butler's thought, which lies in "the opposition between truth and opinion" (Quintana 13). This provided the model for Butler's theory of knowledge, which Quintana expresses as follows: "Truth results from a right performance of reason, error from a false performance . . ." (14). The goal of intellectual inquiry in Butler is what Quintana calls "an understanding of universal nature" (16), which Butler calls in the *Prose Observations* "the Proper object of Science" (13, line 15), in the seventeenth-century sense of knowledge. From this we see that there are absolutes to be had among the available interpretations of Butler's work, although we can also infer that these absolutes are conservative ones, which do not admit of the new currents of thought in astronomy and natural philosophy. A robust scepticism about the way Butler perceives the world around him can be clearly discerned in his work and it is this that shapes his satire. He writes with consummate scepticism, a feature of his writing which probably derives from having observed how all the idealism of the Puritans came to nothing. I shall examine here some of Butler's satirical targets that come under attack because of that scepticism. Each is a variation on the theme of the proximity of perception and error, in Butler's estimation. The first of these is astrology, which receives a lot of attention in *Hudibras* (2.7). Secondly, Butler was writing at a time when astronomers were actively exploring the heavenly bodies for the first time with the aid of the telescope. An early innovation which in fact turned out to be

---

<sup>26</sup> He refers to Butler's *Miscellaneous Observations* in Samuel Butler, *Characters and Passages from the Note-books*, ed. A.R. Waller (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1908). I have traced the quotations he discusses in the edition I prefer, Samuel Butler, *Prose Observations* (1979), ed. Hugh de Quehen (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979).

unsuccessful was the application of certain geographical names to the features of the surface of the moon by the astronomer Johannes Hevelius (1611-1687). Butler satirizes Hevelius for this approach. Then I will look at the satirical reception in *Hudibras* of the interest in the moon in the seventeenth century, decrying it as too remote to be of any real interest economically.

[Passage omitted]

It is this attitude of robust scepticism that we have seen demonstrated in the examples in this section which underpins Butler's satirical reception of the Royal Society. In the next section of the thesis I shall examine how Butler's scepticism extends to one of the experiments of the Royal Society which involves the injection of poison into a dog and examine how Butler wields the axe of rhetoric against it.

### 3.6. BUTLER'S PROSE WORKS

Butler's opening sally against the microscope was written not long after the founding of the Royal Society. His later works which target the virtuosi were written after the public perception of the Society became more clearly defined. It seems appropriate at this point to look to Butler's prose works to see what they can tell us about Butler's attitude towards the virtuosi, written as they were probably in the second half of the 1660s, before going on to analyze the rest of his poetry. I shall firstly look at *An Occasional Reflection on Dr. Charleton*, then at the *Characters* and finally at the *Prose Observations*.

#### 3.6.1. *An Occasional Reflection on Dr. Charleton*

The full title of this short parody by Butler is *An Occasional Reflection on Dr. Charleton's Feeling a Dog's Pulse at Gresham College by R. B. Esq.* I shall provide here a description of the text, comment on what it is that Butler is satirizing, his satirical technique and the conclusions that he draws. As an example of Butler's satirical writing on natural philosophy this text has the virtue of being a concise mixture of description and reflection which may help to orientate us before attempting Butler's more complex works.

Dr Walter Charleton (1619-1707), the virtuoso protagonist of the text, was an eminent physician of the day and one of the founder members of the Royal Society. He was appointed physician to Charles I when the latter retired to Oxford in the early 1640s and subsequently attended on Charles II. He published widely, was central to the medical

profession of the day and was a much-respected figure. Butler's text is a satirical account of the administration of poison to a dog by Dr Charleton at a meeting of the Royal Society held at Gresham College. It was probably written in 1665 (*Hudibras I & II* 308, n. 3). Presumably speaking of the same experiment, Pepys wrote in his diary on 15 March 1665: "Anon to Gresham College, where, among other good discourse, there was tried the great poison of Macassar upon a dog, but it had no effect all the time we sat there" (qtd. in *Hudibras I & II* 308, n. 3). De Quehen and Wilders remark that a further experiment was carried out on 19 April (*Hudibras I & II* 308, n. 3). I have been unable to trace any mention of the experiments in the *Philosophical Transactions*, but the presence of "the great poison of Macassar" in Pepys's diary entry and Butler's account suggest that both were writing about the same experiment. And so it is likely that Butler's satire was written shortly after these experiments took place.

Such experiments had their origin in the Oxford of the 1650s, where great advances were being made in the field of anatomy. There is a spirited defence of Christopher Wren as the inventor of "a Way to conveigh any liquid thing immediately into the Mass of Blood" towards the end of the 1650s and mention of Boyle's order to "put it to Experiment" (129) in an early report in the *Philosophical Transactions*. This was entitled "An Account of the Rise and Attempts, of a Way to Conveigh Liquors Immediately into the Mass of Blood" (*Phil. Trans.* 1 [1665-6]: 128-30). The anonymous author describes the injection of opium and the infusion of *Crocus Metallorum* into several different dogs in experiments that put Wren's invention into practice. The dispensability of the animals which were the subject of these experiments is immediately apparent from the following account: "whereof the success was, that the Opium, being soon circulated into the Brain, did within a short time stupefy, though not kill the Dog; but a large Dose of the *Crocus Metallorum*, made an other Dog vomit up Life and all" (129). Barbara J. Shapiro notes that the experiment was repeated several times with different liquids "and became well-known throughout the university" (133). The report previously cited from the *Philosophical Transactions* attests to the repeated practice of the experiment "both in *Oxford & London*; as well before the *Royal Society*, as elsewhere" (129). The author does not expand on the medical uses to which the invention might be put or on the anatomical purposes, leaving these implied benefits to one side, since the purpose of the article is to confirm Wren as its inventor. The implied benefits are the introduction of benign liquids to medical ends and a better understanding of the structure of vessels which would be of interest to anatomists.

Butler was satirizing a procedure that was well known by the time it came before the members of the Royal Society. And the tools he makes use of in his satire are stylistic ones. He specifically draws on rhetorical features of two of Robert Boyle's best-known non-scientific works, *Some Motives and Incentives to the Love of God. Pathetically discours'd of, in A Letter to a Friend*, published in 1659 (a revision of a work written in 1648 and entitled *Seraphick Love*) and the *Occasional Reflections upon Several Subjects*, published in 1665. The rhetorical patterning of both works always leads the reader upwards towards the contemplation of religious good. As far as the *Occasional Reflections* are concerned, this movement is perhaps best expressed by the following passage from *A Discourse Touching Occasional Meditations* which Boyle placed before the main text of the work: "In a word, when the devout Soul . . . has, by long practice, accustom'd her self (sic) to spiritualize all the Objects and Accidents that occur to her, I see not why that practice may not be one of the most effectual means for making good that magnificent Assertion of the Apostle, That *all things work together for good to them that love God*" (80).

Boyle's technique consists in taking an event or phenomenon, writing about it and drawing a parallel with something of a religious nature. Three examples should suffice to demonstrate the procedure. In "Upon his manner of giving Meat to his Dog" (I, i) Boyle dwells on the fact that he holds out a piece of meat for his dog at a height out of reach to the dog even when leaping. However, if the dog were not to jump up for it when encouraged, Boyle would not let it fall halfway into the dog's mouth. In the same way God "shews and holds forth to us (the Soul's true Aliment) Eternal Glory, and his most Gracious Word summons and animates us to attempt it," rewarding each of us by the effort we show (162). The moral of the piece is that although we cannot reach heaven "by our good Works, we shall not obtain it without them" (163). In "Upon the making of a Fire with Charcoal" a parallel is drawn between wood that has been made into charcoal by burning and the consequences of indulging in lust (III, ix). When charcoal reignites, it burns with renewed intensity, as does someone returning to indulge lust. And in "Upon a Fish's struggling after having swallow'd the Hook" the pretext of the meditation is a fish that has taken the fly and hook into its mouth and wishes it had not: "the one pulling him to too much torture to let him at all relish the other" (33). There follow some examples from scripture, the most earnest of which is the fate of Judas: "And when what he coveted was in his possession, he had the guilt of acquiring it, without the power of enjoying it" (32). We shall see shortly how Butler's own occasional reflection differs in tone. The rhetorical gesture that Butler conspicuously parodies from *Some Motives and Incentives to the Love of God* is the frequent



repetition of the name “Lyndamore”– “Lindamor” in the original. The purpose of the original text is to educate the young bachelor Lindamor away from the inappropriate objects of his passion and to recast that passion as “seraphick love,” in other words, a love of the divine (9). The name Lindamor is repeated quite frequently, perhaps once on every page of Boyle’s original, so the more frequent repetitions in Butler’s text are a playful exaggeration. The device makes Butler’s text more dramatic and reminds the reader of the moralizing tendency of Boyle’s original.

The conclusions reached in Butler’s occasional reflection are diametrically opposed to those expected in one by Boyle. Butler substitutes the upward tendency of Boyle’s rhetoric with a levelling out of what is important and what is not. In Boyle’s *Occasional Reflections* the reader comes to expect the narration of an everyday event and the drawing of a parallel with a religious phenomenon. The overall movement therefore is the exposition of something worldly which is followed by a religious parallel and an elated outcome with some religious insight. The reverse happens in Butler’s *Occasional Reflection*. When we proceed to analyze Butler’s text, we see he consistently trivializes and mocks the experiment. In the first paragraph he portrays Charleton examining the dog’s pulse. The dog is described as “that domestic animal, the vassal and menial servant of man” and Charleton as “industrious and accurate”. As one takes the pulse of the other they “with equal industry contest who shall contribute most to the experimental improvement of this learned and illustrious Society” (238). This is a comic beginning, but by the end of the first paragraph the tone is changing. Butler remarks that the dog neither knows nor cares to know whether Charleton is concerned for his patient’s welfare or for his own enrichment. It is enough for the dog to know that it is doing its duty and “in that may teach us to resign ourselves wholly to advance the interests and utility of this renowned and royal assembly” (238). In the second paragraph Butler plays with an alternative meaning of the phrase “a dog’s leg,” the meaning of which he supplies: “in the language of the vulgar . . . a thing worth nothing” (238). The resulting reflection is that “even that may teach us that there’s nothing so contemptible but may, if rightly applied to, contribute something to the public good of mankind and commonwealth of learning” (238).

There follow two paragraphs in which the suitability of both dog and physician for the task in hand are emphasized in ironic terms. Butler makes fun of the notion that a dog can reason, as suggested by both Montaigne and Sir Kenelm Digby, and so “be a logician, as the learned hold” (238). Butler observes sardonically that if the dog really can reason, his intelligence will be of great help in the carrying out of the experiment, which is concerned

with poisoning him. Butler then makes another highly ironic observation by drawing attention to Dr Charleton's removal of the King of Macassar's poison from the Royal Society on 8 March 1665, which incurred the Society's displeasure. This shows him "as having so natural a propensity to this kind of venomous operation" (238). Butler is dressing up in rhetorical language the notion that Dr Charleton is naturally disposed to poisoning animals.

There then follows a particularly comic paragraph in which the narrator suggests that a dog is more appropriate for the experiment than a cat: "for a cat, you know, is said to have nine lives . . . and it is a matter of no mean difficulty exactly to trace and observe how many of these the lethal force of this destructive medicament will reach" (239). The narrator remarks that the last time this experiment was tried on a kitten, it fell asleep unscathed in the hollow concave of the Society's mace and "as if it had triumphed over its mortal enemy and all our hostilities" was carried before the Society's President (239). This is probably a humorous embellishment on Butler's part.

In the next paragraph "the acute and profound doctor" is praised for his "strength of judgment and ingenuity" for applying the poison to the dog's neck, whence it can enter directly into its brain and onwards to "the several and respective organs of the passive animal" (239). In the experiments carried out under Boyle's purview in Oxford, injections were made into that part of the hind legs of the dog where larger vessels were in evidence. In the following paragraph, which is the penultimate of the piece, the narrator reminds Lyndamore of Sorbière's comment on Sir Robert Murray in his *A Voyage to England*, that it is "a work of admiration" to see someone "bred up in courts and camps" and engaged "in the most weighty affairs of the State" appear in St. James's Park observing the belts of Jupiter through a telescope (239-40). The suggestion is that the former activity is worthy while the latter is not. This gives the narrator a pretext to contrast "this exquisite and solert doctor" in his usual workplace "in the cabinet of fair ladies" where he is daily concerned "to solicit the tender arteries of their ivory wrists" with his role in the current experiment, "that he, I say, should nevertheless condescend to animadvert the languishing diastole of an expiring mongrel" (240). Butler gives these two examples where zenith and nadir are on an equal footing and draws the moral when he writes "as in general nature there is neither higher nor lower, but zenith and nadir are equally on a plane as well as the poles" (240).

It is worth quoting the final paragraph, which consists of one sentence, in its entirety:

From this, Lyndamore, we may learn that as in general nature there is neither higher nor lower, but zenith and nadir are equally on a plane as well as the poles, so we may receive matter of instruction from objects of the meanest and most contemptible quality, as well as from things of

higher and more sublime condition, even as the most industrious and elegant Mr. Hooke in his microscopical observations has most ingeniously and wittily made it appear that there is no difference in point of design and project between the most ambitious and aspiring politician of the world—and of our times especially—and that most importune and vexatious insect commonly called a louse. (240)

It is here that the narrator passes judgement on the experiment, including it with “objects of the meanest and most contemptible quality”. And the critique is widened to the discipline of microscopy—for Butler surely the discipline of raising the utterly insignificant to the level of absolute importance. The text closes with an attack on Robert Hooke’s *Micrographia* where the attention given to the louse puts it on a par with “the most ambitious and aspiring politician of the world” (240). There is nothing morally uplifting in this occasional reflection, only the sense that the preoccupations of the members of the Royal Society are trivial and absurd. The preoccupation with “a dog’s leg” is the equal of being preoccupied with something of no intrinsic value whatsoever under the guise of seeking to make scientific progress. To elevate the louse to such importance as Hooke does is for Butler an absurdity and all such concerns are in fact unworthy of consideration and most assuredly do not contribute to the good of mankind or the commonwealth of learning, to use two of Butler’s ringing phrases. In all of these cases Butler is juxtaposing the high and the low, what is important and what is trivial, and makes it his purpose to show that what is wrongly elevated to the status of the important needs to be returned to the ranks of the trivial.

Butler’s satire is highly effective because it makes use of parody, by redeploying and mocking the rhetoric of Boyle’s original *Occasional Reflections* in order to satirize the concerns of the Royal Society, of which Boyle was a highly revered fellow and an integral part. Butler targets Charleton, Hooke and Boyle, three professionals of the day, in a hostile fashion. The piece is clearly hostile to the early experimental concerns of natural philosophy and, in this respect, it is expressive of the difficulties experienced by outside observers of the seventeenth-century virtuosi in understanding and accepting the way in which the scope of their interests was extended to include not only flora and fauna as a subject of intellectual inquiry but also procedures that must have appeared bizarre.

### 3.6.2. *Characters*

I have already made some small account of the history of the character or character sketch in Chapter One, by way of introduction to an analysis of Butler’s character “An Antiquary”. I will continue with this history now, to locate the *Characters* of Samuel Butler

critically. We owe the awareness of the genre in the seventeenth century to the editorial work of Isaac Casaubon (1559-1614). He published the Greek text of many of Theophrastus's Greek originals with a Latin translation in Lyons in 1592. An enlarged edition was published in 1599. I have already remarked in Chapter One that the form of the Theophrastan character is unusual. His characters begin with a definition, a technique adopted by writers of seventeenth-century characters. Classical scholars now believe these to be Byzantine accretions. What then follows is "a catalogue of actions" which is narrated paratactically (Ussher 20-21). In the case of Theophrastus this was done with realism and humour which was achieved by the use of colloquial turns of phrase. The English character writers of the seventeenth century can be differentiated from each other on stylistic grounds. The character is essentially a stylistic exercise in prose which takes its cue from its subject. Butler looked back to Overbury and Earle, while also drawing on the work of more contemporary writers such as John Cleveland (*bap.* 1613-58).

Theophrastus's first English imitator was the cleric Joseph Hall (1574-1656), whose collection *Characters of Virtues and Vices* was published in 1608. As the title suggests, there was a Christian motivation to Hall's work which resulted in the inclusion not only of negative portrayals but also of virtuous characters which were intended to be the subject of aspiration, as Richard A. McCabe writes in the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. It is difficult to be sure that we can attribute any of the work in the next important collection of characters to its putative author, but Sir Thomas Overbury (*bap.* 1581-1613) gives his name to the Overburian character. Overbury died an unpleasant death in the Tower in 1613 and in the following year the publisher Lawrence Lisle put out a second edition of a poem attributed to Overbury and a collection of characters: *A Wife now the Widdow of Sir Thomas Overburye . . . whereunto are added many Witty Characters . . . written by himselfe and Other Learned Gentlemen His Friends*. In 1622 an eleventh edition had appeared, containing 82 characters, the authors of which are now thought to be John Webster and possibly Thomas Dekker, as John Considine suggests in the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. The writers of the Overburian character would choose "a subject which enabled them to show off their wit and ingenuity in phrase-making" (Aldington 15).

There is a conciseness about the Overburian character, however, which is not typical of Butler. The character writers of the earlier part of the century used the Senecan style, which foregrounded stylistic wit and brevity (Daves 25). Overburian characters also included examples of adoration, such as "A Fair and Happy Milkmaid": "The golden ears of corn fall and kiss her feet when she reaps them, as if they wished to be bound and led prisoners by

the same hand that felled them” (qtd in Aldington 137). This type of character is entirely missing in Butler. Butler maintains a similar interest in professional and social types, while developing the variety of religious and political characters in accordance with the time in which he wrote (Daves 14). Other influences on Butler’s way of writing character sketches came from the work of John Earle as well as John Cleveland. We have already encountered John Earle in Chapter One. Earle paid more attention to the motives of behaviour of his protagonists, while in the Overburian character the writer is more on the outside of his, with a corresponding emphasis on behaviour or symptoms rather than causes (Daves 10). Earle’s *Micro-cosmographie, or, A Peece of the World Discovered in Essayes and Characters* of 1628 was the most popular collection of all, being reprinted many times. Butler was directly inspired by it, as we have already seen in “The Character of An Antiquary”. Cleveland was a Royalist who was writing at the time of the Civil War. He did not publish a set of characters like his predecessors. His popular character sketch “The Character of a London-Diurnall” was published on its own in a pamphlet in 1644. Cleveland capitalized on its popularity in 1647 by publishing *The Character of a London-Diurnal: with Several Select Poems*. Butler borrowed actual phrases such as “Iliads in a nutshell” and “corruption, Thou art my Father” from Cleveland’s character sketch (qtd in Daves 19).

What are the conspicuous themes and stylistic attributes of Butler’s characters? Immoderation and hypocrisy of any kind are among his targets (Daves 12-13).

[Passage omitted]

Critics have reflected on the *Characters* in relation to *Hudibras*. Writing in response to the publication of Waller’s 1908 edition *Characters and Passages from Note-Books*, Edward Chauncey Baldwin proposed a new edition of *Hudibras* which would take advantage of the *Characters*: “It is as if the actors in a burlesque had one by one left the stage and obligingly posed for a photographer” (529). Charles W. Daves in his introduction to his edition of Butler’s *Characters* argues that their satire is more direct than that of *Hudibras*: “Readers of *Hudibras* will find themselves on familiar terrain in reading Butler’s *Characters*, for the works have many human types in common . . . ” (19). And: “The satire in the *Characters*, however, is less cryptic, more directly and unstintingly realized than in *Hudibras*, because each human type stands under fire, singled out for attack” (19-20). In conclusion, there is a particular clarity to the satire of the *Characters* that helps the reader and the critic to reach a better understanding of Butler’s work and intentions.

### 3.6.3. *Prose Observations*

In his preface to the 1979 edition of Samuel Butler's *Prose Observations* Hugh de Quehen is circumspect about the dating of Butler's text, observing that "one of course cannot be certain that passages written out at one time did not originate earlier" (xxvii). However, he notes the date 10 October 1665 for a particular holograph folio and finds no evidence that any of the other material included was written before this (xxvi). He suggests "the later 1660s" as the date of composition for most of the *Prose Observations*, given that they and the *Characters* share "similar ideas or phrases" and that the *Prose Observations* also mention works such as Sprat's *History of the Royal Society* (1667) (xxvi).

While it is tempting to approach the *Prose Observations* in search of a key with which to unlock Butler's true beliefs about early modern science, it seems appropriate to sound a note of caution in this respect. Butler wrote a number of things which may or may not be used to enlist him in the cause of Baconian progress or in the opposing camp where all virtuosi are regarded as coxcombs. In that the *Prose Observations* appear to have been written by Butler *for himself*, perhaps they represent above all an exploration of ideas rather than an endorsement of them. And where the same ideas appear in his poetry duly denigrated, if this is bewildering, we should remind ourselves that Butler was first and foremost a poet, rather than a philosopher. Perhaps he was simply fulfilling the expectations of the genre.

[Passage omitted]

However, it is questionable whether these observations make Butler into some sort of true scientist. Horne concludes his essay with the question as to whether Butler "ever met a scientist who fulfilled his expectations" (15). It is questionable whether Butler had any expectations of scientists at all. It is a recurring feature of some literary criticism of Butler and later of Swift which would have us believe that Butler and Swift had no objection to science, only an objection to the way it was practised in their day. I am wary of this position. Let us now turn to the rest of Butler's poetry which is concerned with the virtuosi, most of it unpublished during his lifetime.

3.7. *THE ELEPHANT IN THE MOON*

*The Elephant in the Moon* is a fully developed burlesque in which the interest of the day in astronomy and in the moon is ridiculed in a highly effective fashion. This is accomplished through the dramatic situation at the heart of the poem, in which an elephant observed on the moon through a telescope turns out to be a mouse which has got inside the instrument. Once again, as in *Hudibras*, Butler is treating a “solemn subject in an undignified style” (Baldick 43). In this case it is the presence of the mouse inside the telescope which undermines the seriousness of the situation. Butler has two principle targets in the poem. The first is the search for the unusual on the part of the virtuosi, encapsulated in the line “Things wonderful instead of true” (510). The second and related target is the literature written in favour of the idea that there is life on the moon, namely John Wilkins’s books on the world in the moon and Kepler’s *Somnium*. Butler encountered Kepler’s ideas through Wilkins’s book of 1640. Ironically the elements of Kepler’s *Somnium* which Butler makes fun of were probably introduced by the astronomer to help disguise the Copernican character of the work. The Royal Society is strongly implied in the poem, particularly when the virtuosi agree to write an account of the sighting of the elephant in the moon and to “print it in the next *Transaction*” (244).

The central idea of the poem that a mouse seen through a telescope is mistaken for an elephant is reminiscent of the episode of the kite in the third canto of the Second Part of *Hudibras*. There the astrologer Sidrophel relates that in the place of a boy’s kite he has firstly seen the planet Saturn and secondly a falling star, both of which he interprets as negative astrological portents. The contrast between what has been seen and what is reported is quite ridiculous and serves both to denigrate and undermine belief in Sidrophel’s profession. This is done through the juxtaposition of what is trivial and what is important, as well as what is prosaic and what is extrapolated from it scientifically. Butler is suggesting that the imaginations of the virtuosi have been stirred by the writings of Wilkins and Kepler about the inhabitants of the moon and that they see what they want to see. They lapse into a perceptual error because of their false expectations. This pattern of behaviour is clearly quixotic and is not the only example in Butler’s work. It informs his assessment of the figure of the virtuoso. The aim of *The Elephant in the Moon* is to convince the reader that what the virtuosi are looking for is fanciful and imaginary. One example of this is the elephant:

Quoth he, ‘A stranger sight appears  
Than e’er was seen in all the spheres,  
A wonder more unparalleled

Than ever mortal tube beheld.  
An elephant from one of those  
Two mighty armies is broke loose,  
And with the horror of the fight  
Appears amazed and in a fright.  
Look quickly, lest the sight of us  
Should cause the startled beast t'imboss . . .' (121-130)

Another is the explanation of the elephant's presence on the moon by one of the virtuosi:

' . . . And if the moon produce by nature  
A people of so vast a stature,  
'Tis consequent she should bring forth  
Far greater beasts too than the earth  
(As by the best accounts appears  
Of all our great'st discoverers),  
And that those monstrous creatures there  
Are not such rarities as here.' (153-160)

Some critics – notably Nicolson and Bruun – have gone to considerable lengths to identify the main characters in the poem. I shall review their conclusions but suggest that while the characters in the poem may have been given certain recognizable features of the most important virtuosi of the day, the important feature here is that the virtuosi talk against themselves. One feature of the burlesque is when characters in classical myth are demystified and talk out of character. Similarly, here it is hard to imagine the real historical virtuosi giving voice to the speeches in the poem since a certain amount of the dialogue bears witness to the low level of credibility suffered by the Royal Society. The virtuosi make themselves look even more ridiculous by accepting the discovery of the elephant on the moon and treating it as something which will give the Royal Society greater credibility. The poem has at its centre the satirical reception of the telescope. This satirical reception may well have been encouraged by the fact that when Butler was writing the telescope had not been fully accepted. It may be the case, as Alexander C. Spence suggests, that Butler drew inspiration from the polemic between Joseph Glanvill and Henry Stubbe and that the notion of the unreliability of the telescope is thematized in the burlesque at the heart of *The Elephant in the Moon* (iv). Butler was clearly aware of the polemical work of Henry Stubbe, who is mentioned in the poem "Only to make new work for Stubbs / And all the academic clubs" (lines 431-2). I shall look at Stubbe's ideas in relation to Butler's poem.

It is a curious fact that *The Elephant in the Moon* remained unpublished during Butler's lifetime. Thyer suggests the following motive in his footnote to lines 27-8: "I cannot help observing on this Occasion, that 'tis very probable, that the true Reason of this Poem's not being published in the Author's Life-time, was the many personal Reflections contained



in it upon Persons of great Consideration, who were, some of them, then alive" (1: 3). After the success of *Hudibras* Butler had gained the favour of Charles II, although this did not immediately translate itself into any financial reward. He was employed by George Villiers, the second Duke of Buckingham (1628-87) between 1670 and 1673 if not for longer (*Hudibras I & II* 310, n. 2). In entering such service, it may have seemed appropriate to keep the poem from the public sphere, containing as it does a number of celebrated virtuosi as characters. Yet not long afterwards Butler had no qualms about publishing "An Heroical Epistle of Hudibras to Sidrophel," a poem even more outspoken in its attack on the virtuosi than *The Elephant in the Moon*.

There may of course be any number of reasons why Butler never published the poem or other works such as the *Satire on the Royal Society*, the *Characters* and *An Occasional Reflection on Dr. Charleton*. Perhaps he regarded *Hudibras* as his main work and everything else as peripheral. The Third and Last Part of *Hudibras* was published in 1678 and Butler died in 1680, so he did publish almost up to the end of his life. In his entry on Butler in the *Dictionary of National Biography*, Hugh de Quehen writes: "Among the unknown facts of his life the most curious is the strange reluctance of the destitute author to release any of his eminently saleable manuscript works" (online edition, para. 14 of 14). The real reason why *The Elephant in the Moon* and other works remained unpublished during the poet's lifetime will probably remain a mystery.

### 3.7.1. Summary of the Poem

*The Elephant in the Moon* is a long poem of 520 lines in octosyllabic couplets. Butler also wrote a version in decasyllabic heroic couplets. This was probably no more than an experiment in that verse form which was popular at the time, particularly among dramatists. The original version of the poem shares the octosyllabic couplet with *Hudibras* and is arguably the most concise and successful of Butler's works. Estimates vary as to when it was written: Wilders and de Quehen suggest 1670-1 at the time of the controversy about the microscope between members of the Royal Society and the polemical Henry Stubbe (*Hudibras I & II* 195 n). Alexander C. Spence suggests 1676 or earlier, also alluding to the controversy (iv). S. Bruun in his article "The Date of Samuel Butler's *The Elephant in the Moon*" notes the mention of John Evelyn's *A Philosophical Discourse of Earth* which was read to the Royal Society in April 1675 and published in November of the same year and referred to in the poem (133-5). He therefore argues that the poem could not have been finished before November 1675. Marjorie Nicolson diverges considerably when she suggests that the

octosyllabic version was probably written in 1666, given the preponderance of astronomical observations at the Royal Society in the mid-1660s (152).

I will now summarize the contents of the octosyllabic version of the poem (*Hudibras I & II* 195-208). The poem consists of a mixture of narrative and eight speeches. The scene is set in lines 1-26. The members of “a learned society” (1) have agreed to meet one summer’s night to make a survey of the face of the moon, enumerating real estate, inhabitants and land. The intention is to search the moon “by her own light” (4). This suggests that the narrator has a pre-Copernican orientation in astronomy since, according to the Copernican understanding of the universe, the moon only has reflected light. Reference is made to the Down Survey of Ireland which resulted in Sir William Petty, a member of the Royal Society, being accused of keeping land for himself. The purpose of the current survey is not only scientific but also colonial. The virtuosi want to observe what crops are planted on the moon with a view to creating new plantations (14-16).

As the virtuosi observe the surface of the moon, battle is joined there by its inhabitants, the Privolvans and the Subvolvani (27-110). These are names which derive from Johannes Kepler’s *Somnium* and were presented to an English readership by John Wilkins. Oral report is given of the battle by two virtuosi. The elephant then makes its appearance (111-60). A third virtuoso looks through the telescope and reports that he sees an elephant breaking loose from one of the two armies (125-30). He stresses the size of the elephant, suggesting that “the moon is much the fruitfuller” (134). He also argues that since the moon has inhabitants who are much taller than mankind, it should come as no surprise that the moon can support elephants of greater dimensions than terrestrial ones (153-60).

The narration continues with the other virtuosi present looking at the elephant through the telescope (161-240). One of the virtuosi argues that all their previous errors will be redeemed by this extraordinary discovery (175-79). He dwells on the poor perception of the society’s undertakings (200-02). They will no longer be an easy target for the wits: “Nor shall our ablest virtuosos / Prove arguments for coffee-houses” (205-06). The speech makes explicit that we are dealing with the Royal Society through the couplet “No more our making old dogs young / Make men suspect us still i’th’ wrong;” (213-14), a reference to the experiments on blood transfusion between dogs at the Society from November 1666 onwards (200 n.). To counteract the negative image of the Society this virtuoso concludes his speech by suggesting that they write a true account of what they have seen in order to triumph with the public (235-40).

The next section runs from line 245 to line 322. There follow two speeches by virtuosi in reaction to one of their number seeing the elephant through the telescope moving swiftly from the west side of the moon to the east. This is the first hint that something is not right. However, one virtuoso argues that given the distance involved from the earth to the moon it is possible that the image being conveyed through the telescope is not accurate, as well as suggesting that the elephants on the moon are able to move more quickly for “being of a different breed” (286). Another virtuoso uses the case to argue against the motion of the earth as proposed in the Copernican system (309-14).

We then come to the turning point of the poem (323-62). While the virtuosi are writing up their account, the footboys begin to look through the telescope and one of them suggests that something small and alive has made its way inside. This is overheard by someone “not so far overgrown / In any virtuous speculation / To judge by mere imagination” (342-44) who looks through the telescope and sees a mouse trapped inside:

For he had scarce applied his eye  
To th’engine but immediately  
He found a mouse was gotten in  
The hollow tube and, shut between  
The two glass windows in restraint,  
Was swelled into an elephant,  
And proved the virtuous occasion  
Of all this learned dissertation. (351-8)

Meanwhile the virtuosi have written their account and set their seals to it, only to be enraged by the discovery of the mouse inside the telescope. This gives rise to one last speech by a virtuoso who is described as an expert in vermin, which gives him the right to speak about the mouse. He speaks in the voice of the justly condemned: “It is no wonder we’re cried down / And made the talk of all the town” (393-94). This virtuoso also draws on the argument from Book Three of Genesis that man is purposefully kept ignorant for his own protection (419-22).

After this speech ends, each of the virtuosi reviews what he has seen, but there is no general agreement. The virtuosi concur that the only solution is to open the telescope up for inspection to discover what is inside (447-84). The denouement takes place between lines 485 and 508, followed by the moral of the poem: the Subvolvani and Privolvans turn out to have been “swarms / Of flies and gnats” (487-88), and then the virtuosi “saw the mouse that by mishap / Had made the telescope a trap,” (503-04); the moral of the poem is that those who pursue “Things wonderful instead of true,” (510) and who “Hold no truth worthy to be known / That is not huge and overgrown,” (515-16) will be rewarded with scorn (520).

### 3.7.2. *Identifying the Virtuosi*

Some critics have attempted to identify the virtuosi in the poem, producing conflicting results. I have proceeded cautiously here, only identifying individuals when the evidence seems clear. William C. Horne groups together those who take this approach as “micro critics” (15 n. 1). These contrast with the “macro critics” (15 n. 2) who are more concerned to discover Butler’s place “in the cobwebby empyrean of mid-seventeenth century intellectual history” (8). The first to identify any of the virtuosi in *The Elephant in the Moon* was Robert Thyer, Butler’s eighteenth-century editor, and he identifies no more than two on the grounds that he might “be thought to endeavour by an invidious Explication to add Bitterness to a Satyr, which may be judged severe enough already against Gentlemen, who in many Respects have deserved so well of their Country, and the learned World” (*Genuine Remains* 1: 3, ll. 27-8 n.).

Marjorie Hope Nicolson makes a concerted attempt to identify the characters in the poem in her book *Pepys’ Diary and the New Science* (143-51). She agrees the first speaker in the poem is Lord Brouncker but thinks the second is Robert Boyle because of the various references to sight in the text of the octosyllabic poem (143). I have followed Wilders and de Quehen in suggesting Sir Kenelm Digby, since the line “To make an optic of a nose” (74) suggests “interchangeability of senses” on which he had speculated in his *Treatise of Bodies* (1644) (197 n. 1). Here and elsewhere, when Butler mentions the transfer of senses between sense organs, he is referring to the ideas in chapter 28 of Sir Kenelm Digby’s *Treatise of Bodies*, which I have only been able to consult in a later edition *Two Treatises; In the One of which, the Nature of Bodies; in the Other, the Nature of Mans Soule, Is Looked into: in the Way of Discovery of the Immortality of Reasonable Soules* (London, 1658):

. . . for when we shall consider, that odors may be tasted, that the relish of meats may be smelled; that magnitude and figure may be heard; that light may be felt; and that sounds may be seen; (all which is true in some sense) we may by this changing the offices of the senses, and by looking into the causes thereof; come to discern that these effects are not wrought by the intervention of aery qualities; but by reall and material applications of bodies to bodies; which in different manners do make the same results within us . . . (309-10)

Digby is writing about how one sense can compensate for another when the latter is absent, rather than what Butler misunderstands as the interchangeability of senses, something which he finds ridiculous. Nicolson suggests John Wilkins for the decasyllabic version on the grounds that Butler introduced lines satirizing Wilkins’s project to create a universal language

(144). She suggests John Evelyn for the third speaker, although only believes the portrait more specific to him in the decasyllabic version (146-7). The couplet “But for an unpaid weekly shilling’s pension, / Had fin’d for wit, and judgment, and invention” from the second version she interprets as referring to a possible non-payment by Evelyn of his subscription to the Royal Society (147). For Nicolson the couplet “And first found out the building Paul’s, / And paving London with sea-coals” points unmistakably to Evelyn, as he was a member of a commission to repair St. Paul’s and interested in the commercialization of clinker brick (148). Despite the mention of “microscopic wit” she identifies the fourth speaker as Robert Boyle, reserving the identity of Robert Hooke for the last speaker in the poem (149-151). S. Bruun varies considerably in his identification of the principle virtuosi of the poem in his article “Who’s Who in Samuel Butler’s ‘The Elephant in the Moon?’” Bruun proposes that:

Butler singles out five prominent fellows for special treatment, prefacing their harangues with more or less detailed descriptions of them . . . Those who receive more detailed attention are the first four speakers . . . and the very last. The identification of the four rests chiefly on these introductory characters, since, with one exception, the style of the speeches has no individual distinction . . . (382)

Bruun accepts Thyer’s view that the first speaker is Lord Brouncker. He reviews the evidence for the identity of the third and concludes that in the octosyllabic version John Evelyn is meant; in the decasyllabic version however, Sir Paul Neile takes his place. Bruun’s justification for this substitution is the same couplet about the unpaid subscription. He has already mentioned Grey’s edition of *Hudibras* where the editor identifies Sir Paul Neile as having “made a great Discovery of an Elephant in the Moon” and goes on to make Neile the discoverer of the elephant in the decasyllabic version. John Wilkins is identified as the second speaker (386), quoting from Wilkins’s own works relating to the moon and using the phrase “universal comprehension” in line 64 of the octosyllabic version, a phrase redolent of the philosophy of Comenius with which Wilkins was familiar (386). Robert Hooke is identified as the fourth speaker because of the mention of the microscope in the text (387). Bruun argues ingeniously that the last speaker is Robert Boyle on the basis that the following lines represent Boyle’s habit of hesitating before he spoke (388):

After he had with Signs made Way  
For something great he had to say  
  This Disquisition  
Is, half of it, in my Discission . . . (*Genuine Remains* I 385-88).

Wilders and de Quehen introduce the phrase “At last prevailed” from the decasyllabic version of *The Elephant in the Moon* to fill the blank half-line. Bruun relates the speaker’s specialization in vermin to Boyle’s “New Pneumatical Experiments about Respiration” which appeared in the *Philosophical Transactions* in August and September 1670. Bruun points out the very real contradiction between the view presented by the fictionalized Boyle that truth should be made “out of strong conceit” (l. 454), and the scrupulous adherence to truth witnessed in Boyle’s own writings (389).

While Nicolson and Bruun go to great lengths to identify the main protagonists, Wilders and de Quehen observe: “Whatever their original conception, the finished portraits do not point unambiguously to particular members of the Royal Society” (195 n.). My own view is that the recognizable features of the individual virtuosi are a kind of window dressing, designed to give a superficial verisimilitude to the assembly. This has a double purpose. The first is to give the poem touches of realism which point the reader in the direction of the idea that the poem is an account of an undertaking by a real group of virtuosi. It also points forward in the poem to the speeches made by the virtuosi which Butler directs against the virtuosi themselves and what they stand for. Towards the end of the poem the entire assembly effectively resolve to lie:

. . . to give truth no regard,  
 But what was for their turn to vouch,  
 And either find or make it such;  
 That ‘twas more noble to create  
 Things like truth out of strong conceit  
 Than with vexatious pains and doubt  
 To find, or think t’have found, her out. (450-6)

It is highly unlikely that any virtuoso in his day would have owned to such a notion. This is surely much more a part of the overall scheme of the burlesque. The virtuosi themselves are recruited by Butler to speak as characters against themselves in the poem. Another example of this device comes during the earlier speech which suggests that the discovery of the elephant in the moon promises great things for the Society:

‘Most excellent and virtuous friends,  
 This great discovery makes amends  
 For all our unsuccessful pains  
 And lost expense of time and brains . . . ‘ (175-9)

Whether the fourth speaker is Boyle or Hooke, neither of them would have regarded the earlier undertakings of the Royal Society as a waste of time and intellectual energy, so the obvious conclusion is that Butler is involving the speaker as a character in the realization of the burlesque.

In contrast, say, to the procedure in Charles Cotton's burlesque of Virgil, his *Scarronnides: or, Virgile Travestie* (1665), where the denigration of the subject takes place in the narrative of the poem, Butler is deploying here the technique of irony of character in the invented direct speech of the virtuosi. Butler characterizes the virtuosi in this way as unproductive, and by having them say as much directly out of their own mouths, he augments the effect of the central action of the poem. Once again perception and error are near to each other. This is the principal dichotomy in *The Elephant in the Moon* which Butler uses to great advantage to undermine the virtuosi through the resulting satire. The irony of character proceeds by his foregrounding of a fictitious negative self-perception on the part of the virtuosi.

### 3.7.3. *A Mouse and not an Elephant*

Both Thyer and Nicolson mention that John Wilkins's writing on the moon provided one of Butler's principle targets in his verse satire. I shall quote from the 1640 edition of *A Discourse Concerning A New World* in the following analysis. It should be noted that Wilkins used an alternative spelling of Kepler's surname, that of Keplar. Thyer regards the lines on the telescope being used by the virtuosi "And now the lofty tube, the scale / With which they heaven itself assail" (lines 21-2) as a satire on the following passage from Wilkins:

'Tis related of Eudoxus, that hee wished himselfe burnt with Phaeton, so he might stand over the Sunne to contemplate its nature; had hee lived in these dayes, he might have enjoyed his wish at an earlier rate, and scaling the heavens by this glasse, might plainly have discerned what hee so much desired. (1.86)

Again, Thyer points out that Wilkins writes "Tis the opinion of Keplar, that as soone as the art of flying is found out, some of their nation will make one of the first Colonies, that shall transplant into that other world" (1.206). This gave Butler the idea that the virtuosi who are making an inventory of the moon might be interested in "settling of new plantations, / If the society should incline / T'attempt so glorious a design" (lines 14-16). Thyer regarded Butler's lines as "A Sneer, no doubt, upon Bishop *Wilkins*" (*Genuine Remains* 1: 2: line 14 n.). The same notion lies behind the couplet "Impatient who should have the honour / To plant an ensign first upon her" (lines 25-6).

Thyer also points out that Butler's terms for the inhabitants of the moon — the Privolvans and the Subvolvani, first mentioned respectively in lines 53 and 83 of Butler's poem — are derived from Wilkins's account of Kepler's description of the moon:

Keplar calls this World by the name of Levania from the Hebrew word [levanah] which signifies the Moon, and our earth by the name of Volva a volvendo, because it does by reason of its diurnall revolution appeare unto them constantly to turne round, and therefore hee stiles those who live in that Hemisphere which is towards us, by the title of Subvolvani, because they enjoy the sight of this earth; and the others Privolvani, quia sunt privati conspectu volvae, because they are deprived of this priviledge. (1: 82-3)

What is striking about the use to which Butler puts this material in the poem is that it is presented as fact. So, when the first speaker begins:

Quoth he, 'Th'inhabitants o'th' moon!  
Who when the sun shines hot at noon  
Do live in cellars underground  
Of eight miles deep and eighty round . . .' (43-46)

we are in the presence of directly reported facts, observations and action. The speaker urges everyone to look through the telescope to see, "As by the glass 'tis clear and plain" (58). This is all part of the edifice erected by the virtuosi that comes crashing down as the poem unfolds. Once again Butler locates perception and error as being close to each other.

The discovery of the elephant, it is hoped, will reverse the perception that the virtuosi are hapless: "And have no more our best designs, / Because they're ours, believed ill signs" (201-02). Or more trenchantly: "This one discovery's enough / To take all former scandals off" (225-26). The discovery of the elephant is carefully built up by Butler into the sole salvation of the Royal Society:

Meanwhile the rest had had a sight  
Of all particulars o'th' fight,  
And every man with equal care  
Perused of th'elephant his share,  
Proud of his interest in the glory  
Of so miraculous a story . . . (161-66)

The representation of the virtuosi is, as one would expect, negative, but doubly so as they condemn themselves out of their own mouths. In fact, no self-respecting virtuoso would ever perceive the undertakings of the Royal Society in this way. This subtle legerdemain on Butler's part also helps to undermine their credibility. The initial realization that something is wrong comes as follows:

One, peeping in the tube by chance,  
Beheld the elephant advance,  
And from the west side of the moon  
To th'east was in a moment gone. (247-50)



Having seen this, the virtuosi debate the reasons for it. One possible explanation is that it is the telescope which is giving a false visual report of the animal (267-68). Another explanation grants the contrary movement of the earth and moon a role in the matter (299-304). Here we have several variations on the theme of perception and error, which prepare us for the central event of the poem, which is the revelation of the identity of the elephant as a mouse trapped inside the telescope. The telescope is the vehicle of the erroneous perception of the situation by the virtuosi. It is not the telescope itself which is criticized directly, but the wrong use of it. Once again Butler reproaches the virtuosi for their search for "Things wonderful instead of true" (510). The telescope has been the vehicle of both perception and error and the virtuosi are chastised for it.

#### 3.7.4. *The Telescope*

*The Elephant in the Moon* still springs from the page fully formed and bristling with originality. The question arises as to whether Butler found any of the poem's ideas outside of his own imagination. One possible source was a debate about the reliability of the microscope which took place in 1670-1 and to which several critics, including Alexander C. Spence, draw attention (iv). The debate was principally between Joseph Glanvill, a member of the Royal Society, a philosopher and cleric, and Henry Stubbe, a physician based in Warwick. In fact, the controversy ranged across a wide spectrum of opinion and scientific instruments and began with the publication in 1668 of Glanvill's *Plus Ultra: or, The Progress and Advancement of Knowledge Since the Days of Aristotle. In an Account of Some of the Most Remarkable Late Improvements of Practical, Useful Learning: To Encourage Philosophical Endeavours. Occasioned by a Conference with One of the Notional Way*, the short title of which is the *Plus Ultra*. As can be seen from the title, the purpose of Glanvill's book was to praise the new learning of his day. The aspect of the controversy which is of interest here is that relating to the telescope, which, along with the microscope, thermometer and barometer had received much praise from Glanvill as instruments which would expand the field of knowledge for the contemporary natural philosopher and which had been unavailable to Aristotle. Spence summarizes the debate about telescopes as follows: "It was alleged by the Stubbe faction that telescopes (and microscopes) presented a false image of the thing observed to the observer, while Glanvill and his friends offered scientific evidence that telescopes merely enlarged and did not distort" (iv). He argues that this controversy may have stimulated Butler's imagination, given the prominence of the telescope in Butler's *The Elephant in the Moon*, where it is the focus of the burlesque. It is

therefore perhaps of interest to provide a little more detail of what was written against telescopes by Stubbe.<sup>27</sup>

Stubbe responded to Glanvill's *Plus Ultra* with the highly polemical *The Plus Ultra Reduced to a Non Plus: or, A Specimen of Some Animadversions upon the Plus Ultra of Mr. Glanvill, wherein Sundry Errors of some Virtuosi Are Discovered, the Credit of the Aristotelians in Part Re-advanced; and Enquiries Made about . . . The Deceitfulness of Telescopes. The World in the Moon, and a Voyage Thither . . .*, which was published in London in 1670. The short title is *The Plus Ultra Reduced to a Non Plus*. Stubbe's prose is rather eccentric in that he will tire of one subject, leave it and then return to it later, but he writes with real verve and shows considerable learning. He argues in *The Plus Ultra Reduced to a Non Plus* that telescopes cannot be wholly relied upon in making celestial observations and concludes: "If I must suspect the *skill* or accurateness of *Galilaeo, Scheiner, Gassendus, Hevelius, Fontana, Ricciolus, and Zucchius*, and such like; pardon me, if I know not *whom* to believe" (47-8). Stubbe is saying that if he has reasonable grounds to suspect the ability of the most famous astronomers of the day when they use a telescope and has cause to question the accuracy of their observations, then the findings of anyone using a telescope must be the subject of reasonable doubt. Stubbe's motivation here is to try to create a climate of doubt about the efficacy of the telescope by polemical means.

Stubbe was sceptical about what difference it would make to the general scheme of things if it were the earth that moved, in other words if the Copernican theory were correct. What he writes is somewhat reminiscent of the passage on the moon in the third canto of the Second Part of *Hudibras*:

By the Benefit indeed of one of these Instruments, the Telescope, we are put in hopes to find a sure way to determine those mighty Questions, Whether the Earth move? or, The Planets be inhabited? And who knows which way the Conclusion may fall?" – I perceive hereby that Mr. Glanvill is not altogether convinced that the Earth moves; and I am as little satisfied, that the solution of those Questions is so mighty and important a thing; for if the Earth stand still, then things will be as they are now: and if it be determined otherwise, yet shall we not need to fear that the Revolution of the Earth in its Diurnal motion, either shake our houses about our ears, or shake us off by the tangent line: and as for those inhabitants of the Planets, in case all our other trading should be lost, we

---

<sup>27</sup> In her article "Some Early Critics of the Royal Society," *Notes and Records of the Royal Society of London* 8 (1950): 20-64, R.H. Syfret discusses the controversy between Glanvill and Stubbe in detail, describing the latter as "the most voluble and outspoken antagonist of the Royal Society in its early years" (20).

shall not finde out any gainful commerce with them; nor need we dread that they will piss out our Eyes as we look up. So that let their Telescopes be brought to that unimaginable perfection, whereby to discover the inhabitants of the Planets as plainly as mites in Cheese, and let the Conclusion fall which way it will, things will fall out no otherwise than they do. (10)

As a polemicist, Stubbe was interested in undermining the Royal Society and in this case, the telescope. He states the potential advantage of the telescope in helping mankind to determine some of the great questions of the day, namely whether the Earth moves, or the planets are inhabited. Soon enough he suggests that these questions are not so important, for if the Earth is stationary then things will remain the same and if the Copernican system turns out to be right, then equally little will change. It will not be possible to trade with the planets as they are too far away nor will any planetary inhabitant “*piss out our eyes*” if we look up. This vulgar phrase amplifies Stubbe’s polemic, which concludes with the notion that everything will remain the same regardless of the outcome. By not giving any credibility to the telescope, Stubbe tries to undermine it in a way that is quite reminiscent of Butler himself in a passage from *Hudibras*. The complete passage runs to 27 lines. Here are the first six:

But what, alas, is it to us  
 Whether in the moon, men thus, or thus  
 Do eat their porridge, cut their corns,  
 Or whether they have tails or horns?  
 What trade from thence can you advance  
 But what we nearer have from France? (2.3.745-50)

It remains an open question as to whether one author influenced the other. Perhaps it is simply a question of Butler’s scepticism running along similar lines to Stubbe’s polemic. For Butler the change in vision facilitated by the telescope goes hand in hand with the errors of reason displayed by those who use them. Stubbe’s work may or may not have interested Butler if he in fact read it. But Guy Laprevotte finds further details in Stubbe’s book which may have exerted a more direct influence on Butler’s imagination (468-9). Stubbe is citing the opinions of a “young Gentleman” of his acquaintance, who may or may not be fictitious (40). The sight of the most common insects through a telescope, he opines, might result in curious speculations: “. . . a *Glow-worm*, or an *Indian fire-Fly* would create strange *disputes* and *contests* among mankind, had they no other helps to discover the *Phaenomenon* then a *Telescope*, magnifying the *object* and its *parts* thirty, forty or one hundred times (41).” And

later on the same page there is a further passage which brings Butler's poem very much to mind:

That it is possible to imagine such things to our selves that were not really in the Moon, but not such as were there, except in a very general and indefinite manner . . . That the appearance of an Earth did not infer the inhabitation of men, much less Animals and Plants like ours: that our own Geography might undeceive us herein some parts of this Globe being not peopled, and the animals, and plants, and nature of the soyle, differing so much from our European productions, as we could not have conceived, had not our Eyes and authentick testimonies gained us to a belief of it.  
(41)

It will perhaps remain an open question as to whether Butler was influenced by Stubbe in the writing of *The Elephant in the Moon*. However, the reverse question also arises as to whether Butler influenced Stubbe in the writing of *The Plus Ultra Reduced to a Non Plus*.

### 3.8. SATIRE UPON THE ROYAL SOCIETY

The *Satire upon the Royal Society* (*Hudibras I & II* 209-11) consists of 104 lines of octosyllabic verse. Wilders and de Quehen suggest 1670-1 as the date of composition (209 n). The poem opens most probably with a reference to Robert Hooke – “A learned man, whom once week / A hundred virtuosos seek” (1-2). At line 13 Butler turns to “the ordinary debate” among the virtuosi which is greatly taken up with the comet of 1664. His description here of the significance of the comet is satirical. At line 37 the narrative turns to the research interests of the Royal Society until line 84, this passage consisting of a long list ranging from the behaviour of the tides and currents of the sea, the nature of colour, magnetism, the physical properties of the moon and whether the sun is nearing the earth. What is most striking about these 48 lines of verse is that they comprise one sentence with each area of inquiry occupying either two or four lines. At line 85 Butler sums up: “These were their learned speculations;” and resumes his listing after line 86 with the line “And all their constant occupations”. The poem ends with three images of sound, the virtuosi inquiring into the nature of the braying of an ass, the neighing of mares and the lowing of a cow.

For Butler any concern with the heavenly bodies was mere superstition and he satirizes the Society's concern with the comet of 1664 as follows:

What wars and plagues in Christendom  
Have happened since, and what to come;  
What kings are dead, how many queens  
And princesses are poisoned since . . . (21-24)

Butler mocks the interest in tides and springs among the virtuosi:

Why currents turn in seas of ice  
Some thrice a day and some but twice,  
And why the tides at night and noon  
Court, like Caligula, the moon . . . (37-40)

It is well established today that the moon plays a role in tides, but not in Butler's day. Here he makes a striking comparison between tidal activity and Caligula's improper suggestions to the moon that it join him in his bedroom (210: n. l. 40). Butler also speculates on how water behaves below the surface of the earth to then run downwards in fountains (49-52). The magnetic attraction of the loadstone and its relationship with the North Star is another interest (53-56) and the appearance of heavenly bodies in motion also occupies the minds of the virtuosi (63-68). The moon reappears in this poem as a subject of scientific inquiry. Questions concern whether its surface is liquid or solid or otherwise and whether the holes that appear on the surface are pores or cities; what sort of atmosphere it has and whether it regenerates (69-80). The last idea comes in fact from the ancient Greek philosopher Xenophanes (6<sup>th</sup> century BC) (211, n. 1). Further interests are the measuring of wind and weighing of air as well as turning a circle into a square (87-88). We know that weighing air was a concern of members of the Royal Society, but the other two activities seem more fanciful and satirical. Similarly, the creation of a medicine out of sunlight, which would put every doctor out of business, seems invented (89-90). Butler also lists the search for the north-west passage; the regeneration of a rose from its own ashes; the nature of a bend in an object immersed in water (91-96). There are some triggers in the poem – signs that we should laugh at what is being described – such as the use of the word "piss" in the following passage: "What is the natural cause why fish, / That always drink, do never piss," (41). The trigger resides in the use of the last word of the quotation, which is both vulgar and colloquial. All this amounts to an indirect representation of the virtuosi through the satirical reception of their interests.

Despite its qualities Butler left the poem unfinished and unpublished. Horne argues that the poem may fail partly because Butler's curiosity gets the better of "his sense of the ridiculous" (15). I find more convincing Ricardo Quintana's view that one of Butler's techniques for creating distortion was "the creation of a comic situation and the development of that situation in dramatic terms" (29). Quintana finds that in many of Butler's later compositions "the absence of anything like a comic situation . . . leaves the satire peculiarly flat" (29). This is arguably the case here. We laugh at the virtuosi of *The Elephant in the Moon* precisely because they mistake a mouse for an elephant and then

suffer the indignity of discovering that the truth is otherwise. Here there is no animating burlesque, but the *Satire upon the Royal Society* remains a well-turned inventory of the interests of the virtuosi.

### 3.9. OTHER WORKS

There are two works remaining to complete this account of Butler's satirical representations of the virtuosi. These are "Hudibras to Sidrophel" and the Third Part of *Hudibras*.

#### 3.9.1. "An Heroical Epistle of Hudibras to Sidrophel"

This text was added by Butler to his revised edition of the First and Second Parts of *Hudibras*, published in 1674 (*Hudibras* 187-90). The poem consists of 130 lines of octosyllabic verse and is regarded by some critics as inferior to Butler's other writing (*Pepys' Diary* 138). The form is familiar from Ovid's *Heroides* and the title conforms with that used in English translations of Ovid's original Latin. Usually a reproach to a heroic lover in the form of a letter from a heroine of classical mythology, Butler's choice of genre is ironic as the poem is a stiff, if not aggressive, reproach by Hudibras of Sidrophel's ongoing interest in natural philosophy. The tone of the poem borders on abuse which puts a certain strain on the reader, apparent from the first four lines in which Hudibras tells Sidrophel it is an idle undertaking "to tamper with your Crazy Brain" (line 2) without trepanning him with the frequency at which a Full Moon occurs. In the face of Sidrophel's continued engagement with natural philosophy, despite loud disapproval from the public, Hudibras gives Sidrophel asses' ears (10) to illustrate his deafness and compares him to William Prynne who lost his ears in the pillory (13).

What is striking about the poem is the sense that natural philosophy has been around for several years and continues to invite scorn from its detractors. The latest reference in the poem is to the research of the Italian Marcello Malpighi (1628-94) on eggs, read to the Royal Society in February 1672, just over eleven years after the meeting at which it was founded. So, at least in one way, the Royal Society was more established. However, its detractors became stronger in their condemnation and this is reflected in the poem. Hudibras describes Sidrophel's preoccupation with natural philosophy as his "Folly," remarking: "When Folly, as it grows in years / The more extravagant appears" (29-30). There is also a change in the way that Butler makes use of the experiments of the Royal Society. Now, instead of the experiments in blood transfusion being the subject for ridicule in

themselves, Hudibras asks Sidrophel: “Can no Transfusion of the Bloud, / That makes Fools Cattle, do you good?” (39-40). Butler is surely referring to Arthur Coga here, who was paid by the Royal Society in 1667 to be the first human subject of a blood transfusion, receiving a transfusion of sheep’s blood into his body. Equally, Hudibras asks in the poem if the remedies for trees “Have no effect to operate / Upon that duller Block, your Pate” (53-4). In both instances the experiments become instrumental in Butler’s much more personal attack on the natural philosophers, represented here by Sidrophel.

Hudibras also attacks the arrogance and tendency to exaggerate on the part of the virtuosi, as Nicolson remarks (*Pepys’ Diary* 137-8). The virtuosi use “the German scale” (line 96) to quantify, one German mile equalling between four and five English ones. Much has been made of “the sole Sir *Poll*” in line 86, representing Sir Paul Neile (1613-86), one of the founder members of the Royal Society, but there is a problem here. If “Hudibras to Sidrophel” is addressed to him, Butler attributes to him all manner of experiments and interests which were not necessarily his, such as the transfusion of blood between dogs reported on by Mr. King in November 1666 and the bleeding of trees after frosts discussed in a letter to the Society from Martin Lister, read in February 1671.

What literary critics have to say about Sir Paul Neile is largely based on Grey’s assertion that it was Neile who made the discovery about the elephant in the moon and Thyer’s assertion that he was the model in real life for Sidrophel.<sup>28</sup> Turning to the work of historians of science yields some more information about this shadowy figure, but as C.A. Ronan and Sir Harold Hartley observe:

---

<sup>28</sup> Critics such as Joseph Toy Curtiss have suggested that the original model for Sidrophel in *Hudibras* was provided by the astrologer William Lilly (1602-81). Lilly was certainly the astrologer with the highest profile during the Puritan experiment and his opinion on important matters was sought on several occasions. Marjorie Nicolson argues in favour of Sir Paul Neile being the intended recipient of “Hudibras to Sidrophel” on the grounds that Neile was the only “Sir Paul” among the members of the Royal Society until 1674 (*Pepys’ Diary* 136). Of course, she does not see the poem as an attempt to reflect Neile’s scientific interests with any degree of verisimilitude (*Pepys’ Diary* 136). The identification of Neile with Sidrophel was first made by the editor Zachary Grey, who continues: “This was the Gentleman who, I am told, made a great Discovery of an Elephant in the Moon, which upon Examination, proved to be no other than a Mouse, which had mistaken its Way and got into his Telescope” (Grey’s *Hudibras*, II, p. 105). S. Bruun argues that lines 125-6 of the decasyllabic version of *The Elephant in the Moon* – “But for an unpaid Weekly Shillings Pension, / Had fin’d for Wit, and Judgment, and Invention” – refer to Sir Paul Neile. Bruun’s argument is somewhat complex, but it seems Neile did not seek re-election to the council of the Royal Society in November 1674 because his proposal to address the problem of unpaid subscriptions to the Society was not realized (384-5). Yet C.A. Ronan and Sir Harold Hartley state that Neile “continued to serve [the Royal Society] at intervals until 1678” (164).

Sir Paul Neile is the only one of the twelve founder members of the Royal Society of whom there is no record in the Dictionary of National Biography. We should know little of his activities were it not for the entries in the Journal Books of the Society and the references to him by Evelyn and in Huygens, (sic) correspondence. (159)

Ronan and Hartley's article provides ample evidence that Neile was very much associated with telescopes. During the Commonwealth "he was living at White Waltham near Maidenhead, evidently a man of means with an interest in astronomy and in the making of telescopes" (159). They also mention an early minute of the Society showing the Society to be desirous that Neile "continue his employment of the artificer for making glasses for perspectives" (159). "In 1658 Neile gave a 35-foot telescope to Gresham College which was later used by Hooke" (159).<sup>29</sup> The Society minutes show him as "evidently skilled in the construction of telescopes" (161). It seems quite likely to me that Neile became associated with the character of Sidrophel because of this interest in telescopes. Nicolson also thought the story "either apochryphal or an exaggeration of the Wits, based upon Neile's extensive collection of telescopes" (*Pepys' Diary* 141). The overall purpose of the poem is to suggest that frauds will eventually be found out: "For all Impostors, when they'r known / Are past their Labor, and undone" (121-2). This is where the case rests and the poem closes with the notion that the destiny of the impostor is: "To turn stark Fools, and Subjects fit / For sport of Boys, and Rabble-wit" (129-30). On balance the sounder interpretation of the intention behind "Hudibras to Sidrophel" is that it is a generalized attack on the virtuoso in one of the darker moments of the Royal Society.

### 3.9.2. *Hudibras, The Third and Last Part*

There is little mention of the virtuosi in the sense in which we have been considering them so far in *Hudibras, the Third and Last Part*, published in 1678, with the exception of a reference to a particular invention brought before the Royal Society on 4 March 1663 by John Aubrey (*Hudibras* 3.1.1564 n). Here the Royal Society is not the direct subject of the satire, but one of its follies serves well as a poetic image. This was a cart invented by one Francis

---

<sup>29</sup> A Gentleman-Usher to the Privy Chamber of Charles I, Neile resumed this position at the Restoration. Importantly, he was one of the party representing the King at the meeting where the Royal Society was founded and "later he was nominated as a member of Council in both the Charters of 1662 and 1663" (Ronan & Hartley 160). Neile often bore messages between the King and the Royal Society. Neile and Sir Robert Moray remained on the Council of the Society until the death of Moray in 1673 and they say that Neile continued to serve at intervals until 1678. He only wrote a *Discourse on cider* that was read on 8 July 1663, but was said to be "a man of considerable influence which he was constantly using to help the Society in its business affairs" (164).



Potter “with legs instead of wheels” (Birch, qtd in *Hudibras* 3.1.1564 n). While it is true that the members of the Society were interested in the improvement of carriages, William C. Horne is surely right to suggest that no “significant modern scientific development” resulted from Francis Potter’s cart (14). Butler turns it into a simile during the description of a struggle. The couplet occurs near the end of the first canto of the Third Part and refers to the Spirit which has been addressing Hudibras: “He thought to drag him by the Heels, / *Like Gresham Carts, with Legs for Wheels*” (*Hudibras*, 3. 1.1563-4). The couplet is particularly incisive in comparison with the discursive speeches and descriptive passages which surround it.

There are other references to the virtuosi in the Third Part, none of them very substantial. The baronet Sir Samuel Morland’s invention of the speaking trumpet – a predecessor of the megaphone – is used as a metaphor in a description of an enchanted castle in the first canto: “I heard a Formidable Noise / Loud as the Stentrophonick Voice” (*Hudibras* 3.1.251-2). Morland (1625-95) wrote an article about his invention for the *Philosophical Transactions* (*Phil. Trans.* 6 (1671): 3056-8) as well as a pamphlet called *Tuba Stentoro-phonica. An Instrument of Excellent Use, As Well at Sea as at Land*, also published in 1671. As Wilders explains the speaking trumpet was named after the Greek warrior Stentor who had a particularly loud voice (*Hudibras* 3.1.252 n). Again, we are in the familiar territory of the Royal Society in this example.

However, there are further examples which show that the word “virtuoso” has become a trope, a word whose meaning has been changed in some way by a modification of its sense. Butler uses the word “virtuoso” in the Third Part when describing Sidrophel who provides “A kind of Broking-Trade in Love” (3.1.356):

By those the Devil had forsook  
As things below him to provoke,  
But b’ing a virtuoso, able  
To *Smatter, Quack, and Cant, and Dabble,*  
He held his Talent most Adroyt  
For any *Mystical Exploit;*  
As others of his Tribe had done,  
And rais’d their Prices Three to One (3.1.361-8)

By the time he published the Third Part of *Hudibras* in 1677 Butler had already published the “Heroical Epistle” and given expression to his contempt for the virtuosi of the Royal Society. He ascribes here to Sidrophel the qualities of superficiality and making use of the terminology of matchmaking. The phrase “*Mystical Exploit*” recalls John Cleveland’s poem “A Song of Marke Anthony” and the following line: “Mysticall Grammer (sic) of amorous

glances" (line 30). The word "mystical" here refers to the impalpable and silent language of attraction between lovers. The main qualities attributed to the virtuoso in this passage (To *Smatter, Quack, Cant, and Dabble*, 3.1.364) involve having superficial knowledge of something, dishonestly professing a skill, affecting a phraseology and being a dilettante. So "virtuoso" appears here as a trope meaning someone quick of speech and both superficial and fraudulent. Butler's use of the word here is ironic.

At the beginning of the third canto Butler writes of the fear mankind brings on itself in certain circumstances. The power of the imagination is such that:

As Rosi-crusian Virtuoso's,  
Can see with Ears, and hear with Noses;  
And when they neither see nor hear,  
Have more than Both supply'd by Fear. (3.3.15-18)

Wilders traces this transfer of the senses between sense organs to a passage in Butler's character "An Hermetic Philosopher" (*Hudibras* 3.3.15 n).<sup>30</sup> Here we have an example from Butler's work of the tendency to associate the virtuoso with the Rosicrucians which is found in the 1680s, with Butler also drawing on his understanding of hermetic philosophy. Aphra Behn provides a fuller exploration of the association between the virtuoso and the Rosicrucians in her play *The Emperor of the Moon*, as will become apparent in the next chapter.

In these passages it is evident that Butler again uses notions associated with the virtuosi to adorn *Hudibras*. However, as we can see from these four examples, the figure of the virtuoso is peripheral here. As far as what the references mean, in the first two instances, Gresham's Cart and Morland's speaking trumpet, we are still in the world of the Royal Society and the experiments conducted there. The third reference points us towards a world of esoteric thought which became associated with the virtuosi in the 1670s and the 1680s. In the fourth example Butler clearly associates the virtuoso with the figure of the Rosicrucian (3.3.15).

---

<sup>30</sup> In the character, the adepts are said to have "built a philosophical Hospital for the Relief of those, that are blind, deaf, and dumb, by establishing a Community of the Senses, whereby any one may supply the place of another in his Absence . . ." (Butler, *Characters* 154-5); Thyer regarded the first part of this character as a portrait of the alchemist Thomas Vaughan (139 n) with the focus widening for it to become a general portrait of the Rosicrucians (144-5 n).

## 3.10. CONCLUSION

Samuel Butler was the first satirist to engage with the virtuosi. While very little of what he wrote on the subject was published during his lifetime, it is important to understand Butler's response and the form that the satirical reception of the virtuosi took in his work. Butler wrote according to the intellectual conception of the world before the revolution in natural philosophy took place. Indeed, he responded to that revolution while it was taking place. The main satirical strategy he used was shaped by his perception that the outcome of the experiments of the virtuosi were neither experiments of light nor experiments of fruit in Baconian terms, but experiments in triviality. This is particularly the case where the subjects are lice or dogs. So, to satirize these instances of triviality, he responded with the usual strategy of low burlesque as he practised it, which is to denigrate what was considered important or serious by equating it with something trivial or repulsive with the intention of mocking it and taking away the justification for taking it seriously. We see this in the account of Hooke's examination of the louse through the telescope, which he compares to the futile observations of Socrates and Chaerephon in *The Clouds*. He thereby invokes the position of the educational innovator in ancient Greece, which provides an important intellectual correlative to the scientific innovators at The Royal Society. Butler would have seen Socrates as justly satirized in *The Clouds* for his eccentric pursuits and educational strategies. By invoking the satire of a writer of the importance of Aristophanes, he brings to bear on Hooke and his magnifying telescope the reductive quality of Old Attic Comedy. The literary allusion is therefore also very much a part of the satirical technique. This example sets the tone for the reception of the virtuosi in the three equally damning references to them in the Third Part. The strident and attacking tone of "An Heroical Epistle of Hudibras to Sidrophel" suggests that Butler had run out of patience with the fellows of the Royal Society in the face of public disdain. These were the only instances of the satirical reception of the virtuosi in Butler's work to be published during his lifetime and establish a pattern of satirical attack on the Royal Society which is indirect in the sense that Butler mostly targets individual experiments. We can extrapolate from this that the fellows and the Royal Society are to be denigrated and discouraged by what Butler writes.

Among the unpublished works, Butler's *Characters* deride those who acquire through curiosity ("A Curious Man") as well as mocking the virtuosi in their various guises ("A Virtuoso" and "An Antisocordist"). His satirical technique here is the outlandish comparison, which often punctures the pretension of the subject with its down-to-earth imagery. *An*

*Occasional Reflection on Dr. Charleton* uses the rhetoric of Boyle's *Occasional Reflections* to take the reader in the opposite direction to Boyle's religious insight and ecstasy. In the latter, there is further ample evidence of Butler's dismissive attitude towards the experiments conducted at the Royal Society in the unpublished *Satire upon the Royal Society*, although in this case Butler did not find a way to make the poem work dramatically.

The pursuit of knowledge inspired by ideas in a book points clearly towards the possibility of using a Cervantean technique. Butler had used this in *Hudibras*, the central characters of Hudibras and Ralph being reminiscent of Don Quixote and Sancho Panza. Of all Butler's works concerned with early modern science, it is *The Elephant in the Moon* which is quite clearly quixotic in character. It will be recalled that the literary character of Don Quixote was foolhardy and impractical when pursuing his chivalric and idealized vision of reality, which was derived from reading too many chivalric romances and mistaking them for reality. Part of Cervantes's satirical technique was to create a double perspective on the activities of Don Quixote. In this way the reader experiences the actions of Don Quixote as the character does, while also receiving a second account of them which reveals them to be highly romanticized and foolhardy. Butler uses this technique in *The Elephant in the Moon*. At the heart of the poem lies the fact that the inhabitants of the moon turned out to be swarms of flies and gnats inside the telescope while the elephant was in fact a mouse that had become trapped there. The virtuosi and the writings of Wilkins and Kepler are made to look completely ridiculous in this moment. The realization that what the virtuosi were looking for through the telescope is in fact something quite different – a mouse – is the organizing principle of the poem.

So, with Aristophanes and Cervantes as literary allies, Butler is clearly pointing us in the direction of considerable scepticism towards natural philosophy. He sees it as another abuse of human reason, and this is why the short passage about the microscope is ascribed to the agency of Sidrophel. Neither of these two examples are explicitly Menippean in character, but it is noteworthy that in both cases Butler introduces an alternative perspective from another writer to create a dialogue with the new science of natural philosophy. Butler's portrayals of the virtuosi before *The Elephant in the Moon* are in a sense occasional reflections. Each one concentrates on details of scientific activity or observation, whereas in *The Elephant in the Moon* Butler finds an idea worthy of an extended burlesque, making use of the mechanics of quixotic satire on learning (Pardo *Satire*, 2). So, the attack on Hevelius in *Hudibras* is limited to the telescope which discerns the obvious. The lines in *Hudibras* which follow on the microscope emphasize the trivial life forms observed through it.

In *The Elephant in the Moon* the constant assumption of the poem is that the undertakings of the virtuosi are absurd. The way Sir Kenelm Digby's observations on the senses are presented are designed to make the concept appear ridiculous. One of the virtuosi is described as engaging with the telescope "applied one eye and half a nose" (line 65). The poem is based around the presentation of Kepler and Wilkins's presentation of life on the moon as if it were fact, only to stumble half way through upon the conceit of the poem, that a mouse and gnats and flies inside the telescope have been mistaken for life on the moon.

There is some considerable irony of character in the speeches made by the virtuosi in the poem. Butler gets them to give voice to the general scepticism surrounding the Royal Society which was perceived as passing its time with fruitless experiments, sentiments to which the real virtuosi would not have owned. The story of the elephant in the moon is initially presented as something that will save the reputation of the Royal Society. When the elephant is found to be a mouse, we hear the voice of the detractors of the Royal Society through one of its representatives:

It is no wonder we're cried down  
And made the talk of all the town,  
That rants and swears for all our great  
Attempts we have done nothing yet (393-6)

One virtuoso was prepared not to trust the evidence of his own eyes when the story begins to unravel – surely against the spirit of the experimental method. In this way the virtuosi are made to appear quite ridiculous, seekers after the fantastical who

Hold no truth worthy to be known  
That is not huge and overgrown (515-6)

In the opening lines of the *Satire on the Royal Society* for all the Society's intellectualism there is a noteworthy proximity of astronomy and superstition (209). Butler goes on to enumerate several experiments, some carried out at Gresham House. In the character of *The Astrologer* Butler's condemnation mounts in the last few sentences of which this is the penultimate: "He fetches the Grounds of his Art so far off, as well from Reason, as the Stars, that, like a Traveller, he is allowed to lye by Authority" (110-11). Butler discerns a similar untrustworthiness in the utterances of the virtuosi who in his view look for what is both novel and sensational. Butler wants to return us to the evidence of our own eyes to accept the nature of perception as it was before the invention of the telescope and the microscope. He looks backwards, even if he expresses himself most ingeniously in his work.



#### CHAPTER FOUR. THOMAS SHADWELL AND *THE VIRTUOSO*

Shadwell was clearly acquainted with Samuel Butler and his work. Butler's *The Elephant in the Moon* is referenced in his satirical play *The Virtuoso* and Butler is also said to have helped Shadwell with the details of his satire, as Hugh de Quehen writes in the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (online edition, par. 8 of 14). Furthermore, Shadwell was one of the coffin bearers at Butler's funeral in September 1680, as Kate Bennett also writes in the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (online edition, par. 12 of 17). As the majority of what Butler wrote to satirize the virtuosi was not published during his lifetime, it was the play *The Virtuoso* by Thomas Shadwell which was the first substantial work to deal with the subject that was available to a contemporary audience. The play was first performed by the Duke's Company in May 1676 with Charles II attending on 25 May. It was then licensed for publication on 31 May 1676.

Born in Norfolk, Shadwell was educated at Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge, matriculating on 17 December 1656. In terms of his dramatic career, he was famously at odds with John Dryden (1631-1700). Dryden's antipathy towards Shadwell inspired him to write *MacFlecknoe*, a biting verse satire in which Shadwell is crowned as the king of dullness. Shadwell and his dramatic reputation lay under the spell of this work until the early twentieth century, when his plays were reappraised. Ironically, during his lifetime Dryden was relieved of the post of poet laureate after the Revolution of 1688 and replaced by Shadwell. The latter died in 1692 of an overdose of opium, which he used as a palliative for his gout.

*The Virtuoso* is a Restoration comedy and as such it requires a full complement of intrigue and romantic aspirations on the part of the supporting characters who interact with the central character and subject of the play. Longvil and Bruce, who are described as "gentlemen of wit and sense" in the *Dramatis Personae*, are in love with Clarinda and Miranda, Sir Nicholas's nieces. Sir Formal secures an invitation from Sir Nicholas for the young men to witness the dissection of a lobster at his home to be followed by dinner. The

dissection is the first of a series of actual experiments carried out by fellows of the Royal Society which Shadwell incorporates into the play (1.1). Sir Formal insists that Gimcrack is “the finest speculative gentleman in the whole world” (1.1). The indirect characterization of Sir Nicholas continues in the next scene (1.2) when Miranda and Clarinda speak of the large amount of money Gimcrack has spent on microscopes. He “has studi’d these 20 years to find out the several sorts of spiders, and never cares for understanding mankind”. We also learn that he is the guardian of their fortunes until they come of age.

The second scene of Act Two famously opens with Sir Nicholas learning to swim on a table in the presence of Sir Formal Trifle and the Swimming Master. The visual impact of this after so much indirect characterization is considerable. Sir Nicholas stresses that he is only interested in the speculative part of swimming, not the practice, or, put another way, he is interested in knowledge and not use. There then follows mention of three of the most talked about experiments of the Royal Society in the 1660s and 1670s. The first concerns a dog being kept alive with a pair of billows; the second a blood transfusion between two dogs; the third a blood transfusion between a sheep and a man (2.2). Later in Act Three the interests of the virtuoso are further specified with reference to several examples of the *topos* of the mean. Sir Formal details Sir Nicholas’s interests in “ants, flies, humble-bees, earwigs, millipedes . . .” (3.3). The interest of a virtuoso in such creatures, and spiders as well, for the sake of knowledge is derided in dramatic asides by Longvil and Bruce. Sir Nicholas Gimcrack and his wife discover each other’s infidelities, which marks the beginning of the dissolution of the Gimcrack household (4.2). Sir Nicholas’s store of air is described in 4.4. and a container of Bury air is released in 5.2. This references Charles II’s comment to Sir William Petty (see 1.7.2. above) and Boyle’s experiments. The moon, another recurring *topos* in this kind of scientific satire, is discussed.

Snarl, Sir Nicholas’s uncle and an elderly member of his household, tells a group of ribbon weavers that Sir Nicholas and Sir Formal have invented the engine loom, which would leave them without work. The weavers search for Sir Nicholas with violent intent (5.3). A steward announces that “several engineers, glass makers, and other people you have dwelt with for experiments, have brought executions and extents, and seiz’d on all your estate in the country” (5.6). Sir Nicholas loses all, turns to his nieces and says “The money which I have of yours will redeem all, and I will account with you,” but Clarinda and Miranda have chosen Longvil and Bruce as their guardians. Sir Nicholas is ruined and the romantic couples in the comedy pair off.



In the character of Sir Nicholas Gimcrack, Shadwell creates a brilliant caricature of the figure of the virtuoso. And, in his characterization, Shadwell established the main characteristics of the type for many years to come. These were the propensity to spend substantial amounts of money on objects of scientific inquiry, the concentration on the theoretical at the expense of the practical, and a much greater interest in the preoccupations of early modern science than in the affairs of mankind. Shadwell is constantly at pains in the play to make his audience laugh at the virtuosi as a way of discrediting them. It is in the few principal scenes set in Sir Nicholas's laboratory in which Shadwell creates a direct satirical account of natural philosophy, as well as in a further important scene in which Sir Nicholas is confronted by an angry mob of ribbon weavers who have been led to believe that he has invented an engine loom which will make them redundant.

Sir Nicholas Gimcrack's propensity to spend large amounts of money on his interest in natural philosophy disrupts his household. His niece Clarinda relates that he has spent £2,000 on microscopes, a large amount of money in 1676 equating to over £300,000 in today's money (1.2.6). The subject only recurs towards the end of the play, where it acts as the trigger to dissolve Sir Nicholas's household. A steward announces that a number of engineers, glass makers and other individuals with whom he has had dealings for experiments have taken legal steps to secure his country estate against payment of their debts (5.6.28-30). This leaves Gimcrack with no option but to ask the other characters in the play if they will help him financially, but none of them will. Another aspect of the satirical portrayal of Sir Nicholas is how he concentrates on the theoretical and neglects the practical. This is reductive from a satirical point of view and an important way of undermining him. It would not be possible to put on the stage the sequence of experiments Bacon suggests — experiments of light followed by experiments of fruit — or the slowness of the fellows of the Royal Society in discovering any of the rules which govern nature. So Shadwell finds a reductive comic device with which to denigrate the figure of Sir Nicholas and entertain the audience. By separating theory and practice, Shadwell can portray the virtuoso's enthusiasms and the audience is left to wonder at the point of it all if, as by Gimcrack's own admission, he never does anything which has a practical outcome. I shall examine this theme further in a later section. Finally, Gimcrack's preference for the company of the subjects of his experiments over that of humanity is a consequence of his obsession with natural philosophy. Just before the end of the play, after his pleas for financial support have been rejected, he says: "That I shou'd know men no better! I wou'd I had studi'd mankind instead

of spiders and insects" (5.6.22-3). He thereby provides a moral for the story and the reason why nobody will help him.

The contrast with Butler's portrayal of the virtuosi is marked. In Butler's works the focus is largely on the experiments carried out by the virtuosi and is therefore indirect, focusing on the experiments and emphasizing how the interests of the virtuosi place the important and the unimportant on an equal footing. Shadwell, by contrast, makes his virtuoso a social being and portrays human relations between virtuoso and those around him as dysfunctional. In *Sir Nicholas Gimcrack* Shadwell creates a highly memorable caricature of the virtuoso and his interests, using irony of character to have Sir Nicholas condemn himself out of his own mouth. The virtuosi themselves remain rather shadowy figures in Butler's works. Here Shadwell exaggerates the virtuoso's character traits and concentrates on only a very few of the experiments carried out by the Royal Society fellows, in particular the sensational ones concerned with blood transfusions.

#### 4.1. LITERATURE REVIEW

It is difficult to say very much that is new about *The Virtuoso* because of the substantial amount of scholarship already in existence on Shadwell's play. I shall review what I consider to be the most important secondary literature here and then proceed to explore the workings of Shadwell's satirical and comic technique. Albert S. Borgman did much to reverse the harm done to Shadwell's work and reputation by Dryden's verdict with his book *Thomas Shadwell: His Life and Comedies*, which was first published in 1928. Borgman showed the proximity of Shadwell's wording in *The Virtuoso* to sources in the *Philosophical Transactions* and regarded many of Shadwell's attacks as simply exaggerations of passages in that publication (169-71). Furthermore, he demonstrated Shadwell's indebtedness to Robert Hooke's *Micrographia* (172-3). Borgman had an interesting view of the play, remarking what he saw as two principle shortcomings. He regarded it as a weakness in *The Virtuoso* that Shadwell had highlighted so many failings in the new scientific movement. He thought this resulted in making the scenes in Sir Nicholas's laboratory unwieldy and overly full of satirical material (173). He also saw failings in Shadwell's characterization of Gimcrack, believing that Shadwell had not followed his own rule of achieving absolute consistency in character portrayal, something necessitated by his adherence to a theory of Jonsonian humours (162). However, in weighing up Shadwell's overall achievement as a dramatist, it was Borgman's view that while his plays did not "possess the literary polish that is found in the comedies of Etherege and Wycherley, they do present a much larger gallery of characters" (253).

Borgman concluded that as “a satirist of contemporary fads and ideas” Shadwell was “eminent among the dramatists of his time” (254).

“Shadwell and the Virtuosi,” by Claude Lloyd, was published in 1929. This is an important essay which documents many of the sources for Shadwell’s work. Lloyd rates the impact of the play highly, regarding it as a more effective attack on the Royal Society than anything in Butler, Marvell (1621-78), Swift or Joseph Addison (1672-1719). In his view Shadwell drew mainly on three sources, Sprat’s *History*, Hooke’s *Micrographia*, and the *Philosophical Transactions* (475). And it was the abundance of material in the second work which made it the richest source for Shadwell’s play (482). Lloyd asserts that Shadwell “found it possible to dispense with most of the conventional intrigue of Restoration comedy, depending for his main effect upon a treatment of the virtuoso’s ‘humour’” (472-3), a view that is surely undermined by the romantic intrigue in the play involving the male characters of Bruce and Longvil and the female characters of Clarinda and Miranda. He suggests that Shadwell chose for the main body of his satire those aspects of science which “seemed most ridiculous when subjected to the common sense of the time” (491). And so the play contains a satirical treatment of subjects ranging from “the moon as a planet with a physiography of its own, of flying – especially of flying to the moon – of the density of the air, of the transfusion of blood, and of the projection of sound” (491). Shadwell then made the observations of the Royal Society seem absurd “by carrying them far beyond where they stopped” (492).

Lloyd draws attention to an important aspect of the language of *The Virtuoso* which is important in mapping the contours of Shadwell’s satire (492-3). This is the pedantry of some of the language in the play (492-3). Lloyd says generally of the scientists of the day that “they were subject to the charge of pedantry, both for using a learned language [Latin] and for forming another which was beyond ordinary use if not understanding” (492). In the play, while Sir Nicholas uses “a highly Latinized vocabulary of scientific terms” (492), Shadwell gives to Sir Formal Trifle as well as some terms of his own, “an extra pomposity in using them” (493). As Lloyd observes, “the words which Shadwell adds to increase the flavour of pedantry are usually given to Sir Formal rather than to Sir Nicholas” (493).

Another account of the play is to be found in Marjorie Nicolson’s introduction to the 1966 edition of *The Virtuoso*. She sees the interests of Sir Nicholas Gimcrack as divisible into three groups: the moon and related subjects, which she observes would almost have been passé by 1676; the microscope, more topical thanks to Hooke’s *Micrographia*, published in

1665; a number of experiments associated with Robert Boyle, this group being perhaps the most original for not being written about elsewhere.

A widely referenced essay on *The Virtuoso* is Joseph M. Gilde's "Shadwell and the Royal Society: Satire in *The Virtuoso*," published in 1970. However, the viewpoint advanced there is widely regarded as erroneous. Gilde suggests that the characterization of Sir Nicholas Gimcrack and Sir Formal Trifle illustrate the reservations held at the Royal Society itself about specious science and ornate rhetoric. Gilde narrowly defines scientific inquiry at the Society as only having a utilitarian end, a position diametrically opposed to Sir Nicholas's own view that knowledge is its own reward.

There are several other critical essays on *The Virtuoso*, but I shall only mention two more recent ones here. In "Gimcrack's Legacy: Sex, Wealth, and the Theater of Experimental Philosophy" (2008), Tita Chico explores the sexual and financial dimensions of Sir Nicholas's single-minded pursuit of natural philosophy. She also contrasts Mrs. Centilivre's play *The Basset-Table*, first performed in 1705, the central character of which is Valeria, a virtuosa. And in "Theatrical Space and Scientific Space in Thomas Shadwell's *Virtuoso*," John Shanahan writes lucidly about science and theatre. He sees Shadwell's real originality as lying in the attack on the sanctity of the virtuoso's laboratory and his real triumph as striking at the form taken by science in the play.

The older secondary literature refers to the edition of *The Complete Works of Thomas Shadwell* edited by Montagu Summers and published in 1927. More recent critical accounts tend to use the edition prepared by Marjorie H. Nicolson and David S. Rodes in the Regents Restoration Drama Series and published in 1966. I have preferred the edition prepared by Juan A. Prieto-Pablos, Maria José Mora, Manuel J. Gómez-Lara and Rafeael Portillo for the University of Seville Press and published in 1997. This choice is justified by the claim made by these recent Spanish editors that Rodes's "curious reading mistakes," which result from problems in distinguishing the archaic letter "s" from the letter "f," mar the 1966 edition (xlili).

#### 4.2. WHO IS THE SATIRICAL BUTT OF THE VIRTUOSO?

Shadwell took certain measures to distance the subject of the play from the virtuosi of his own day, but at the same time very obvious parallels with some of them can be detected. In the prologue he writes: "Yet no one coxcomb in this play is shown, / No one man's humour makes a part alone, / But scatter'd follies gather'd into one" (p. 6, ll. 27-9). Subsequently Lady Gimcrack says of Sir Nicholas: "He is a rare mechanic philosopher. The

College indeed refus'd him, they envi'd him" (2.1.298-9). At the beginning of the following scene when we encounter Sir Nicholas learning to swim upon a table, she observes: "'Tis a thing the College never thought of" (2.2.14). So, according to Lady Gimcrack, Sir Nicholas as a virtuoso is located outside of the scientific establishment, having been refused membership of the Royal Society, yet there is also a suggestion that he is more original or perhaps more outlandish than their current practice. However, I believe Shadwell's decision to dissociate Sir Nicholas from Gresham College and thereby from the Royal Society is a distancing device implemented so that Charles II, the royal patron of the Society, would not be offended by the play at any level. The majority of the scientific material satirized in the play, however, comes from the Royal Society itself, either in the form of experiments recorded in the *Philosophical Transactions* or Hooke's *Micrographia*. There is also the further question as to whether the character of Sir Nicholas represents an exaggeration of the type of the virtuoso. For Sir Formal Trifle, his friend and ally in the play, Sir Nicholas is "the finest speculative gentleman in the whole world, and in his cogitations the most serene animal alive" (1.1.259-61). Elsewhere in the play, however, there is a suggestion that Sir Nicholas is only a modest example of his kind. In an aside with Longvil, Bruce says in amazement of Sir Nicholas: "No fanatic that has lost his wits in revelation is so mad as this fool." Longvil replies "You are mistaken. This is but a faint copy to some originals among the tribe" (5.2.86-9).

It is clear from this brief examination that a variety of opinions are available within the play. It is my view that the characterization of Sir Nicholas Gimcrack exaggerates some of the features of the virtuosi. I also believe that he represents a number of highly selective interests of the virtuosi which would have been easily understood by a theatre audience and which lent themselves to comedy. It is hard to imagine Shadwell dramatizing, for example, an interest in the way in which the tides work, or one of the astronomical concerns of the members of the Royal Society. I take at face value Shadwell's comment in his prologue that no single satirical target is to be found here, and so regard Sir Nicholas as a composite portrait, but it is true that he does draw extensively on experiments carried out by Robert Hooke and Robert Boyle.

While in the imaginative world of *The Virtuoso* Sir Nicholas is located outside of the scientific establishment, critics agree that the character owes much to the historical figure of Robert Hooke. At least one of Hooke's demonstrations is referenced in the play. This is the grotesque experiment involving a dog which is kept alive, in the words of Gimcrack, "by blowing wind with a pair of bellows into the lungs" (2.2.101-2). The abundant references to *Micrographia* also suggest Hooke as a model. And it is clear from Everett L. Jones's short

article “Robert Hooke and the Virtuosi” that Hooke took himself to be the target of the play (181-2). Jones quotes an entry from Hooke’s diary for 2 June 1676: “With Godfrey and Tompion at Play. Met Oliver there. Damned Doggs. *Vindica me Deus*. People almost pointed” (qtd in Jones, 181). As Tita Chico puts it, “due to the nature of his publications and his roles within the organization, Hooke was in many ways the public face of experimentalism” (31). For Shapin and Schaffer, the character of Gimcrack represents a portrayal of Robert Boyle (70). While this seems to me to be going too far, there are also a number of references in the play to experiments associated with Boyle. The conclusion is surely that the mirror for Sir Nicholas Gimcrack was not placed entirely before Robert Hooke.

We have an idea by now of the type of experiments which are satirized in *The Virtuoso*. We are also aware of how the division of theory and practice in Gimcrack’s approach to natural philosophy increases the comic effect of the character. These two elements in the comedy would have emphasized the strangeness of the virtuosi’s interests to an audience of the time. That grown men concerned themselves with blood transfusions, spiders and storing air could only appear comical in the first years of the Royal Society until the reasons for studying such things had become apparent. And the notion that Sir Nicholas never did anything to achieve a practical outcome would have increased the overall comic effect.

It is largely the ideas of John Wilkins about the moon that are satirized in *The Virtuoso*, as received by Samuel Butler. The moon is mentioned on several different occasions. In the closing speech of the play’s second scene Snarl recounts that his nephew Sir Nicholas has been “compiling a book of geography for the world in the moon” for twenty years (1.2.235-6). During his swimming lesson Sir Nicholas mentions that he is already quite advanced in flying, the idea of which had become popular in the 17<sup>th</sup> century. He thinks “twill be as common to buy a pair of wings to fly to the world in the moon, as to buy a pair of wax boots to ride into Sussex with” (2.2.33-5). Sir Formal mentions the desirability of visiting the moon “since the intelligence with that lunary world would be of infinite advantage to us, in the improvement of our politics” (2.2.39-41), to which Sir Nicholas rejoins that the moon doubtless has “the superior government of all islands” (2.2.43-4).

When Sir Nicholas, Bruce and Longvil meet again in Act 5, Scene 2, Longvil asks Sir Nicholas if he believes the moon to be “an earth” (5.2.78). Prieto-Pablos *et al* (5.2.85 n) suggest that Sir Nicholas’s reply may recall Butler’s *The Elephant in the Moon*:

SIR NICHOLAS. Believe it! I know it; I shall shortly publish a book of geography for it. Why, ‘tis as big as our earth; I can see all the

mountainous parts, and valleys, and seas, and lakes in it; nay, the larger sort of animals, as elephants and camels; but public buildings and ships very easily. I have seen several battles fought there. They have great guns, and have the use of gunpowder. At land they fight with elephants and castles. I have seen 'em. (5.2.79-85)

Indeed, in this passage it also sounds as if Sir Nicholas has looked through Hevelius's telescope which was satirized in *Hudibras* (2.3.261-76). Where he says he has seen great guns and the use of gunpowder, the starting point is to be found in *The Elephant in the Moon* with its description of a battle on the moon. Gimcrack also speaks about an ambitious ruler, saying that there is now "a great monarch who has armies in several countries in the moon, which we find out because the colours which we see are all alike" (5.2.90-2). He asserts that there are many states allied against this monarch who is "a very ambitious prince, and aims at universal monarchy" (93-4), but Gimcrack thinks the rest of the moon will be too much for him. Where the moon appears as a subject of the dialogue of the play, it is that moon of the seventeenth century that was thought to be inhabited and reachable by flight.

#### 4.3. SHADWELL'S SATIRICAL TECHNIQUE

For the purposes of examining Shadwell's satirical technique we have already seen a number of suggestions on how to group the satirical targets in *The Virtuoso*. My preference is to look at three different techniques Shadwell uses in his satirical reception of the virtuosi. These are the way he brings situations in actual experiments to an absurd conclusion. Secondly, the way facetious remarks are used as a satirical tool in the comedy. And thirdly his use of irony of character to undermine Gimcrack's pretensions.

##### 4.3.1. *Going beyond the Philosophical Transactions*

[This discussion is excluded]

##### 4.3.2. *The Facetious Remark as Satirical Tool*

There are also a number of examples where Shadwell's satirical tool in *The Virtuoso* is a facetious remark made by another character on the details of an experiment. An early example of this in the play is Shadwell's reworking of Robert Hooke's demonstration of respiration during the dissection of a dog. The dog is kept alive by blowing air into his lungs with a set of bellows. Sir Nicholas recounts the details of his own clinical experience based on Hooke's, and Longvil ironizes the account and expresses disdain by saying "I have heard of a

creature preserv'd by blowing wind in the breech, sir" (2.2. 103-4), "breech" being another word for "anus". Air introduced into a dog's body through the anus would have no effect. Gimcrack shows his eagerness to please and lack of anatomical knowledge by agreeing that such an operation is frequent (2.2.105).

[Further discussion is omitted]

#### 4.3.3. *Irony of Character*

Irony of character occurs when a character becomes an involuntary or unconscious satirist of himself or herself. There are a number of examples of this in *The Virtuoso*, which we shall now examine. Shortly afterwards in the same scene that has just been under discussion, Gimcrack, Bruce and Longvil are about to go outside to observe the moon, when Sir Nicholas's servant enters with news of "a great rabble of people" outside the house (5.2.103). These are the "ribbon weavers, who have been inform'd that you are he that invented the engine loom, which has provok'd 'em to rise up in arms, and they are resolv'd to be reveng'd for't" (5.2.106-9). The scene dovetails with the following one, at the beginning of which it transpires that Snarl is the person who has convinced the ribbon weavers that Sir Nicholas and Sir Formal are the inventors of the engine loom as a way of exacting revenge on the pair for the way in which he has been treated (5.3.1-4). Sir Nicholas's reply to his servant is instructive: "Tell 'em I am innocent, I never invented anything in my life" (5.2.140-1). And he says directly to the weavers in the following scene: "I never invented so much as an engine to pare cream cheese with. We virtuosos never find out anything of use, 'tis not our way" (5.3.78-80).<sup>31</sup>

Gimcrack is constantly at pains to stress that his sole aim is knowledge without practical application. As he puts it during the hilarious and justly celebrated scene of the swimming lesson in Act 2, Scene 2: "I content myself with the speculative part of swimming; I care not for the practice. I seldom bring anything to use, 'tis not my way. Knowledge is my

---

<sup>31</sup> Continuing the trend in careful documentation of the play's sources, Judith Slagle provides documentary evidence from the Calendar of State Papers and the Middlesex County Records for 10 August 1675 to the effect that "invention of some type of automatic loom was the cause of riots there on 10 August 1675, less than a year before Shadwell's play opened" (Slagle 353-4). According to the Middlesex County Records a number of people broke into the house of one James Moore at St. Leonard's Shoreditch, carried away four "engine weaving looms" and set fire to them (354). Slagle sees Shadwell's use of this incident as evidence of Shadwell's awareness of the effect of new inventions on working people (354).



ultimate end" (2.2.82-4). Shortly after this he says: "I never studi'd anything for use but physic, which I administer to poor people" (2.2.88-89). Shadwell can thus incorporate into the play the idea that the concerns of Sir Nicholas have no practical use. This is underlined at the end of the play when Gimcrack has been abandoned by everyone. He says:

SIR NICHOLAS.            Am I deserted by all? Well, now 'tis time to study for use. I will presently find out the philosopher's stone; I had like to have gotten it last year, but that I wanted May dew, being a dry season. (5.6.130-3)

Here Sir Nicholas says he will search for the Philosopher's Stone, the traditional means for creating gold as a way of making his researches more practical. But the fanciful nature of the search already undercuts his new undertaking with more irony of character.

#### 4.4. PEDANTRY OF LANGUAGE

Lloyd argues that Sir Nicholas Gimcrack and Sir Formal Trifle are both pedants because of the way they use language (492-3). It is Sir Formal who carries the main load of pedantry in the comedy. His association with Sir Nicholas is responsible for the transference of the ridicule created by pedantry from one to the other. For oratory, it is Sir Formal who receives the sharpest criticism in the play. Already described in the *Dramatis Personae* as "Sir Formal Trifle, the Orator, a florid coxcomb" (p. 7), Sir Formal is variously called in the play "a foolish flashy fellow" by Snarl, and "this wordy fool" by Longvil (2.2.238 & 3.3.122). Bruce says the following of Sir Formal in the first scene: "Is there so great a rascal upon earth as an orator, that would slur and top upon our understandings, and impose his false conceits for true reasoning, and his florid words for good sense?" (1.1.228-31).

The language which Sir Formal uses sometimes compromises his ability to communicate effectively. An excellent example of this is his speech on the occasion of introducing Bruce and Longvil to Sir Nicholas:

SIR FORMAL.            Hold, Sir Nicholas; here are those noble gentlemen and philosophers, whom I invited to kiss your hands; and I am not a little proud of the honour of being the grateful and happy instrument of the necessitude and familiar communication which is like to intervene between such excellent virtuosos. (2.2.50-4)

The phrase "the necessitude and familiar communication which is like to intervene" in this quotation is so ornate that Sir Formal's precise meaning is obscured. Lloyd also says that the scientists of the day "were subject to the charge of pedantry, both for using a learned language and for forming another which was beyond ordinary use if not understanding"

(492). In the following example, Sir Formal undertakes to describe Sir Nicholas to Bruce and Longvil before they meet him. Part of the speech is as follows:

SIR FORMAL. Trust me, he is the finest speculative gentleman in the whole world, and in his cogitations the most serene animal alive. Not a creature so little, but affords him great curiosities. He is the most admirable person in the meletetiques, viz., in reflections and meditations, in the whole world. (1.1.259-264)

Sir Formal's use of the word *meletetiques* reflects a familiarity with the work of Robert Boyle – so new is this word that Shadwell has to include a gloss of its meaning in the speech “reflections and meditations” (1.1.263). It is likely that Sir Formal's use of language here will appear ridiculous onstage. Shadwell makes Sir Formal the vehicle for this aspect of his satire on the virtuosi. It would not do to have Sir Nicholas speak in a way which is difficult to follow and as his constant companion, Sir Formal is a kind of virtuoso himself.

Sir Formal's oratory is purely comic in other scenes of the play. When he is trapped in the vault and is trying to become intimate with Sir Samuel Hearty because the latter is dressed as a woman, he cries “Not all the fragrant bosom of the spring affords such ravishing perfumes” (4.1.34-5) to which Sir Samuel replies “O Lord, sir! You are pleas'd to compliment! [Aside] Ah, lying rogue, my breath smells of tobacco” (4.1.36-7). But it is in the scene with the ribbon weavers that his oratory fails most spectacularly. Snarl has convinced the ribbon weavers that “this Sir Nicholas, and one Sir Formal that's with him, invented the engine loom, to the confusion of ribbon weavers” (5.3.1-3). Sir Formal enters the street outside Sir Nicholas's house to address the crowd of weavers. There is a marked contrast between the simple speech of the weavers and Sir Formal's rhetoric. The weavers constantly substitute “vertoso” and “vertosos” for “virtuoso” and “virtuosos” and their dialogue is characterized by both vulgarity and roughness. Sir Formal flounders in the following exchange:

SIR FORMAL. . . . But let it not be said that Englishmen, good commonwealth's men, and sober discreet ribbon weavers, should be thus hurri'd by the rapid force of the too dangerous whirlwind, or hurricane of passion.

FIRST WEAVER. He speaks notably.

SECOND WEAVER. He's a well-spoken man, truly.

SIR FORMAL. Of passion, I say, which with its sudden, and – alas! – too violent circumgyrations, does too often shipwreck those that are agitated by it, while it turns them into such giddy confusion, that they can no longer trim the sails of reason, or steer by the compass of judgement.

- FIRST WEAVER. His tongue's well hung, but I know not what he means by all this stuff.
- SIR FORMAL. I say, gentlemen –
- SECOND WEAVER. Pox on you, you shall say no more. What's this to the invention of the loom?
- THIRD WEAVER. This is one of the inventors, hang him. Where's t'other? Break open the house. (5.3.41-58)

And so Sir Formal's mixture of metaphor and circumlocution fails him and it falls to Longvil and Bruce to disperse the crowd later in the scene by discharging their pistols.

#### 4.5. BORROWINGS FROM HOOKE'S *MICROGRAPHIA*

The founding work of microscopy in England was written by Robert Hooke and published in 1665 under the title *Micrographia: or Some Physiological Descriptions of Minute Bodies Made by Magnifying Glasses with Observations and Inquiries thereupon*, as has already been mentioned in Chapter Two. *Micrographia*, as it is generally known, gave access to a new world previously unseen in such detail by mankind. The work consists of 60 separate "Observations" which deal with a wide range of subjects, but the two most prominent areas to engage Hooke's attention were insects, the subject of 22 separate observations, and plant matter, with 16 separate observations. Not all the subjects observed by Hooke are illustrated, but over half of the insects observed are. Furthermore, many of the most striking illustrations in the book as a whole are of insects, which appear particularly to have engaged Hooke's attention. The illustrations of the flea and the louse are particularly striking. They are designated as 34. *scheme* and 35. *scheme* respectively in Hooke's text. Many other insects such as the ant, the gnat and the fly are also illustrated by Hooke. Perhaps there was more of interest to him in these creatures to illustrate than in the earlier subjects of the book. Both this prominence and the vivid artistic representation of insect life may be another reason why insects particularly caught the attention of the satirists, in the same way that visually engaging experiments such as those involving blood transfusion did.

[Passage omitted]

In conclusion, we can see that Shadwell's use of his borrowings from Hooke's *Micrographia* serve to question the usefulness and even the veracity of early modern scientific inquiry. And, in being real words written by a leading virtuoso of the day, they also

give a verisimilitude to the play so acute that Hooke took himself to be the subject of *The Virtuoso*. Writing the account of Hooke's life and work in the *Dictionary of Scientific Biography*, Richard S. Westfall described Shadwell's *The Virtuoso* as a "wretched physico-libidinous farce" (6.483). Furthermore, summing up his disdain for the negative reception of Hooke's *Micrographia* by Shadwell in the play, Westfall observed that "no amount of ignorant ridicule could dim the book's luster" (6.483-4). Such trenchant remarks written by a twentieth-century historian of science suggest that Shadwell hit his mark very well.

#### 4.6. CONCLUSION

Shadwell and Butler both satirized the virtuosi, sharing a conception of them as being misguided and foolhardy. However, they diverged in the way they gave shape to them. Shadwell provides us with a well-drawn caricature of the figure of the virtuoso in the shape of Sir Nicholas Gimcrack. Butler reproaches the virtuosi for their abuse of reason while Shadwell condemns what his caricature stands for not only by satirizing early modern science but also for the way in which Sir Nicholas interacts with those around him. His nieces complain that he spends large amounts of money on microscopes to study various life forms without understanding humanity. He selfishly becomes indebted to his suppliers to the extent that they lay claim to his country estate. When his suppliers take legal steps to secure their money the pleas Sir Nicholas makes to his nieces fall on deaf ears. They have been restrained in his household for too long and suffered too much from his lack of humanity. Butler writes in prose and verse and describes his subject there while satirizing it in the burlesque way, denigrating it by comparing it to something trivial or vile. Shadwell is a dramatist who draws on other techniques to satirize his subject.

[Passage omitted]

## CHAPTER FIVE. SUBSEQUENT SATIRICAL ACCOUNTS OF THE VIRTUOSO: BROWNE, BEHN AND KING

It is the aim of this chapter to examine four separate works written after the first attacks on the virtuosi had been made. We will see how the satirical impulse combines with other themes or evolves as the virtuosi persist in time. The four works are the *Musaeum Clausum, or Bibliotheca Abscondita* by Sir Thomas Browne, *The Emperor of the Moon* by Aphra Behn and *The Transactioneer* and the *Useful Transactions in Philosophy, and Other Sorts of Learning: In Three Parts* by William King.

### 5.1. CURIOSITY AND COLLECTING

While it is true that the work of Francis Bacon and Sir Isaac Newton provided a great stimulus to natural philosophy in the seventeenth century and therefore empowered the virtuoso to pursue natural philosophy, there was another force at work which also animated the lives of the virtuosi: curiosity. We have already encountered its satirical reception in Samuel Butler's character sketch "A Curious Man" and we will encounter it again in some of the texts that I will analyze in this chapter and the next. In the period under discussion in this thesis, the noun curiosity came to have several interrelated meanings. What we might call its root meaning was a scientific or artistic interest in things, a connoisseurship which was attributed to a specific individual. An object possessed curiosity because it was novel or strange. It might also be curious for the excellent workmanship which informed its construction. Or it might be a trifle, an overrated vanity not worth the attention it receives.

[Passage omitted]

### 5.2. *MUSAEUM CLAUSUM, OR BIBLIOTHECA ABSCONDITA*

The *Musaeum Clausum, or Bibliotheca Abscondita* is a short work by Sir Thomas Browne (1605-82) first published posthumously in 1683. It is the thirteenth of Browne's *Miscellany Tracts* which were published together in that year. The title can be translated as

“The Locked Museum, or the Lost Library”. The work is a parody of the inventories of the European cabinets of curiosities which came into existence from the sixteenth century onwards. As we have just seen, such collections housed a wide range of exhibits ranging from books and antiquities to animals and fossils, as well as artefacts which were historical or religious in character. Browne was clearly familiar at some level with the European cabinet of curiosity, since he mentions some of the most important ones at the beginning of *Musaeum Clausum*, including those belonging to Aldrovandi and Wormius, who are mentioned above.

According to a note made by John Evelyn in the margin of the first *Miscellany Tract*, they were mostly written as letters to Sir Nicholas Bacon (3). Geoffrey Keynes remarks in his preface to *The Miscellaneous Works of Sir Thomas Browne* that “the *Miscellany Tracts* have never been popular, though they contain much curious matter. The last one indeed, *Musaeum Clausum*, shews Browne in his most whimsical vein, but humour so erudite is not to everybody’s taste” (xii). In a letter to the *Times Literary Supplement* Jeremiah Finch suggests that the presence of a Latin version of *Musaeum Clausum* in the commonplace book of Walter Charleton may mean that the latter is the addressee of this particular tract (871). And that places it within the network of scholarly correspondence between collectors which was characteristic of the second half of the seventeenth century (Preston 166).

The *Musaeum Clausum* is divided into three sections, “Rare and generally unknown Books” (131-5) with 20 entries, “Rarities in Pictures” (135-9) with 34 entries, and “Antiquities and Rarities of Several Sorts” (139-42) with 25, making a total of 79 entries. The subtitle of the work already indicates that there may be parody afoot: “containing some remarkable Books, Antiquities, Pictures and Rarities of several kinds, scarce or never seen by any man now living” (131). The explicit statement which makes us realize we are reading a parody is to be found at the end: “He who knows where all this Treasure now is, is a great Apollo. I’m sure I am not He” (142). Claire Preston makes several interesting observations about the nature of the collection Browne assembles here. She describes it as “a straightforward catalogue list” in which Browne does not separate books and objects out into distinct collections, in the fashion of many of the great cabinets of curiosities, including that of Aldrovandi (166). Preston remarks that “none of the sections has any obvious thematic consistency” (166). Nor does she regard everything as invented for the purposes of parody: “The eagle stone . . . souvenirs of specific events such as the Doge’s ring found in the belly of a fish caught in the Adriatic, and various naturalia like squid ink (against hysteria) – all these are actual or generically typical elements of contemporary collections” (167). But parody is certainly a constituent part of the *Musaeum*, and the text is certainly of interest to the

student of representations of the virtuosi, as it is a satirical account of the interests of the English antiquarian in the later seventeenth century. We are in the presence here of a spoof catalogue, an inventory of things some of which are imaginary or intangible. These are shaped by Browne's classical learning and his love of antiquity, as well as his professional interest in medicine. Many of the items are curiosities, yet they are curiosities which are parodic because they may have existed or may not have existed. Browne enjoys himself in creating these parodies by using his erudition playfully. He also points to the material void which surrounds any collection (Preston 155-6). Browne was certainly aware of the possibilities of parody, as is evident from an observation entitled "Upon Reading Hudibras" in the *Miscellaneous Writings* (202), where he alludes to burlesque verse. Here Browne begins: "The way of Burlesque Poems is very Ancient, for there was a ludicrous mock way of transferring Verses of famous Poets into a Jocose Sense and Argument, and they were called . . . *Parodiae*" (202).

Sir Thomas Browne's *Musaeum Clausum* is not exclusively an example of the satirical reception of curiosity or collecting. Its inclusion in this thesis is warranted by those aspects which are satirical, but it also goes beyond the strictly satirical. There are ideas from history such as how books or manuscripts travel enormous distances, as well as lost books, some of which would have been of great use to scholars. Some items are present to provide verisimilitude, such as the eagle stone, a standard collectible item of the day. The work is in part optative in character. It represents in part a list of items that Browne would like to have, such as the "punctual relation of Hannibal's march out of Spain into Italy" (132), an account more informative than that provided by Livy. But some other entries are fully satirical. One of the most striking is the "*Batrachomyomachia*, or the Homeric Battel between Frogs and Mice, neatly described upon the Chisel Bone of a large Pike's Jaw" (142). The original was just over three hundred lines long while Chapman's translation, which Browne may just have known, consisted of 444 lines of iambic pentameter couplets. This is an example of the satirical reception of the type of miniature carving associated with the Saxon court. Most carvings of this nature were carried out on cherry stones or other small items. The bone from the pike's jaw is an outlandish artistic medium, and it seems unlikely that all of the lines from the poem would fit into such a space. The other rarity worth mentioning is "A large Ostridge's Egg, whereon is neatly and fully wrought that famous Battel of Alcazar, in which three Kings lost their lives" (138). This is the eighth item among the "Antiquities and Rarities of several sorts". Such an egg is much larger than the standard cherry stone and is perhaps necessary to accommodate the death of three different monarchs, but also marks it out as

satirical. It is through these items that Browne satirizes the virtuosi who collect such things. I shall now enumerate several of the items in the *Musaeum Clausum* and comment on their significance.

#### 5.2.1. Books

The very first entry illustrates Browne's depth of knowledge of the classical world. Concerned with a fictitious poem by the Roman poet Ovid (43 BC-AD 17), it departs from the accepted notion of his death in Tomis on the Black Sea, referring to an alternative, fictitious tradition that he died in Sabaria – a city now in western Hungary near the Austrian border – on his way back to Rome after being pardoned by Augustus or after the Emperor's death. And there "found wrapt up in Wax" is a poem "written in the Getick Language" (131). This was the language of the Getae, "a Thracian tribe who had settled by the 4<sup>th</sup> century BC on the lower Danube to the south and east of the Carpathians" (*Oxford Classical Dictionary* 636). The idea that Ovid wrote a poem in this language was perhaps suggested by the marginal comment "Ah pudet & scripsi Getico sermone Libellum" which Kevin Killeen suggests is a misquotation from Ovid's *Ex Ponto* (4.13.19) (Browne 929, n. 72). This is an item which might have existed and which Browne might have liked to have in his collection. It also opts for the more positive version of the end of Ovid's life in which he is pardoned. So, it is optative in character, as is the next item, an imaginary letter from Quintus Cicero to his better-known brother Marcus Tullius (106-43 BC), after the latter requested an account of Britany (Britain). The letter describes "the Country, State and Manners of the Britains of that Age" (132) and would have been of tremendous interest to William Camden and other antiquaries. It is sometimes difficult to know which elements in this work are imaginary as it is often difficult to corroborate their existence. In entry nineteen the Ethiopian Prophecy of Enoch is mentioned. This is a non-canonical book in the Western biblical tradition and so it is possible to corroborate that this work exists. However, I have been unable to determine who Zaga Zaba was in entry ten under books, also associated with Ethiopia. The third entry among the books, nevertheless, appears to be unmistakably fictitious and the account reflects both classical learning and Browne's interest in medicine. It is "An Ancient British Herbal, or description of divers Plants of this Island . . ." by Scribonius Largus (c. AD 1-50), a Roman physician who went on Claudius's British campaign in AD 43. According to an entry in the *Oxford Classical Dictionary* the only surviving work by Scribonius Largus is in fact the *Compositiones* (prescriptions), a work that would have been of interest to Browne as a physician (1370). Another item of this kind is "A Commentary of Galen upon the Plague of



Athens described by Thucydides" (134). We also have here a modest instance of the depth of historical perspective Browne intermittently evokes. The Plague of Athens took place in the early years of the Peloponnesian War of the 5<sup>th</sup> century BC, while Galen was a court physician in Rome under the Emperor Marcus Aurelius. Another entry concerned with plague is the penultimate one of the entire collection, "*Pyxis Pandoraae*, or a Box which held the *Unguentum Pestiferum*, which by anointing the Garments of several persons begat the great and horrible Plague of Milan" (142). This was another real plague, which struck in the first half of the seventeenth century and Browne draws on the story of Pandora's box to raise the aetiology of the outbreak to the status of myth. Here the plague has been disseminated, done its work and gone. To add the box which held it to a collection of curiosities is a gruesome parody of the articles which usually make up such collections.

Some of the entries are remarkably detailed and nuanced, demonstrating the vagaries of history. A particularly complex example is a written account of the life and death of Avicenna (c. 980-1037), whom Browne has probably mistaken for the 11<sup>th</sup>-century Islamic philosopher Averroes (d. 1198), according to Keynes's footnote (132, n. 1). This entry of nine lines consists of a true account, a reference to a false account, the authors of both accounts, and the recipient of the true account with a reference to the place where the true account was discovered. So the subject is from the eleventh century, the author of the true account Benjamin of Tudela (1130-73), a twelfth-century Jewish traveller and the concatenation ends after the Siege of Montpellier in 1622 when Louis XIII of France (1601-43) entered that city, a span of six centuries.

Likewise, several of Browne's other literary inventions owe at least some of their rarity to the vicissitudes through which they have passed before reaching the cabinet. For example, we read of "Some Pieces of Julius Scaliger, which he complains to have been stoln from him, sold to the Bishop of Mende in Languedock, and afterward taken away and sold in the Civil Wars under the Duke of Rohan" (133). The "Pieces" in question end up at four removes from their rightful owner, their author, entering as they do into the vicissitudes of seventeenth-century French history. They are stolen, sold to the Catholic bishop of Mende, then taken by the forces of the Protestant Duke of Rohan and sold in the Civil Wars to an unidentified owner. And there are works which were lost to antiquity or which never existed. Claire Preston calls Browne's entry of Seneca's letters to St. Paul as "temptingly plausible" on the grounds that "Seneca's brother was the Roman administrator who declined to prosecute Paul," and notes that the correspondence is "sadly inexistent" (172). Here the sense is not of what once was and has been lost, rather of what might have been. The pursuit of curiosities

can take many forms and here Browne is suggesting that history has outmanoeuvred the collector. It is unable to offer him something which would be highly desirable, yet which does not exist.

In the various examples described here, Browne is doing different things. He also invents things which would have been highly desirable to collect, as in the case of the two optative examples, the text about Ovid and the imaginary letter from Quintus Cicero to Marcus Tullius Cicero. He shows the vagaries of history in the case of the item related to Benjamin of Tudela. And finally, he is partly satirizing the aspirations of the virtuoso whose curiosity leads him to want to collect things that are ever rarer and eventually become so rare that they do not even exist.

#### *5.2.2. The Rarities in Pictures & Antiquities and Rarities of Several Sorts*

The rarities in pictures consist among other things of scenes illuminated by moonlight or made of snow or ice. There are important moments in history, such as the submission of Vercingetorix (82-46 BC) to Julius Caesar (100-44 BC) and the crossing of the River Rhone by Hannibal (b. 247-c. 183 BC). There are also representations of “three passionate Looks,” that of Thyestes on learning “that he had eaten a piece of his own Son; of Bajazet when he went into the Iron Cage; of Oedipus when he first came to know that he had killed his Father, and married his own Mother” (137). The pictures are also subject to the same vagaries of history as the books, as for example in the case of “A Night Piece of the dismal Supper and strange Entertain of the Senatours by Domitian, according to the description of Dion” (136). The poor relationship Domitian (51-96 AD) had with the Senate is well known: it seems likely that the Dion mentioned here is Dion Cassius who “flourished about the 230<sup>th</sup> year of the Christian era” and much of whose history of Rome is now lost (*Lempriere* 209).

There are some particularly striking inventions among the antiquities and rarities. The most obviously fictitious is “The Skin of a Snake bred out of the Spinal Marrow of a Man” (141). The first entry is a quite feasible sedimentation from the Third Mithradatic War in which Pompey defeated the most famous king of Pontus, Mithradates VI Eupator Dionysus (120-63 BC): “Certain ancient Medals with Greek and Roman Inscriptions, found about Crim Tartary; conceived to be left in those parts by the Souldiers of Mithridates, when overcome by Pompey, he marched round about the North of the Euxine to come about into Thracia” (139). The sixth item among the antiquities and rarities is the immaculately preserved body of Crispinus: “*Mummia Tholosana*; or, The complete Head and Body of Father Crispin, buried

long ago in the Vault of the Cordeliers at Tholouse, where the Skins of the dead so drie and parch up without corruption that their persons may be known very long after, with this Inscription, *Ecce iterum Crispinus.*” Although the existing scholarship suggests otherwise, this is surely a reference to Juvenal’s *Fourth Satire*, where the opening words are “*Ecce iterum Crispinus*” and refer to a gauche Egyptian courtier of Domitian, who is first encountered in Juvenal’s *First Satire* (1.26-9). A translation of the relevant lines in Juvenal’s *Fourth Satire* reads as follows: “He’s a monstrosity without a single good quality to make up for his faults, a feeble dandy, strong only for lechery, an adulterer who rejects only unpartnered women” (Juvenal 4.2-4). It is also the inscription to Samuel Butler’s “An Heroical Epistle of Hudibras to Sidrophel,” where it forms the epigraph. I prefer this interpretation to that of it being a reference to Horace’s *First Satire* where the reference is to a poetaster called Crispinus (Horace *Satires* 1.1.20). The entry seems to me to be a literary joke, reducing the noble body of an interred Father to something much more reproachable and gives a physical location to Crispinus. This example is therefore clearly satirical.

Yet there is another dimension to the whole text which requires commentary. As Claire Preston puts it: “Here, a regrouped anthology of precious, formerly lost things is being proposed as *itself* now lost” (172). While the aim of collecting in this era may have been to foreground the unusual and advance the reputation of the collector, while hopefully also increasing knowledge, *Musaeum Clausum* also contains within it the contrary forces of dispersal and oblivion. The collection is at once locked and lost. This is the sideways step that Browne’s imagination takes, making of the fabric of history and literary history the very materials of his art. It was for this reason that Browne’s work appealed to Jorge Luis Borges (1899-1986). And it is exactly Browne’s wistful sense of melancholy and ephemerality which endeared him to W.G. Sebald (1944-2001). While the antiquarian and the virtuoso were seeking merit in this world through their acquisitive endeavours, Browne hints in this work at the surrounding darkness into which anything they might illuminate by possessing it may fall. This is only partly satirical, placing the collection beyond the reach of the virtuoso in a gesture that could also be interpreted as tragic or mocking. Dispersal and oblivion are not of themselves humorous but do make collecting relative in the general scheme of things. Pushing the collection into the void is arguably a way of mocking the virtuoso’s pretensions.

### 5.3. *THE EMPEROR OF THE MOON*

SCARAMOUCH. This madness is a pretty sort of a pleasant disease, when it tickles but in one vein. Why, here’s my master now: as great a scholar, as

grave and wise a man, in all argument and discourse, as can be met with; yet name but the moon, and he runs into ridicule, and grows as mad as the wind.

Aphra Behn, *The Emperor of the Moon* (1995), 2.3.183-7.

Aphra Behn's farce *The Emperor of the Moon* is a further example of a literary work which satirizes contemporary thinking about the moon. My own analysis of it is that its main satirical targets are astronomy, seventeenth-century writing about the moon and Rosicrucianism. However, a recent critical reading of the play by Al Coppola relates it to developments at the Royal Society, as well as contemporary politics and a wider unreflecting attitude towards spectacle among Behn's contemporaries. Coppola's suggestion that the play is a metaphor for a need to refocus the attention of the Royal Society's virtuosi is an interesting one and at least needs to be mentioned in this thesis.

The first performance of *The Emperor of the Moon* took place in March or April of 1687 at the Dorset Garden Theatre and the first two published editions date from 1687 and 1688 respectively. The play was therefore written towards the end of the reign of Charles II. Behn's point of departure was the French comedy *Arlequin, empereur dans la lune* which was performed in Paris in 1684. A mixture of scenes in French and *commedia dell'arte* scenes in Italian, the printed French text was attributed to Nolant de Fatouville (b. 17<sup>th</sup> century, d. 1715) (Behn, *The Rover* xviii). Commentators agree that Behn produced something more tightly structured than the original.

*The Emperor of the Moon* is set in Naples and has three acts, the first and third with three scenes each and the second with five scenes. It is evident from the *dramatis personae* that Behn took over into her English play some of the stock characters of the Italian *commedia dell'arte*. Most interestingly, Behn adapts the character of the old and pedantic doctor for her satirical purposes. In her farce he becomes Doctor Baliardo, a name deriving from *balordo* and meaning "stupid" (Behn, *The Rover* 378, n. 1). His man is Scaramouch, another stock character, and his household is completed by his daughter Elaria, his niece Bellemante and their governess Mopsophil. Don Cinthio and Don Charmante are nephews to the Viceroy and lovers of Elaria and Bellemante. Cinthio's man is called Harlequin. All the characters on the moon are imaginary and assumed. Don Cinthio and Don Charmante take on the characters of the Emperor and the Prince of Thunderland. Their attendants Kepler and Galileus are described as two philosophers and twelve persons representing the figures of the twelve signs of the zodiac. Behn explicitly called the play a farce and the action is mainly

concerned with the duping of Doctor Baliardo by Don Cinthio and Don Charmante to further their romantic ambitions which are obstructed by the Doctor's obsessions with the moon.

*The Emperor of the Moon* was intended to be a visual delight for audiences of the time and it is greatly concerned with the notion of seeing, both with the eye and the mind. Doctor Baliardo is a kind of virtuoso who is obsessed with the moon, as is evident from this early passage of dialogue from the play's first scene:

- |              |  |
|--------------|--|
| SCARAMOUCHE. | You must know, madam, your father, (my master the doctor) is a little whimsical, romantic, or Don Quick-sottish, or so.  |
| ELARIA.      | Or rather mad.   |
| SCARAMOUCHE. | That were uncivil to be supposed by me; but lunatic we may call him without breaking the decorum of good manners, for he is always travelling to the moon.   |
| ELARIA.      | And so religiously believes there is a world there, that he discourses as gravely of the people, their government, institutions, laws, manners, religion and constitution, as if he had been bred a Machiavel there.   |
| SCARAMOUCHE. | How came he thus infected first?   |
| ELARIA.      | With reading foolish books, Lucian's <i>Dialogue of Icaromenippus</i> , who flew up to the moon, and thence to heaven; an heroic business called <i>The Man in the Moon</i> , if you'll believe a Spaniard, who was carried thither, upon an engine drawn by wild geese; with another philosophical piece, <i>A Discourse of the World in the Moon</i> , with a thousand other ridiculous volumes too hard to name. (1.1.83-100) |

The characterization here is explicitly Quixotic. The books he has read fuel Baliardo's obsession with the moon and despite all the aids to vision that surround him in the form of scientific instruments, or perhaps because of them, he is unable to engage with the reality presented by the human beings around him. Furthermore, there are several elements in the characterization of Doctor Baliardo that point to him being a satirical representation of a later seventeenth-century virtuoso. Behn includes some direct satire of the tools of the new science. In the first scene Mopsophil calls to Scaramouch in the following way: "Run, run, Scaramouch; my master's conjuring for you like mad below: he calls up all his little devils with horrid names, his microscope, his horoscope, his telescope, and all his scopes" (1.1. 124-6). In the second scene of the first act Charmante claps a glass with a prepared image on it onto the end of the Doctor's telescope on two separate occasions. The first image is of a young woman which makes the doctor think he is seeing a beautiful female spirit (1.2.84). The

second is a representation of the emperor of the moon (1.2.120-1), but here the satire is more directed at Doctor Baliardo's Rosicrucian preoccupations.

When he meets Charmante in the second scene of the first act, the latter says to him with considerable irony: "The fame of your great learning, sir, and virtue, is known with joy to the renowned society" (1.2.27-8). The "society" probably refers to the Rosicrucians, but as Jane Spencer suggests in her note it may also be "a satirical glance at the Royal Society" (382, n. 10). There are many references to Rosicrucianism in this scene and particular to a work by the Abbé de Villars (1635-73) translated into English and published in 1680 as *Count of Gabalis: or, the extravagant mysteries of the Cabalists: Exposed in Five Pleasant Discourses on the Secret Sciences* (Behn, *The Rover* 382, n. 11). The Doctor is obviously acquainted with the work when he says: "I must confess the Count of Gabalis renders it plain, from writ divine and human, there are such friendly and intelligent demons" (1.2.35-7). And in a speech slightly later in the scene Charmante mentions several real or mythical characters from history that are described in the work as the offspring of the Rosicrucian spirits or as having had dealings with them. It is in this scene that Charmante introduces the notion of "the emperor of the moon . . . the mighty Iredonozor" (1.2.116-17). Spencer notes that this name is derived from Irdonozur, the prince who rules over the world in the moon in Godwin's novel *The Man in the Moone* (384, n. 3). Charmante, as he appears in this scene, is referred to later as "the virtuoso" (2.3.89) but is a virtuoso whom the Doctor regards as a "famous Rosicrucian" (2.3.165). The use of the word is therefore ironic. At the climax of the play when the emperor of the moon is about to descend, the Doctor, Elaria and Bellemante enter the richly adorned gallery and Elaria asks where they are. The Doctor does not know but puts her off with the following: "Let not thy female ignorance profane the highest mysteries of natural philosophy" (3.3.10-11). So there is some direct reference to virtuosi and natural philosophy in the play, although the use of these terms may sometimes be ironic. This leads to the conclusion that if the virtuoso is the subject of this play, it is a vision of a virtuoso much preoccupied with Rosicrucianism and with peering into the world in the moon.

The interpretative *status quo ante* for *The Emperor of the Moon* very much focuses on the play's status as a farce. The duping of Doctor Baliardo is called by Steven Henderson an "embedded farce-within-a farce" (63). Furthermore, Henderson argues, Behn locates "the embedded farce-within-a-farce in the domestic setting of the romance plot, so that the primary action . . . and the secondary action of the embedded 'farce' become one and the same" (63). Neither Spencer nor Henderson foreground the virtuoso aspects of the play. For Henderson, *The Emperor of the Moon* was a response on Behn's part to the popularity of

Italian *commedia dell'arte*, which had become all the more established in the affections of London theatregoers by the presence there in 1673 and 1675 of a leading Paris-based troupe (Henderson 59). By contrast, Coppola makes of Doctor Baliardo's otherworldly preoccupations a metaphor for his understanding of the Royal Society of the time. The Society was much ridiculed in the 1670s and Coppola argues that in response to the ridicule it had undergone through its emphasis on the telescope and the microscope, the Royal Society repositioned itself by foregrounding the work of its Curator of Plants, Nehemiah Grew (*hap.* 1641-1712). Grew was also instructed to produce a catalogue of the Royal Society's "repository of rarities, specimens and scientific instruments," the *Musaeum Regalis Societatis* (1681). For Coppola,

. . . a new logic of spectacle runs through this text . . . In the *Musaeum*, the viewer's appetite for wonder is stoked only to be gratified in such a way as to reinscribe a normative, anthropocentric frame of reference, one which gives priority to the naked eye over the distortions produced by specialized instruments like the microscope and the telescope. (485-6)

While this may be a reasonable interpretation of what was happening at the Royal Society in the 1670s and early 1680s, to make *The Emperor of the Moon* a metaphor for this phenomenon seems to me somewhat far-fetched.

### 5.3.1. Behn's Use of Her Literary Sources

I will detain the Reader no longer, only let him as he reads this, or any piece of this kind, both laugh and wonder, at the extravagant boldness of Man's imagination, and think in what danger of Shipwrack (sic), that Vessel is, which has too much Sail and too little Ballast.

Abbé de Villars, *The Count of Gabalis* (1680), 10-11.

Aphra Behn draws on three distinct literary sources in *The Emperor of the Moon*. Firstly, she draws on the rich literature of voyages to the moon or theoretical works about lunar voyages listed in Elaria's speech and quoted above (1.1.95-100): Lucian's *Dialogue of Icaromenippus*, Bishop Godwin's *The Man in the Moon*, and *A Discourse of a World in the Moon*. By the time *The Emperor of the Moon* was first performed in 1687, these lunar references lay slightly in the past. Lucian's Menippean dialogue about Icaromenippus's voyage to the moon is referenced at least in 1620 by Ben Jonson in his *News from the New World* (Robinson 130). *The Man in the Moon* had been published in 1638 and what is I think a reference to John Wilkins's *The Discovery of a World in the Moone* (*The Discovery of a World in the Moone. Or, A Discourse Tending To Prove, That 'tis Probable There May Be*

*Another Habitable World in that Planet*), dates back to 1638 as well. What is new and contemporary in 1687 is the use Behn makes of the Abbé de Villars's *The Count of Gabalis*, which had been published in an English translation in 1680. This is her second literary source for the farce.

[Passage omitted]

#### 5.4. *THE TRANSACTIONEER*

But pray, what does this contribute to the Advancement of Natural Knowledge?

William King, *The Transactioneer* (1700), 40.

*The Transactioneer with Some of his Philosophical Fancies: in Two Dialogues* was published anonymously in London in 1700. It was described by the contemporary Theophilus Cibber (1703-58) as "one of the severest and merriest satires that ever was written in Prose" (qtd. in "More Strange than True" 213). The author was William King (1663-1712), whose *Dialogues of the Dead* had been published the previous year. Whereas in that work his target had been the classical scholar Richard Bentley, in this work he had set his sights on Hans Sloane. One of the secretaries of the Royal Society, Sloane was also the editor of the *Philosophical Transactions Giving some Account of the Present Undertakings, Studies and Labours of the Ingenious, in many Considerable Parts of the World*, from 1695 to 1713. In the first dialogue the protagonists are a Gentleman, who represents King's standpoint, and a Virtuoso who consistently recommends Sloane's own writing in the *Philosophical Transactions*. In the second dialogue the Gentleman converses with the Transactioneer, a fictionalized version of Sloane himself, about the improbability of their contents and the reliability of those that supply him with such material. Or as King puts it in his preface: "have treated him [Sloane] under two Characters: as an Author and an Editor. In the former I have consider'd his own personal Capacity: In the other, his Judgment in the choice of his Friends, and of the Discourses that he Publishes (n.d.)." I now propose to examine some of the specific targets of King's satire as well as to look at the uses to which he puts his sources among the reports in the *Philosophical Transactions*. It will be seen that King's technique is one of a direct confrontation with the text, quoting it, abbreviating it, adding to it, all with the aim of making it appear ridiculous. The portrait of the virtuoso that results is an indirect one in which a lack of rigour and perhaps even a certain credulity leave Sloane high and dry above the plain of scientific intent.



*The Transactioneer* has been well served critically by the work of Roger D. Lund, who supplied the introduction for the Augustan Reprint Society facsimile edition of the text and also wrote an insightful article about the work, entitled “‘More Strange than True’: Sir Hans Sloane, King’s *Transactioneer*, and the Deformation of English Prose.” Lund suggests that *The Transactioneer* “almost certainly influenced the Scriblerian mode of satire,” while awarding that palm more decisively to King’s later *Useful Transactions in Philosophy and Other Sorts of Learning* (London: 1708/9) (227-8, n. 4). He regards *The Transactioneer* as “a work that exerted a significant influence upon later satirists of science, and one which deserves to be rediscovered by modern readers” (213). And Lund quotes astutely from Isaac Disraeli (1766-1848) to illustrate that King “introduces a new element to satires on the modern virtuoso” (213).<sup>32</sup> In Disraeli’s view, “[King] took advantage of their [the *Philosophical Transactions*] perplexed and often unintelligible descriptions; of the meanness of their style . . . of their credulity that heaped up marvels, and their vanity that prided itself on petty discoveries, and invented a new species of satire” (359-60). In Disraeli’s opinion, King’s satirical innovation lie “in selecting the very expressions and absurd passages from the original he ridiculed, and framing out of them a droll dialogue or a grotesque narrative, he adroitly inserted his own remarks, replete with the keenest irony, or the driest sarcasm” (360). At the same time Disraeli saw the limitations of King’s approach, suggesting that the labours of King offer an important lesson to “real genius” (261). Once the original stimulus and King’s humorous response have receded in time, the whole becomes like a “paralytic limb,” impeding the proper functioning of the rest of the body (361).

Looked at more positively, what is new here is that the satirical reception of the virtuosi has been extended to the language they use and how they use it. The actual articles from the *Philosophical Transactions* provide King with examples of what he regards as bad writing. Occasionally, components of individual transactions become part of his satirical response. He also focuses on the curious which is included there. While King expects scientific rigour and focus, a major component of Sloane’s profile as a virtuoso was curiosity. King also makes the formal innovation of using the Menippean device of the satirical dialogue here. It will be amply evident from reading the extracts from *The Transactioneer* in this section that King is writing in dialogue form. In his case this comes from a particular genre in

---

<sup>32</sup> Isaac D’Israeli wrote popular works such as *Calamities of Authors*, 2 vols (1812) and *Quarrels of Authors*, 3 vols. (1814). After his death his work was edited by his son the Conservative politician Benjamin Disraeli (1804-81).

ancient literature, that of the dialogue of the dead, invented by Lucian of Samosata. Writing in his critical history of the genre, Frederick M. Keener says: "In the standard history of the form, Rudolf Hirzel observes that a dialogue is more than just a transcript of any conversation. The dialogue is the literary embodiment of dialectic, a form that probes and dissects a topic from two or more points of view (qtd in Keener, 5). As Keener points out, the character of Menippus in Lucian's *Dialogues of the Dead* "is called a 'Barker' because he is a Cynic (from the Greek for *dog*)" (145). The Gentleman in King's *The Transactioneer* is based on this barking interlocutor. The genre of the dialogue of the dead is one in which the pretensions of those who have recently died are broken down by an interlocutor. Although there is no mythological apparatus in King's *The Transactioneer*, the rhetorical strategies employed by the Gentleman are familiar from King's Menippean predecessors. The tone in Lucian's dialogues can be acerbic, but in King's work a certain eighteenth-century charm and deference acts as a veneer to conceal King's true intent and the purpose of the Gentleman's questioning. It exists to probe both the Virtuoso and the Transactioneer and to get them to reveal the actual state of play: self-interest on Sloane's part in collecting curiosities and an editorial laxness deriving from a lack of scientific rigour.

For Lund *The Transactioneer* is important for "its preoccupation with the language of scientific reporting" (215). He also firmly believes that "Sloane had torpedoed the linguistic program of the Society and subjected both the *Philosophical Transactions* and the Royal Society to public ridicule" (216). In Lund's view it was Thomas Sprat in *The History of the Royal Society* (1667) who established the imperative for a clear, unadorned style for the virtuosi: "It was to be a superior style, defined by its clarity, its referential precision, and one characterized by the absence of that rhetorical obfuscation so common to the Schoolmen and that self-consciousness and preciosity so characteristic of the modern Wit" (216). King attacks Sloane for falling short of this standard of writing in his own prose, which King sees as undisciplined and unruly, as well as in the prose of his contributors, the content of which he sees as being both exaggerated and improbable.

There is another factor that is relevant to the inclusion of reports of extraordinary phenomena in the *Philosophical Transactions*. Fontes da Costa cites Steven Shapin's view that gentlemen had a "central role in the management of testimony in seventeenth-century England" (82). A gentleman's testimony could guarantee a report, whether it was accurate or not. In 1700 it would have been difficult to reject some reports because of "the codes of civility in operation at the Society" (88). It was only in around 1750 that "intrinsic plausibility"

came to outweigh testimony in the assessment of what had been observed (89). Also, one way of enhancing the authentic status of a report was to include a certain amount of circumstantial detail. This becomes another satirical butt in King's satire, as he associates such detail with the trivial (Fontes da Costa 95).

#### 5.4.1. *The Improbable: Case Studies*

A recurring question in *The Transactioneer* is that of the usefulness of the contents of the *Philosophical Transactions*. King writes accusingly in his Preface as follows: "All who read his *Tranactions* (sic) either in *England* or beyond the Seas, cry out that the Subjects which he writes on are generally so ridiculous and mean: and he treats of them so emptily . . ." (n.d.). There are references in *The Transactioneer* to many examples from the pages of the *Philosophical Transactions*. Reports relating to human subjects include the practice of severing the uvula in the Scottish Highlands and providing bread and cheese as a remedy (51); a series of grotesque accounts of childbirth in which pregnancies are said to go on for up to seven years and children are delivered sometimes bone by bone and sometimes by way of the navel and sometimes the anus (53-5); the effect of the laying on of hands by a Mr Greatrix which extends in one case to curing the fits of a mother by laying his glove on the heads of her daughters (76). From reports relating to fauna King notes among others instances of a whole duck being removed from the stomach of a snake at Batavia and another snake being killed in Achin with a whole deer in its belly (60); the development by grasshoppers of a martial discipline and the power of flight in July; an account of the generation of fleas (84-5). King selects these for their improbability and in the case of the fauna because of his scepticism about the usefulness of the information. Reading the titles of these accounts they do point to considerable credulity on Sloane's part as editor of the *Philosophical Transactions*. Pregnancies which last seven years most certainly contradict any normal expectation for human childbirth. The story of Mr Greatrix and his healing hands is absurd because in this instance he cures a mother by using not a hand but a glove which in turn is placed on the heads of her daughters, rather than her own head. The contents of the stomachs of the two snakes seem quite impossible and suggest that Sloane is being far too trusting of the correspondents on whom he relied for some of the contents of the *Philosophical Transactions*. All of these examples undermine his credibility as an editor.

5.4.1.1. Chinese Ear-pickers

Lund remarks that “Sloane was perhaps most notorious for his collections of natural antiquarian curiosities” (214). He was also fascinated by contemporary curiosities as can be seen from his fascination with the contents of a cabinet of items sent to the Royal Society from China. Among the items Sloane describes, Lund singles out the Chinese ear-picker for comment and uses it as a prime early example of something valued by Sloane but which for King is of debatable usefulness. The Chinese ear-picker is an implement made and used in China for cleaning the human ear which receives some attention in *The Transactioneer* (214-5). The source in the *Philosophical Transactions* is “An Account of a China Cabinet, filled with several Instruments, Fruits, &c. used in China: sent to the Royal Society by Mr. Buckley, chief Surgeon at Fort St. George. By Hans Sloane, M.D.” (*Phil. Trans.* 20 [1698]: 461-2), which is accompanied by generous illustrations of ear-pickers (and other items) as well as a drawing of a Chinese man cleaning his right ear with such a tool. Here is the relevant part of Sloane’s original text:

Fig. 14. Is a Chinese Figure, wherein is represented one of that Nation, using one of these Instruments, and expressing great Satisfaction therein. This I had of William Charleton, Esq.; who favoured the Royal Society with a Sight of it at one of their Meetings.

Here is the satirical treatment by King:

VIRTUOS.                      Fie! No, *It’s a Chinesses Eigure [sic], wherein is represented one of that Nation, using one of these Instruments (that is an Ear-picker) and expressing great satisfaction therein. See Transact. Numb. 246. (15)*

King italicizes original text from the *Philosophical Transactions* in the dialogues, making various uses of his material. In the first example given here, he incorporates what is in the original a description of an illustration into his text and drops the attribution to William Charleton. He then has his Gentleman ask, in the first place, if the human figure illustrated in the *Transactions* “among the Razors and Tooth-pickers” (15) is that of Sloane himself; and then: “A great deal of satisfaction, indeed for a Man to stand picking his Ears? But pray of what use are the *China* Ear-pickers of, in the way of Knowledge?” (15).

The following is the original text of the passage from the *Philosophical Transactions*, which King adapts as the reply:

Whatever Pleasure the Chinese may take in thus picking their Ears, I am certain most People in these parts who have their hearing impaired and have advised with me for their Help, I have found have had such

misfortunes first come to them by picking their Ears too much, and thereby bringing Humours, or ulcerous Dispositions in them. (392)

Compare King's adaptation:

VIRTUOS. Why, the Learned Author hath made this useful Comment upon it, says he, *Whatever pleasure the Chineses may take in thus picking their Ears. I am certain most People in these Parts, who have had their Hearing impaired, have had such Misfortunes first come to them, by picking their Ears too much.* (15)

As we can see, King pares back the original and simplifies it. There follows an exchange typical of the kind in *The Transactioneer*:

GENT. Why then were they brought into these Parts, if they be of such mischievous Consequence?

VIRTUOS. The chief design was to entertain the Philosophical Secretary; for hetook (sic) as much satisfaction (sic) in looking upon the Ear-Picker as the *Chinese* could do in picking his Ears. (15-16)

Here a simple disingenuous question prompts an answer consequent to the satirical intention of the work, which is to reveal the arbitrary nature of editorial selection. The original report does contain the wider lesson that inserting foreign bodies into the ear with the intention of cleaning them is ill-advised. But this gets lost in the presentation of the China Cabinet in *The Transactioneer* as something alien and outlandish which is unworthy of consideration and is only included on a personal whim of the editor. It is evident from the last example that King's satirical purpose is given expression in the Gentleman's question. This seems innocent but in fact elicits a devastating response from the Virtuoso, revealing the personal tastes of Sloane as shaping the procurement of the Ear-picker.

In a related example, King adds to his source material to make his satirical point. Sloane returns to the China Cabinet in the following edition of the *Philosophical Transactions* in "A further Account of the Contents of the China Cabinet mentioned last Transaction, p. 390. By Hans Sloane, M.D." (461-2). Here are the two passages that form the basis for King's text:

Fig. 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13. Shew Eight several Instruments made for paring the Nails, at which, in China, the people are very curious and dextrous. These Instruments are each of them shaped like a Chizzel.

Fig. 14. Represents a kind of Instrument, called in China, a Champing Instrument. Its use is to be rub'd or roul'd all over the Muscular Flesh. It is

like an Horses Curricomb, and is said to be used after the same manner, and for the same Purposes that they are made use of for Horses.

Compare:

VIRTUOS. Page 462. *Eight several Instruments made for pairing the Nails, at which in China the People are very curious and dextrous. As also an Instrument much like a Horse Curry-comb, with which they curry the Natives, as we do Horses. But besides these, our Learned Author tells us, it contained a Sea-Horse Tooth, a Pair of Brass Tweezers, a Purse made of Straw, One wide-toothed Comb, One strait-toothed Comb, an Instrument to clean the Combs, a Sheet of brown Paper from China, a Black Scarabeus, a Scarlet Butterfly, an Ash-coloured Capricorn, a Locust and a Phalaena<sup>33</sup> all to pieces, a Painter's Brush, &c.*

GENT. These things must needs be of great use, especially the Brass Tweezers and the Combs.

VIRTUOS. Of extraordinary use! And *It were to be wished*, says our Curious Annotator, that *other Travellers into Foreign Parts, would make such Enquiries, into such Instruments and Materials that are [sic] any manner of way for the Benefit or innocent Delight of Mankind.* As Tooth-pickers, Razors, Ear-pickers, &c. (17-18)

Everything after the phrase “But besides these, our Learned Author tells us, it contained” is added by King from a third article by Sloane on the contents of the Chinese cabinet (*Phil. Trans.* 21 [1699]: 70-2). King’s editing together of material from the two separate articles by Sloane emphasizes the triviality and inconsequentiality of the contents of the cabinet. The fact that the insects and the Capricorn are “all to pieces” rather undermines their usefulness. The sea-horse tooth is exotic, while the tweezers, the purse made of straw and the combs and comb-cleaner seem rather banal. To state his intention quite clearly, King has the Gentleman say that these “things must needs be of great use, especially the Brass Tweezers and the Combs” (18). And in the last speech of the passage just quoted, King presents Sloane’s exhortation to collect more foreign curiosities as a clarion call for the collection of yet more examples of the inconsequential by travellers abroad. Sloane’s curiosity as a

---

<sup>33</sup> Phalaena: “*Entomology*, now. *hist.* Originally: a moth. In later use: a member of the former group Phalaena of moths, originally including all moths other than hawkmoths and later restricted to the geometrids and some pyralids; also (**Phalaena**), the group itself” (“Phalaena, n.” *OED Online*. Oxford UP, March 2019. Web. 14 March 2019).

collector lies at the heart of the example of the Chinese Ear-pickers. It is this that King satirizes with a view to ridiculing Sloane's proclivities as a collector.

#### 5.4.1.2. Poppy Pie

A variation on the issue of the usefulness of the reports is the extent to which the detailed information included in them is trivial and unworthy of being recorded. King questions this in the report on the case of Charles Worth and the delirium he and his colleagues experience after eating a "poppy pie," pointing to a further lack of discrimination on Sloane's part as an editor. The original report is entitled "An Account of some Effects of *Papaver Corniculatum luteum*, &c." by J. Newton (*Phil. Trans.* 20 [1698]: 263-4). Here is the original text:

In my Itinerary from *London* to *Margaret Island*, and thence most by the Sea Shoar to the Lands End in *Cornwall*, to observe what Plants each Part produced, between *Pensants* and *Marketjew*, on the Sandy Shoar, there growing abundance of *Papaver Corniculatum Luteum*, or Horned Poppy, with a Yellow Flower, vulgarly called in *Hampshire* and *Dorsetshire*, *Squatmore*, or *Bruseroot*, (as I was there informed) where they use it against Bruises external and internal: Mr. *John Hancock*, an Apothecary in *Pensants*, gave me the following Account of its Effects on one *Charles Worth*, and others of his Family, dwelling at the Half-way House between *Pensants* and *Marketjew*, (*viz.*) That the said *Charles Worth*, causing a Pye to be made of the Roots of the said Poppy, supposing them to be Sea-Holly or Eringo Roots (for that by order of a Physician lately lodging at his House, they had made Pies thereof, which was very pleasant to them) but he eating of the aforesaid Poppy Pye (whilst hot) was presently taken with such a kind of *Delirium* as made him fancy that most what he saw was Gold, and calling for a Chamber Pot, being a white Earthen one after having purged by Stool into it, he broke it into pieces, and bid the By-standers to save them, for they all were Gold, as was also (as he said) all the Pewter in the House (he then pointing to it). The Man and Maid Servants, having also eat of the same Pye, stript themselves quite naked, and so danced one against the other a long time. The Mistress, who was gone to Market, coming Home, and saying, How now, what is here a do? The Maid turn'd her Brich against her, and purging stoutly, said, There, Mistress, is Gold for you. A Child in the Cradle having also tasted of the Pye, was much dosed, and turned its Mouth to and again, and thus they continued for some Days, and then became well. All which was confirmed to me by the Man and Wife of the said House, where we then went to refresh our selves (they then keeping a Publick House).

Here it may be queried, whether the Yellow Colour the Flowers running in their Minds (which the eating of the Roots had now depraved) might not beget that Idea in them, to fancy most things to be Gold, they also being Yellow.

And here is what King makes of it in *The Transactioneer*:

TRANSACT. And First, As for the Virtues of Medicines, it hath not only been discovered by Dr. *Mullen* that *Irish Mackenboy Root* may be carryed in the Pocket three days without purging, but what hath been observed of the strange Effects of *Papaver Corniculatum* is very remarkable, for N. 242. we have the following account. *In my Itinerary from London to Margaret Island.* (mark the Elegancy of the Word *Itinerary*) and thence most by the Seashore to the Lands-End, to observe what Plants each Part produced. Between *Pentsants* and *Macketjew*, lived one *Charles Worth* an Apothecary, who causing a *Pye* to be made of the said *Poppy* --- -- and eating of the said *Poppy Pye*, whilst hot, was presently taken with such a kind of a *Dilirium*, as made him fancy that most that he saw was *Gold*, and calling for a Chamber-pot, being a *White Earthen* one, after having purged by stool into it; he broke it into peices, and bid the by-standers to save them, for they were all *Gold*.

GENT. Methinks your Correspondent is very Circumstantial in Relating the Circumstances and Symptoms of the *Dilirium*.

TRANSACT. O dear Sir! There was an absolute necessity to be exact in Particulars, for had he only told us, that the Herb Purged and caused a *Dilirium*, how must we have known that he made use of an Earthen-Chamber-Pot, that he purged into it, and then broke it.

GENT. Truly as you say we should have been altogether at a loss there: And to speak Truth; the most diverting Circumstances would have been wanting.

TRANSACT. Yes, The Pleasant Circumstances set off the Story, for People purge into Chamber-Pots and are *Dilirious*, that never took *Papaver Corniculatum*

GENT. But pray, What does this contribute to the Advancement of Natural Knowledge?

TRANSACT. If it increases Knowledge, it certainly advances it: And pray, Does not a Man know more that knows the Chamber-Pot was broke, than he that hears of a *Dilirium*, and Purging? But these were not all the Effects of *Papaver Corniculatum*. For, *The Man and Maid Servants*, having also eat of the same *Pye*,



*strip'd themselves quite naked, so danced one against another a long time.*

*GENT.* Truly they had more satisfaction in their *Dilirium*, than the Master could have in breaking a dirty Chamber-Pot, one would think. But did not the Master and the Maid *dance one against another*?

*TRANSACT.* If they had, it would have been *Papaver Corniculatum* indeed [sic], but I cannot tell that; only *The Mistriss, who was gone to Market, coming home, and saying how now? What is here to do? The Maid turned her brich against her, and purging stoutly, said, there Mistriss, is Gold for you.*

*GENT.* This *Papaver Corniculatum* is a very strange kind of an Herb. (39-41)

At the centre of this passage is the belief on King's part that Sloane is selecting reports for publication which contain too much circumstantial information that is of no wider use for the reader. In fact, if one looks at the episode as the description of a drug-induced hallucination, the details to which King's Gentleman objects are quite interesting. Under the influence of the poppy pie, the protagonists not only believe that the waste products of their own bodies are gold, but also that the broken pieces of a white earthenware chamber pot are also made of gold. From King's point of view this information about the chamber pot is sordid and contributes nothing. The two contrasting opinions are encapsulated in an exchange between the Gentleman and the Transactioneer in the above passage, in which the Gentleman asks what the matter in hand contributes to the furthering of "Natural Knowledge". The Transactioneer contends that if it increases knowledge, it certainly advances it. In this respect the Transactioneer prefers an increase in the volume of knowledge to a more selective approach, valuing quantity in knowledge, whereas the Gentleman constantly reproaches him for the quality of the knowledge displayed in the pages of the *Philosophical Transactions*.

#### 5.4.1.3. A Shower of Whiting

A further example of the eccentric material Sloane includes from his correspondents is the account of the shower of whiting which supposedly fell in Kent in 1666. It is entitled "A Letter from Dr. Rob. Conny, to the late Dr. Rob. Plot, F.R.S. concerning a Shower of Fishes" (*Phil. Trans.* 20 [1698]: 289-90). Here is the original text:

Since my last to you I have received an Account of the prodigious Rain you long ago desired of me, and this Opportunity offering of conveying it safely to you I wou'd no longer delay it, and had I received the Account as

you promised me of that of the Herrings, I might possibly have said somewhat more, but I shall now leave that to you. The Account I had from a Worthy Gentleman of this County, who had a Box full of these Fishes which he preserved, but that being mislaid, he could not perform his Promise of giving me some of them, which he says he will certainly do, whenever he finds it. The Account is thus:

On *Wednesday* before *Easter*, Anno 1666, a Pasture Field at *Cranstead*, near *Wrotham* in *Kent*, about Two Acres, which is far from any part of the Sea or Branch of it, and a Place where are no Fish Ponds, but a Scarcity of Water, was all overspread with little Fishes, conceived to be rained down, there having been at that time a great Tempest of Thunder and Rain; the Fishes were about the Length of a Man's little Finger, and judged by all that saw them to be young Whitings, many of them were taken up and shewed to several Persons; the Field belonged to one *Ware* a Yeoman, who was at that *Easter-Sessions* one of the Grand Inquest, and carried some of them to the Sessions at *Maidstone* in *Kent*, and he showed them, among others, to Mr. *Lake*, a Bencher of the *Middle-Temple*, who had One of them and brought it to *London*, the Truth of it was averr'd by many that saw the Fishes lye scattered all over that Field, and none in other the Fields thereto adjoining: The Quantity of them was estimated to be about a Bushel, being all together. Mr. *Lake* gave the Charge at those Sessions. (289-90)

And here is how King incorporates it into *The Transactioneer*:

TRANSACT. I shall not Dispute that. But in the next place proceed to give you an Account of a Shower of Fish, Numb. 243. we have the following Words, *Since my last to you, I have received an Account of the Prodigious Rain you long ago desired of me, and this Opportunity offering of conveighing it safely to you, I would no longer delay it, and had I received the Account as you promised me of the Herrings, I might possibly have said something more, but I shall now leave that to you.*

GENT. The great Concern You and your Correspondent seem to have been in; make me long for the Story of the Fishes.

TRANSACT. I shall come to that presently. *The Account I had from a worthy Gentleman of this Country, who had a Box full of these Fishes, which he preserved; but that being mislaid, he could not perform his promise of giving some of them, tho' he says, he will certainly do it when he finds it.*

GENT. And pray Sir, cannot you give an Account of the Fishes till then?

- TRANSACT. Yes, yes, I told you I should come to it presently. *On Wednesday before Easter, a Pasture-Field at Branstead near Wrotham in Kent about Two Acres, which is far from the Sea, or any Branch of it, and a Place where there are no Fish-Ponds, but a scarcity of Water, was all overspread with little Fishes, conceived to be Rained down, there having been at that time a great Tempest of Thunder and Rain: The Fishes were about the length of a Man's little Finger, and judged by all that saw them to be young Whitings. The Field belonged to one Hare a Yeoman. But why they should fall into this Yeoman's Ground only no body knows.*
- GENT. But pray how came they to be Rained?
- TRANSACT. That's unknown too, only it may probably be guess'd, that the Bird Cunter having robbed a Fish-Market, could carry the Prey no further: But however it was. I think this yeoman would do well to make a Fish-Pond against the next Shower.
- GENT. Truly this Story of the Fish is a very Strange one: It's almost Incredible. (64-5)

King brings into question here the veracity of the original report simply by relating its content directly, and by means of the gentleman's response, which is satirical in character. The shower of fish does appear outlandish and the fact that Sloane's correspondent has mislaid the box full of the fish in question does arouse suspicion. This appears to be an example where the codes of civility in operation allow something quite improbable to get into print.

[Passage omitted]

#### 5.4.1.4. Sable Mice

The aversion to certain types of fauna registered by Butler and Shadwell in their works discussed previously is also in evidence in *The Transactioneer*. It is another form of indirect satire on the virtuosi, reproaching them for being concerned with such animals. King singles out for comment "*A Relation of the small Creatures called Sable-Mice, which have lately come in Troops into Lapland, about Thorne, and other Places adjacent to the Mountains, in Innumerable Multitudes*". The report originated with Sir Paul Rycout F.R.S. and was sent to a Mr. Ellis who conveyed it to the Royal Society (*Phil. Trans.* 21 [1699]: 110-2). The original report has: "they are so fierce and angry, that if a Stick be held out at them, they

will bite it, and hold it so fast, that they may be swung about in the Air . . ." (111). King abbreviates this slightly, as he does a later passage about the way they defend themselves:

. . . when they are met in Woods or Fields and stopt, they set themselves upon their hinder Feet like a Dog, and make a kind of barking or squeeking noise . . . and if at last they be forced out of it, they creep into holes, and set up a cry sounding like *biabb, biabb*. (111)

The Gentleman's ironic reaction to the account of the sable mice is as follows: "It enriches a Man's Understanding much, to know the Fury and Conduct of a Mouse, and what Noise it makes when it is frightened" (82). The level of irony here, signalled by the phrase "the Fury and Conduct of a Mouse" is relatively high.

Elsewhere the Transactioneer mentions an account of the generation of fleas (84-5). The Gentleman mentions this in his angry dismissal of the preoccupations of the Transactioneer with which the dialogue closes: "Nor is what you have acquainted me with, of the Generation of Fleas; any more than what a Lowzy Beggar could have told many Years ago." (87) The tone is positively angry here, so the object of inquiry is not only ironized but also dismissed as not even being worthy of consideration.

As mentioned above, the Gentleman is based on the character of Menippus in Lucian's *Dialogues of the Dead* but has a substantial veneer of late seventeenth-century gentility. In this role he is a conscious ironist. He uses his irony to probe the pretensions of his interlocutor and reveal them for what they are. The Virtuoso's words by contrast are also ironic but display observable irony. This irony therefore comes from the author.

#### 5.4.2. *The Excellency of Sloane's Style*

In the Preface to *The Transactioneer* King is quite clear about language:

'Tis plain a Man that is himself once possess'd of any Subject, can express it to another, if he has but Language. If his Head be clear, and the Things rightly digested in it, there can be no Difficulty in the conveying them thence. But where a Man has no real Parts; and is Master of only Scraps pick'd up from one and from another, or Collected out of this Book or that, and these all in confusion in his Head, 'tis obvious what a Writer he must needs make. (n.d.)

King also denounces Sloane directly in the Preface for writing "in a Syle [sic] so confused and unintelligible, that it is plain he's so far from any usefull Knowledge, that he wants even common Grammar". An outstanding example of a lack of clarity and poor English on Sloane's part is given early in the first dialogue:

VIRTUOS. O Sir, he's a great Man; for besides his wonderful Skill in Physick and Phylosophy, he has a strange

Tallent at Stile, his Knack at that is admirable; to convince you of this, I shall refer you to the *Philosophical Transactions*, Numb. 252. p. 188. where you will find, the following *Representation of a Limestone Marble found in Wales, when polished*; so his Intelligencer Phrases it.

GENT. Admirable indeed!

VIRTUOS. Why! There lies the Rarity of the Thing, for an ordinary Reader would think it was polished before it was found. But Sir, the Transactioneer himself far outstrips him in his Note upon this remarkable peice [sic]; take it in his own Words. *This Stone is a sort of Coral, and the Lapidis Astroitidis sive stellaris primum Genus. Boet de Boadt, or Astroites Worm, Mus. It grows in the Seas adjoining to Jamaica; It is frequently found fossile in England. I have some of it found here that will polish as well as Agat, which was many Years since found out by Mr. Beaumont. There are many other things growing in the Seas adjoyning to Jamaica, and not to be found in these Parts, which are frequently dug up in the Inland Parts of England, and elsewhere, where they do not naturally grow.*

GENT. Pray Sir let me desire you to give me the meaning of what you have related in plain English, for the Sublimity of this way of Expression is above my mean Capacity.

VIRTUOS. The Dignity of the Subject will by no means admit of it; besides it will be an injustice and lessening of the Authors performance. (4-5)

Sloane's original is a terrible jumble and King proceeds to draw out the contradictions in meaning in the following speech by the Gentleman:

GENT. Verry like! But pray Sir how are we to interpret him, when he says, the *Limestone Marble* that was *found in Wales* and was a *Coral*, and the *Lapidis*, and the Lord knows what, *grew in the Seas adjoyning to Jamaica*? Besides what he has about its being *found* and *found* again has almost confounded me I must confess. His Intelligencer says, 'twas *found in Wales*. He, that it grows in the Seas of Jamaica: That *it is frequently found Fossile* (mark the Phrase) in *England*: That he *has some of it found here, which was many years since found out by Mr. Beaumont*: That *there are many things found in the Seas of Jamaica, not to be found in these Parts, (i. e. in*

*England) which are frequently to be dug up in the Inland Parts of England, where yet after all they do not grow. This in my sense is to say it was found in Wales but grew in Jamaica: 'Twas frequently found in England, and by way of reinforcement 'twas found here, and many years since found. And that there are many things growing in those Seas, not found in these Parts of England, which are more frequently dug up (or found) in the Inland parts of England, where yet they do not grow, or are not found. This to a man of Ordinary Understanding is pretty odd! What wou'd the drift of this be did the Author put it into English. (6-7)*

Although this satirical procedure is somewhat laborious for the reader, King hits his mark. What Sloane says has been found in both England and Jamaica has in fact not been found in England. Apparently innocent on the surface, the Gentleman reveals Sloane's laxity. King became an advocate at Doctors' Commons at the age of 29 in 1692 – a sort of barrister – and there is something of the rhetoric of law here, in the way that the Gentleman of King's dialogue unravels Sloane's careless use of language. This example confirms that the Gentleman pretends to be innocent and well-meaning, but actually he is not.

While the marginal comment for the above passage is "The Excellency of his Stile," the one for the following, less complex example is "Grammar remarkable". Here is the full text of the original anonymous report, which is entitled "Clark, the Posture-Master" (*Phil. Trans.* 20 [1698]: 262):

In the *Pall Mall* at London, lived one Clark, (call'd, *The Posture-Master*) that had such an absolute Command of all his Muscles and Joints, that he can dis-joint almost his whole Body; so that he impos'd on our famous *Mullens*, who lookt on him in so miserable a Condition, that he would not undertake his Cure: Tho' he was a well grown Fellow, yet he would appear in all the Deformities that can be imagin'd, as Hunch Back'd, Pot Belly'd, Sharp Breasted; he dis-jointed his Arms, Shoulders, Legs and Thighs, that he will appear'd as great an Object of Pity as any; and he has often impos'd on the same Company, where he has been just before, to give him Money as a Cripple; he looking so much unlike himself, that they could not know him. I have seen him make his Hips stand out a considerable way from his Loins, and so high that they seem'd to invade the Place of his Back, in which Posture he has so large a Belly, as tho' one of our Company had one of a considerable Size, yet it seem'd lank compared with his: He turns his Face into all Shapes, so that by himself he acts all the uncouth, demure, odd Faces of a Quaker's Meeting: I could not have conceiv'd it possible to have done what he did, unless I had seen it; and I am sensible how short I am come to a full Description of him: None certainly can describe what he does, but himself. He began Young to bring his Body to it, and there are several Instances of Persons that can

move several of their Bones out of their Joints, using themselves to it from Children. (262)

King gives this report the marginal comment “Grammar remarkable” (21). He halves it in extension and remarks in brackets the errors in the sequence of tenses committed by Sloane, bringing the passage to a hilarious end by making “all the uncouth Faces” of the original those of a Transactioneer contemplating a Chinese Ear-picker:

VIRTUOSO. *In Pall-Mall at London lived one Clark, who was called the Posture Master; that had such an absolute Command of his Muscles and Joynts, that he can (i.e. could) dis-joynt almost all his whole Body. He was a well grown Fellow, yet he would appear in all the Deformities that can be imagined, as Hunch-backed, Pot-bellied Sharp-breasted; he dis-joynted his Arms, Shoulders, Legs and Thighs, that he will (instead of would) appear as great an Object of Pity as any Man, and he has often Impos'd on the same Company where hath been just before to give him Money, as a Cripple. He turns his Face into all shapes, so that by himself he Acts all the uncouth Faces, of a Transactioneer pausing over a China Earpicker. (21)*

The way in which King introduces the China Ear-picker here is reminiscent of how he uses the Condor in the account of the shower of whiting in section 5.4.1.3. King brings into satirical play another item of curiosity to the virtuosi. And the fact that the Posture Master makes “all the uncouth Faces, of a Transactioneer pausing over a China Earpicker” (21) adds explicit satire to the original account of the Ear-picker as a worthless object.

##### 5.5. *USEFUL TRANSACTIONS IN PHILOSOPHY, AND OTHER SORTS OF LEARNING: IN THREE PARTS*

In the two dialogues that form *The Transactioneer* King had attacked Hans Sloane both as a contributor to and as the editor of the *Philosophical Transactions*. The technique of modified quotation from the original with the aim of bringing into question the felicity of its style and the reliability of his contributors combine with the structure of the dialogue and the ironic comments and questions of the Gentleman to make the work efficient in the execution of its satirical intent, if somewhat compromised as a reading experience. *The Transactioneer* was published in 1700. King returned to advocacy in London on behalf of his friend the Third Earl of Angelsey (1670-1702) in 1701 and it seems probable that he was in Ireland from the beginning of 1702 to the end of 1708. Shortly after his return to London in late 1708, King published his *Useful Transactions in Philosophy, and Other Sorts of Learning*.

There were three numbers of this project, the first for January and February 1708-9, the second for March and April 1709 and the third for May to September 1709. Kerby-Miller notes that “King’s use of material in his first two issues was extravagant. It is obvious that he could have maintained this pace only by extraordinary exertions on his part or the support of a group of friends. King was too easy-going to keep up the effort and the £5 he was paid for each issue by the publisher was not enough to share with anyone else” (73). I shall refer to the text published in *The Original Works of William King, LL.D.* (2.57-178).

In the important preface to the first number, King reflects in the voice of an editor on the wide range of preoccupations among philosophers. He writes: “It may not improperly be said at present, that there is nothing in any art or science, how mean soever it may seem at first, but that a true Virtuoso, by handling it philosophically, may make of it a learned and large Dissertation” (59). After introducing the contents of the first volume, he remarks ironically: “The whole is designed to promote Learning as much as any thing of the same nature and method that for these many years last past has appeared in public” (61). Evidently there has been a widening of the remit of the virtuoso, and this is reflected in the satirical targets found in the work.

King’s *Useful Transactions* are fascinating for the different forms that the satirical intent assumes throughout the short life of the project. Most are titled and attributed in the manner customary to the *Philosophical Transactions*, but the extent to which some quote directly from original articles in that journal is more limited than in *The Transactioneer*. In the first number, two of the six articles do this. The first is “An Essay on the Invention of Samplers,” which satirizes “An Essay on the Invention of Printing, by Mr. John Bagford; with an Account of his Collections for the same, by Mr. Humfrey Wanley, F.R.S. Communicated in two Letters to Dr. Hans Sloane, R.S. Secr.,” (*Phil. Trans.* 25 [1706-7]: 2397-410). The second article is “Some Natural Observations made in the School of Llandwwfwrhwy,” which satirizes “Some Natural Observations made in the Parishes of Kinardsey and Donington in Shropshire, by the Reverend Mr. George Plaxton. Communicated by Mr. Ralph Thoresby, to Dr. Hans Sloane, R.S. Secr.” (*Phil. Trans.* 25 [1706-7]: 2418-23).

In the second number, four out of the five articles quote directly. In each case King sets up a narrative framework within which to cite and smite the original text, suggesting each time that its concerns are frivolous and absurd. In the third number, King is solely concerned with sending up Sir Hans Sloane’s *A Voyage to the Islands Madera, Barbados, Nieves, S. Christophers and Jamaica* (1707) in the thinly disguised “A Voyage to the Island of Cajamai in America”. The technique here is again one of direct quotation.



The other three articles in the first two numbers which do not conform to King's usual style are two book reviews under the rubric of "An Account of Books in Letters to Dr. Littlebrand, by Dr. Playford". These are "An Account of Meursius's Treatise of the Grecian Dances" and "An Account of Meursius's Book of the Plays of the Grecian Boys. In a second letter." These pieces are of particular interest, since they appear to be reproduced in Chapter Five of the *Memoirs of Scriblerus*. The *Philosophical Transactions* do contain book reviews, and it is this kind of scholarly review that King has in mind here. The other piece is entitled "A New Method to Teach Learned Men How to Write Unintelligibly. Communicated by Mr. Loveit to Mr. Lackit." One quotation will suffice to show the direction of King's humour here: "But that language which may be of most use to you is the Scrawlian" (89).

#### 5.5.1. *The Tongue*

I now propose to examine two of the articles in the second number which quote extensively from their satirical targets. Let us begin with one of King's attacks on the work of the Dutchman Antoni van Leeuwenhoek (1632-1723). Van Leeuwenhoek was an important Dutch scientist who contributed decisively to the development of the microscope. His observations appeared in the *Philosophical Transactions* between 1673 and 1724. There is also an interesting account of his bequest to the Royal Society of 26 microscopes and "a Number of Minute Subjects" (447-9) by Martin Folkes, vice-president of the Royal Society (*Phil. Trans.* 32 [1722-3]: 446-53). Van Leeuwenhoek's lenses revealed ever more about human beings and fauna and it was he who discovered the microorganism and went on to describe many of its varieties. Johannes Heniger states that one result of van Leeuwenhoek's advances in magnification was the necessity for a new scale for measuring ever smaller entities, which van Leeuwenhoek developed using among other things "a hair from his beard" (*Dictionary of Scientific Biography* 8.127). By refining the microscope van Leeuwenhoek was opening up ever greater fields of vision and in the same way that Robert Hooke's *Micrographia* had come under attack by Butler and Shadwell, so the Dutchman's letters in the *Philosophical Transactions* became a target for William King.

There are two satires of van Leeuwenhoek's work in the second number of the *Useful Transactions*, one on his observations on the tongue and the other on membranes of the intestines. The first is lengthier, but also more unstable as a satirical text, displaying within its confines a number of responses to the satirical target. "The Tongue" draws on two of van

Leeuwenhoek's letters to the *Philosophical Transactions*.<sup>34</sup> The first letter is a straightforward account of the removal of whitish matter "which seem'd to be very strongly united to the Particles of the Tongue" (210) and the observation of it and of the phlegm which results during the course of van Leeuwenhoek's fever:

The Tongue. New Additions to Mr. Anthony Van Leeuwenhoek's [sic] Microscopical Observations upon the Tongue, and the White Matter on the Tongues of Feverish Persons. In which are shewn, the several Particles proper for PRATTLING, TATTLING, PLEADING, HARANGUING, LYING, FLATTERING, SCOLDING, and other such like Occasions. Communicated by Mr. Testy. (103-114)

King's starting point is to have his narrator Mr Testy mention that he has been reading the first of the two letters and found it curious, as a result of which he has decided to embark on his own observations. In the original letter van Leeuwenhoek is his own subject, scraping the white matter from his own tongue with a penknife or silver tongue-scraper and observing the results in "clean China coffee-dishes" (210). The earnest quality of the original is sent up by King who has Mr Testy enlist the services of a local wine-porter whom he asks to visit him the morning after drinking "a pint or two of brandy extraordinary" (103). By using characters from the lower reaches of society and coarse behaviour, King satirizes the gentility of the natural philosophers, as well as the content of this particular experiment by van Leeuwenhoek. For example, the wine-porter is asked to present himself the morning after drinking heavily "without hawking or spitting" (103). This instruction is made to preserve the sedimentation and mixes a more vulgar type of language than would be used at the Royal Society. The narrator removes the sedimentation from the wine-porter's tongue with "a large case-knife," parodying Van Leeuwenhoek's penknife or silver tongue-scraper (103). A fish-wife is also included in the account apropos of the hardening of the tongue, as she "has great necessity for the preservation of so important a member, especially at Billingsgate" (104). King then mixes together quotations from the original letter and adds details which mock van Leeuwenhoek's procedures. A "large case-knife" is used by Mr Testy's butler to gather the matter from the porter's lips and it is placed into "two new white earthen chamber-pots" (103).

---

<sup>34</sup> "A Letter from Mr. Anthony van Leeuwenhoek, F.R.S. containing his Observations upon the White Matter on the Tongues of Feverish Persons, &c." (*Phil. Trans.* 26 (1708-9): 210-4) and "Microscopical Observations upon the Tongue; in a Letter to the Royal Society from Mr. Anthony van Leeuwenhoek, F.R.S. XXVI, No 315, 111-23 with illustrations" (*Phil. Trans.* 26 (1708-9): 82-6).

King then enlists the help of van Leeuwenhoek as a character in the satire under the name "Monsieur Leeuwenhoek". King picks up on van Leeuwenhoek's description of "an unspeakable number of long particles agreeing in length with the hair of a man's beard, that had not been shaved in eight or ten days" (212). Mr Testy asks Monsieur Leeuwenhoek if this is what he had observed, and Leeuwenhoek's reply is "How can I tell that, Sir? Do not some mens [sic] beards grow faster than other some?" (104)

In his observations Leeuwenhoek uses the word "animalcula" to describe microorganisms. Here is an instance from the first letter:

. . . and it happen'd as I wished, and I discovered an unconceivable Number of exceeding small Animalcula, and those of different sorts; but the greatest Number of them were of one and the same Size, but they were so little, that without a careful Observation, and a very good Microscope, they would have escap'd my Sight. Most of these Animalcula rendezvous'd in that part of the Water where the said Matter of my Tongue lay . . . (214)

King responds to this word by making a joke on the idea of small animals:

. . . for I inquired of my man if he did not think he saw that the particles of the white matter were like Eggs; he told me, 'Yes, and that he saw innumerable Serpents, Kites, Ravens, Ostriches, Crocodiles, and such like sort of creatures, coming out of them.' From whence I raised this philosophical reason, why drunken men are so quarrelsome; for, as I said before, the hot liquor throwing up an 'evaporation or coagulation from the intrails . . . (213)

the latter being a quotation from Leeuwenhoek's letter: "which being so, we ought not to doubt, but that the said Matter is protruded out of the Tongue, and no evaporation or Coagulation from the Intrails" (213).

There are four further stages to the satire. In the first Mr Testy suggests that Leeuwenhoek could do a great service to the world in researching "these Animalcula rendezvouzing [sic] upon the Tongues of all sorts of persons in their several circumstances," as they would account for "the true reason of the formation of all languages" (105), and that they would resemble the indigenous fauna of each country. King turns to the second letter from van Leeuwenhoek and presents the idea that a close examination of the composition of the tongue will facilitate "an account of the several phenomena of the voice and speech that is produced by it" (105-6). Then he introduces the character of "The Ingenious Mr. Trencher," who joins Mr. Testy to eat. This is the pretext on which to quote extensively from Leeuwenhoek's account of the composition of animal tongues (cow, ox, hog, sheep). The last part of "The Tongue" is an ingenious piece of writing in which King makes reference to a

reproduction of the illustrations which accompanied edition Number 315 of the *Philosophical Transactions* in which the second letter was published. One example is: "The Figure E, sets forth the shape of an eternal Pratler or Tatler, who has a multitude of these particles, whose sharpness is rendered obtuse or blunt by the perpetual use that is made of them" (113). Another example is: "The Figure represented by the Letter F, shews the true nature of Pleading and Haranguing; the streams of Eloquence flowing from the root in several rivulets, No. 1; but terminating still in a poignancy, or pungency, which is not ungrateful, but rather tickles than offends the ears of the audience, after a various manner; . . .; and No 3, which is extreme Satire" (113).

King also introduces foodstuffs into his account. When discussing the sharpness of the particles on a hog's tongue, once it has been cooked the particles lose that quality. There is a satirical quality to the language of which King makes use: "I complained to him, that the particles were not sharp. He answered, it was true and that the subsiding of their points was occasioned in their torrefaction by desuction of the globular particles of the Butter with which it had been basted, which made it more luscious to the Palate" (110). From this quotation it is evident that once again as with the introduction of the wine-porter and fish-wife from a lower social strata, by introducing a parody of the vocabulary of cooking King is satirizing the discourse of the natural philosopher.

"The Tongue" is a curious piece of satire. King's satirical technique revolves around the targeted text, ever changing and never entirely distancing itself from it. There is no consistent satirical framework, other than the overall narration of Mr. Testy. There is a touch of comic genius in King's descriptions of the emanations from the tongue portrayed in the illustrations (Figure X). He arrives at this after long quotations from the two original letters and it is perhaps a shame that King quoted so much and put less faith in his own powers as a satirical writer. And it seems a fair assessment in the context of the evolution of satirical writing about the virtuosi, that King's writing here is at a transitionary stage, beginning to find its own satirical voice while not yet working itself free of its target.

#### 5.5.2. *The Eunuch's Child*

King creates a much more consistent satirical framework in "The Eunuch's Child," the first article in the second number of the *Useful Transactions*. The subject of the piece is made explicit in the lengthy subtitle: "Some important Queries, whether a Woman, according to Justice and any Principles of Philosophy, may lay a Child to an Eunuch: as the Matter was argued between the Churchwardens of Santo Chrysostomo in Venice, and the Learned

Academy of the Curiosi there: occasioned by an Accident of that Nature happening to Signior Valentio Crimpaldi, Knight of the Order of the Caponi.” The target of King’s satire here is the work of Francis Hauksbee (c. 1660-1713). Hauksbee was a pioneer in the research of electricity, who performed experiments before the Royal Society between 1703 and 1713. Henry Guerlac observes that after 1704 Hauksbee fulfilled the same role as Robert Hooke at the Royal Society, that of “demonstrator or curator of experiments” (*Dictionary of Scientific Biography* 6.169). In “The Eunuch’s Child” King quotes extensively from three of Hauksbee’s contributions to the *Philosophical Transactions*. These are “An Account of the Repetition of an Experiment touching Motion given Bodies included in a Glass, by the Approach of a Finger near its outside: With other Experiments on the Effluvia of Glass. By Mr. Fr. Hauksbee, F.R.S.” (*Phil. Trans.*, 26 [1708-9]: 82-6); “Experiments of the Luminous Qualities of Amber, Diamonds, and Gum Lac, by Dr. Wall, in a Letter to Dr. Sloane, R.S. Secr.” (*Phil. Trans.* 26 [1708-9]: 69-76); “An Account of the Success of an Attempt to continue several Atmospheres of Air condensed in the space of one, for a considerable time. By Mr. Fr. Hauksbee, F.R.S.” (*Phil. Trans.* 26 [1708-9]: 217-8). So, King is satirizing different types of experiments here. The first concerns effluvia which Hauksbee’s experiments show can pass through glass, while the second are concerned with electroluminescence. Both, by analogy, are designed to support the argument that a eunuch can father a child, something which is a biological impossibility. The Churchwardens appear to have won the argument in favour of the eunuch Valentio’s paternity, but a Gentlewoman appears and recounts how her own daughter Molly goes to bed “with Signior Gioseppe, one that, it seems, came over to sing in the Opera” (101). Molly runs out of the bedroom in tears, and her mother’s summary of the encounter is as follows: “I know my daughter, poor babe, has too much of my blood in her, to have run crying out of bed, if any *Eunuch* in Christendom had been able to get her with child” (102). Both mother and daughter are ready to swear that “Signior Valentio, being an *Eunuch*, could not get that child” (102), and this down-to-earth testimony is enough to overturn the arguments based on Hauksbee’s texts concerned with effluvia, amber (and air). Once again, the precepts of natural philosophy are defeated by common sense. I shall concentrate on the first two of Hauksbee’s experiments to illustrate King’s procedure.

What matches the subject of the first experiment to the satirical framework is the notion of effluvia, the word used by Hauksbee and his predecessors to describe electricity. In his experiments Hauksbee was able to show that this substance passed through glass, and it is this quality that King is burlesquing in “The Eunuch’s Child”. Members of the Academy of the Curiosi are summoned to help with the argumentation at the hearing. One, Signior Aerio,

sets out to prove that Valentio is the father of the child, including in his speech the statement “I ground my opinion upon the experience I have of all sorts of *effluvia’s*, and what their power is in the production of nature” (96). By nature here the speaker means “human reproduction”. The text of Hauksbee’s transaction then becomes evidence for the case for the prosecution in trying to prove that the eunuch Signior Valentio Crimpaldi is the father of the child. In the original text Hauksbee writes: “But how to Account for such Uncommon Phaenomena seems very difficult. Yet give me leave to make some Observations on former Experiments of the like kind, which with Remarks on some others lately made, may in some measure solve that difficulty” (83). King includes this in a slightly modified form in Signior Aerio’s speech after the above sentence (96).

In a second speech to the assembly Signior Clappario draws on the second of Hauksbee’s articles listed above to continue the satire thus: “I would not think the *effluvias* proceeding from your person should be of less value or reputation, than those proceeding from the artificial *phosphorus*, or polished amber. If their *effluvias* can cause *light*, why may not your *more noble ones* do the same. Give me leave to inform this noble audience and the world what I know concerning the *artificial phosphorus*.” (98) He goes on to quote at length text which demonstrates the luminous qualities of artificial phosphorus and amber. By analogy he concludes “You cannot imagine I should think the *effluvias* of Signior Valentio and this lady less productive of what is glorious . . .” (100).

### 5.5.3. *Millers Are Not Thieves*

The other articles in the first two numbers represent a more self-sufficient form of satire. The move from direct quotation within a satirical framework to a more synthetic form of satire represents a further evolution in King’s satirical technique. A good example of this is “An Essay, proving, by Arguments Philosophical, that MILLERS, though falsely so reputed, yet in reality are not THIEVES; with an intervening Argument that TAYLORS likewise are not so. In a Letter to Dr. HARBOROUGH, from Dr. WILLIAMS” (72-7). This is an amusing and ironical refutation of the popular notion that millers are thieves by recourse to the tools of natural philosophy. Taking as its starting point the proverbial condemnation of millers as thieves “Dr. Williams” argues as follows:

Before any one pretends to judge of the honesty and veracity of a *miller*, it were proper that he should study Experimental Philosophy and the Cartesian hypothesis of atoms, together with the nature of vibration, rarefaction, and motion, and to have so far a knowledge in opticks as to make use of a magnifying glass, and to read carefully all Mr Leewenhoek’s

[sic] observations. All this *millers* should likewise do, for their own justification, when they have leisure time from their honest calling. (75)

This is of course another variation on the theme that the newly arrived pretensions of natural philosophy will always flounder in the face of the accumulated shared experience of mankind. King amusingly applies the arguments of natural philosophy to the question of the miller's honesty. He argues that "it is the wantonness and perverseness of the flour, more than the fraud of the *miller*" which accounts for any deficiency in the weight in the flour (75). "I have always observed, how these impetuous atoms seize upon the cloaths, hands, face, and hair, of the *miller*, so as indeed to render him a ghastly spectacle; and I have been so far from thinking that the *miller* took the corn, that I have been more afraid lest the corn should steal the *miller*" (75). This rhetorical edifice is, of course, designed to fall in upon itself and leave the use of the arguments in favour of the perversity of the corn looking absurd.

#### 5.5.4. Looking Ahead to the Scriblerians

While the suspicion must remain that *The Transactioneer* is only of real interest to the literary historian rather than the general reader, nevertheless it remains an important text since it takes issue with natural philosophy on its own terms and finds it wanting. King had a fine mind and as a lawyer was trained to be adversarial. His satirical technique is distinct from those discernible in earlier writers, and he also shows signs of entering into the spirit of natural philosophy in order to make it look ridiculous, an approach we will find in later writers on the subject. We will encounter the Scriblerus Club in the next chapter. As we will see there, the traditional view is that in 1713-14 a number of wits came together under the name of the Scriblerus Club with the express intention of satirizing progressive knowledge. Most prominent at the time were Jonathan Swift and Dr John Arbuthnot and they were joined by Alexander Pope, Thomas Parnell and John Gay. Their intention was to write the *Memoirs* of Scriblerus and to anticipate its publication with pamphlets written in the name of Martinus Scriblerus, such as *Annus Mirabilis*. King's *Useful Transactions* point forward to the Scriblerians in two important ways. The first is from a formal point of view. The work clearly anticipates Lund's notion that formal parody is characteristic of works of Scriblerian satire (*The Eel of Science* 35): one of the fascinating things about the *Useful Transactions* as a whole is that they are a formal parody of the *Philosophical Transactions*. The former were published as individual numbers – or tracts – in the manner of the latter, complete with parodic titles and authors. It is noticeable that King creates a fictional framework to provide a berth for his parodies (as he does in *The Eunuch's Child*), and also

writes mock dissertations which are an indirect type of satirical reception for the virtuosi who wrote the original pamphlets. However, the two remain separate in King. The Scriblerians take things further by creating a framework for their mock hero Martinus Scriblerus and making him the author of a mock-treatise on poetry, the *Peri Bathous*.

The second way in which King's work anticipates that of the Scriblerians is in his writing. The two individual pieces in the *Useful Transactions* of most interest from a Scriblerian perspective are the two letters attributed to a Dr Playford and addressed to a Dr Littlebrand (77-85). These are entitled respectively "An Account of Books: in Letters to Dr. Littlebrand. By Dr. Playford" and "An Account of Meursius's Treatise of the Grecian Dances". Kerby-Miller comments extensively on these two items in his note on Chapter Five of the *Memoirs of Martinus Scriblerus* (221 ff.), suggesting that "much of Cornelius' treatise on ancient games had been anticipated" by King in the *Useful Transactions* (221). Johannes Meursius (1579-1639) was a Dutch scholar and King is referring to Meursius's *Orchestra. Sive, De Saltationibus Veterum (Orchestra, or On the Dances of the Ancients)*. This was a real work of scholarship published in 1618 and is a collection of over two hundred dances and figures. There are several features in what is a parody of a scholarly book review which indicate that this is a satirical account written under the name of Dr Playford. These are the invention of new and comic vocabulary (saltatrical, dancitive); the invention of other scholarly authorities such as "Gripholdus Nicknackius . . . a writer, in my judgement, not authentic" (81); and the erudite joke of "the large Folio of Sckleckius Rodornus (who proves High Dutch to have been the language of Japhet)" (81); these are all triggers for a reading as a satirical reception. It is Meursius's choice of subject matter which is the stimulus for King to make a satirical reading, suggesting that dancing is not a serious subject for a work of Latin scholarship. Dr Playford says he will wait for the publication of "a new Edition of the voluminous Eustathius upon Homer" before making a comparison with a number of contemporary English dances such as Greensleeves and others (79). A contrast is implied between Meursius's *On the Dances of the Ancients* and Eustathius, an important Homeric scholiast, putting Meursius's collection of dances in a lower stratum of classical scholarship. By contrast "An Account of Meursius's Book of the Plays of the Grecian Boys" appears to be a vehicle for some macaronic poetry about boys (*The Gentleman's Magazine* Vol. 100, 216). The similarities between King's work and Chapter Five of the *Memoirs* have not really been properly accounted for. Whatever the relationship between the two, King's work does represent a transition from the seventeenth-century procedures of Butler and Shadwell to the eighteenth-century ones of Swift and the Scriblerians.



## CHAPTER SIX. SCRIBLERIAN SATIRE: SWIFT, POPE AND OTHERS

### 6.1. THE SCRIBLERUS CLUB

#### 6.1.1. *The Members*

The words attributed to Pope by Joseph Spence (1699-1768) in his *Anecdotes*, which were first published in 1820, concerning the *Memoirs* of Martinus Scriblerus and the members of the Scriblerus Club have often been quoted in discussions about the Club's membership:

The design of the Memoirs of Scriblerus was to have ridiculed all the false tastes in learning, under the character of a man of capacity enough that had dipped into every art and science, but injudiciously in each. It was begun by a club of some of the greatest wits of the age: Lord Bolingbroke, Lord Oxford, the Bishop of Rochester, Mr. Pope, Congreve, Arbuthnot, Swift, and others. Gay often held the pen, and Addison liked it very well and was not disinclined to come into it. (Spence 1: 56)

Spence's method was to collect his information from conversation. Whatever he heard and whatever Pope said, it is surely wrong to include here the names of men who were not at the heart of the Scriblerian project. Perhaps some of them approved but did not participate. Or perhaps here we have some of the names of those who were approached to take part in Pope's original proposal of 1713 for a publication entitled *The Works of the Unlearned*.<sup>35</sup> Among the principal commentators there is slight disagreement over the exact membership of the Scriblerus Club.<sup>36</sup> There exists a consensus that there were five principal members. It

---

<sup>35</sup> I can only agree with Robert J. Allen that Pope's account to Spence "cannot be accepted as literally true" (261-2). The presence of Congreve and Addison is unlikely for political reasons. Allen sees no corroborating evidence to support the presence of Oxford and Atterbury, or indeed of Bolingbroke, who has also been described as a member elsewhere. One notable example of this occurs in *The Life of Alexander Pope* (1889) by W. J. Courthope, where the author writes of Bolingbroke and Pope that "they met as fellow members of the Scriblerus Club" (5: 233).

<sup>36</sup> There are slightly differing accounts of the membership of the Scriblerus Club. Among the principal commentators on the Scriblerus Club to whose work I shall refer – namely George A. Aitken, Robert J. Allen, Charles Kerby-Miller, Patricia Carr Brückmann and Angus Ross, the editor of Arbuthnot's letters. In Allen's opinion the five who were really members were Pope, Gay, Parnell, Swift, and Arbuthnot.

was these five who gave the inimitable flavour to the works that were published and which both described the life and works of the fictitious character Martinus Scriblerus, as well as being attributed to him. They were Jonathan Swift, John Arbuthnot, Thomas Parnell (1679-1718), John Gay and Alexander Pope. It will be seen from their respective dates of birth that Swift and Arbuthnot were slightly older than Parnell and that Gay and Pope were considerably younger. The contested member is the Earl of Oxford, the Tory politician who joined the other five by invitation.<sup>37</sup> The main business of the Club was to produce the biography of Martin and to this the invitations issued to Oxford bear witness. One invitation written around 1 April 1714 closes with the couplet: "Come then, my lord, and take your part in / The important history of Martin" (*Memoirs* 352). Another probably written a fortnight later has: "Then come and take part in / The Memoirs of Martin" (*Memoirs* 355). The Club would meet in Arbuthnot's room at St James Palace, where Arbuthnot attended on Queen Anne (1665-1714) in his capacity as physician-in-ordinary. As a member of the earlier Brothers Club, Swift had envisaged arranging a certain amount of financial support for needy poets. Among the Scriblerians high preferment might be expected for Parnell, Gay and Pope once Oxford had become acquainted with them, given that Oxford was the Lord Treasurer.

#### 6.1.2. *The Creative Catalyst*

We cannot say with any certainty when the members of the Scriblerus Club first began to associate with each other.<sup>38</sup> However, Pope's approach to Swift with a proposal for a satirical project in October 1713 was probably the first palpable step towards the formation of the Scriblerus Club. Pope's proposal is described in a letter from Pope to John Gay dated 23 October 1713:

[Dr Parnell] enters heartily into our design. I only fear his stay in town may chance to be but short. Dr. Swift much approves what I proposed, even to the very title, which I design shall be, The Works of the

---

This view was also shared by G.A. Aitken (56). The man sometimes included and sometimes not is Robert Harley, Earl of Oxford. Aitken and Allen do not include him among the active membership, while Kerby-Miller, Brückmann and Ross do. Brückmann's book is concerned with the Scriblerians as a diaspora and so is not pertinent to this account.

<sup>37</sup> In Allen's view "Oxford was the only non-member who followed the activities of Scriblerus with any constancy" (263). But he sees Oxford as "an invited guest, – an interested and welcome onlooker rather than a participator" (262). This may have been membership by another name. It is Charles Kerby-Miller who speaks in clear terms of Oxford being a member (24-6). Ross has Oxford as a member (*Correspondence of Dr. John Arbuthnot*, 155, n. 1). It seems likely that Oxford's presence was also, as Kerby-Miller says, that of some "sort of patron" (*Memoirs* 24).

<sup>38</sup> Allen is probably right when he says that the exact moment at which the five "drew together cannot be exactly determined" (263).

Unlearned, published monthly, in which whatever book appears that deserves praise, shall be depreciated ironically, and in the same manner that modern critics take to undervalue works of value, and to commend the high productions of Grub-street. (qtd. in Allen 263)

As Allen observes, we see here four of the five at work on “a distinctly Scriblerian project” (263). Pope’s proposal is interesting for its inversion of critical values and the intention to publish ironical praise of works produced on Grub Street. The title of Pope’s project for *The Works of the Unlearned* parodies the journal *The History of the Works of the Learned, or, An Impartial Account of Books lately printed in all Parts of Europe*. This was a learned and widely respected publication with a number of contributors. It began to appear in January 1699, coming to a temporary halt in 1711, only for the final number to be published in January 1712. It mainly consisted of informed and insightful book reviews.<sup>39</sup>

In fact, this was not the first time a future member of the Scriblerus Club had mentioned *The History of the Works of the Learned*. In 1712 Swift had received from Arbuthnot a piece referred to as *The Art of Political Lying* (Aitken 294-303). Swift was very taken with it and arranged to have it printed (*Memoirs* 12). It consists of a proposal to publish a work in two volumes, with *A Treatise of the Art of Political Lying* along with “an Abstract of the First Volume of the said Treatise” (293). Swift said of this piece that it was: “just like those pamphlets called *The Works of the Learned*” (52). The title of *The History of the Works of the Learned* may have been shortened to *The Works of the Learned*, as the full title is rather long for everyday speech, but in the 1699 edition of the journal “The Works of the Learned” is the header on the left-hand pages. Arbuthnot’s concrete way of writing about abstract subjects is apparent early on in the description of the first chapter where the author “reasons

---

<sup>39</sup> Kerby-Miller documents clearly Pope’s interest in a satirical version of *The History of the Works of the Learned*. The first appearance of Pope’s idea in print was in a letter he sent to the *Spectator* and which was published in No. 457 dated 14 August 1712 (*Memoirs* 14). Kerby-Miller thinks Pope did not take the idea seriously at this stage, neither seeing the existence of the appropriate editorial resources nor the necessary experience on Pope’s part. Here is a brief extract from Pope’s letter: “Now, Sir, it is my Design to Publish every Month, An Account of the Works of the Unlearned. Several late Productions of my own Country-men, who many of them make a very Eminent Figure in the Illiterate World, encourage me in this Undertaking.” *The History of the Works of the Learned* had ceased publication in January 1712 and here is Pope a few months later recalling the work and proposing a satirical version in which he intends to target those who incur his displeasure. The idea clearly anticipates *The Dunciad* and *The Dunciad Variorum* and is also interesting for the generic character of the project, as a parody of a type of publication, namely the learned journal. By 1713 Kerby-Miller suggests that Pope had received enough negative stimuli – criticism from John Dennis in 1711 and the celebrated “ironic paper” on the pastorals of Ambrose Philips in *The Guardian* (No. 40 dated 27 April 1713) – to return to the idea of *The Works of the Unlearned* with renewed vigour (*Memoirs* 16-17).

philosophically concerning the nature of the soul of man, and those qualities which render it susceptible of lies" (294). Here is the extended description of that soul:

He supposes the soul to be of the nature of a plano-cylindrical speculum, or looking-glass; that the plain side was made by God Almighty, but that the devil afterwards wrought the other side into a cylindrical figure. The plain side represents objects just as they are; and the cylindrical side, by the rules of catoptrics, must needs represent true objects false, and false objects true: but the cylindrical side, being much the larger surface, takes in a greater compass of visual rays. That upon the cylindrical side of the soul of man depends the whole art and success of Political Lying. (294)

We can already see here the difference between the satirical styles of Arbuthnot and Pope. Arbuthnot's approach is more general, working with the concept of political lying, while if Pope's plan had come to fruition, his approach would have been more specific. In his proposal for *The Works of the Unlearned*, the intention was to single out specific works for comment. Although nothing came of the proposal, it can be seen as an important catalyst in the formation of The Scriblerus Club and its satirical programme. It is not clear when it was abandoned in favour of the subsequent satirical programme of the Club, but that programme probably evolved in tandem with the emergence of the Club itself in late 1713 and early 1714.

### 6.1.3. *The Name of the Club*

The name of the Scriblerus Club is synonymous with the character of Martinus Scriblerus, the fictitious character at the centre of the Club's satirical programme. While we remain at one remove from the source of the invention and lack any direct testimony on the subject from the Scriblerians themselves, it is as well to draw out the meaning of the word "scribler" and its cultural significance in the early eighteenth century to understand what it signifies in terms of the satirical representation of the virtuoso.<sup>40</sup> Bailey's *Dictionary* of 1721

---

<sup>40</sup> The noun "scribler" is usually – though not always – spelt with one letter "b" in the eighteenth century and with two in the twentieth and twenty-first. There have been two different explanations hitherto of the origin of the name of Martinus Scriblerus and thereby of the name of the Club itself. Aitken, Arbuthnot's late Victorian biographer and editor, records Swift's entry in his Journal on 11 October 1711 that "Oxford called him Dr. Martin, because martin was a sort of swallow, and so was a swift; and it has been suggested that the name of Martin S. was derived from this pleasantry. Martin was, of course, the name of one of the three sons in the Tale of a Tub" (57, n. 3). Allen expands on this: "When the name was later applied to the fictitious personage, a surname was added to indicate the mysterious gentleman's literary proclivities, and the whole latinized in deference to his scholarship. The character of Martinus Scriblerus soon became so definitely established that any member who wished to wield his pen in the interest of the club could assume it as a cloak of pseudonymity" (261). Kerby-Miller traces the suggestion that Oxford's nickname of Martin for Swift gave rise to Martinus Scriblerus's first name to Deane Swift's edition of the first forty letters to Stella, published in 1768. (NB: Deane Swift [1707-83] was the grandson of Godwin Swift, the uncle of Jonathan.) In Kerby-Miller's

perhaps provides the ultimate value judgement by giving the following definition of the verb “to scribble”: “to scatch [sic] or dash with the Pen” (n. pag.). A usage of the word with which Jonathan Swift would have been very familiar occurs early on in Sir William Temple’s *An Essay upon the Ancient and Modern Learning*, quoted here from Samuel Holt Monk’s edition of 1963 in which the spelling has been modernized:

But I cannot tell why we should conclude that the ancient writers had not as much advantage from the knowledge of others that were ancient to them, as we have from those that are ancient to us. The invention of printing has not perhaps multiplied books, but only the copies of them; and if we believe there were six hundred thousand in the library of Ptolemy, we shall hardly pretend to equal it by any of ours, nor perhaps by all put together: I mean so many originals that have lived any time, and thereby given testimony of their having been thought worth preserving. For the scriblers are infinite, that like mushrooms or flies are born and die in small circles of time, whereas books, like proverbs, receive their chief value from the stamp and esteem of ages through which they have passed. (38)

Temple is arguing here against the notion that there were fewer writers in classical antiquity and suggesting that the printing press has only multiplied the number of copies of a finite number of books rather than increased the range of books on offer. He then makes a value judgement about ancient writers in contrast to modern ones, contrasting the respect due to the ancient writer whose works have accumulated a substantial reputation over the centuries as they make their way to the present day with the modern writer or scribbler whose work is ephemeral. The qualities of the “scribbler” here are presence in great numbers and ephemerality. Temple is writing here in a relatively abstract way, so it is as well to examine some other uses of the word in the context of the print culture of the day to see in which other contexts it was used and by whom.

In the 1690s we see the word used in a polemical context in a pamphlet with the intention of making a value judgement.<sup>41</sup> The arrival of a thriving newspaper culture was not

---

view it was unlikely that the Scriblerians would make use of what he regards as a weak joke. More cogently he argues that it was improbable “that they would adopt any name which would link Swift with their learned fool” (31). He offers a different explanation: “Since their hero was to be above all a ‘scribler,’ they chose a last name for him by simply latinizing that much used term of contempt, and for a first name to match they selected that of Sir Martin Mar-all, the famous figure in Dryden’s comedy whose amiable absurdities had made ‘Martin’ a common name for the comic blunderer” (31). If the character of Martinus is to be used as a satirical tool with which to mount an attack on the figures of the virtuoso and the pedant, Kerby-Miller’s explanation does resonate more than that of Aitken.

<sup>41</sup> See John Gadbury, *The Scurrilous Scribler Dissected or, A Word in William Lily’s Ear* (London, 1693); also, Edmund Elys, *Three Letters to the Author of a Book, Entitled The Lord’s Day un\*\*\* [ . . . ] The Pride and Folly of an Ignorant Scribler Made Manifest* (London, 1694).

far away. The Printing Act had been passed on 10 June 1662 and was often referred to as the Licensing Act as it regulated all forms of printed material (Astbury 296). 1695 saw the expiry of this legislation and the appearance of new publications like the *Post Boy*, the editorial policy of which was Tory. The first daily newspaper to appear was *The Daily Courant*, which was first published in March 1702. There is an example of the word being used to describe a sententious journalist on the *Post Boy* in a tract published after negotiations for peace began between Britain and France in 1711.<sup>42</sup> It is probably no more than a coincidence, but for the student of the Scriblerians perhaps the most intriguing use of the word comes in 1711 with the publication of the pamphlet *Postscript for Postscript. By Way of Answer to Dr. Kennet's Gentleman-like Treatment of the Person that Translated and Explain'd his Sermon for Him*. The author calls himself the Sham-Scribler. White Kennett (1660-1728) was chaplain in ordinary to Queen Anne and Dean of Peterborough and this pamphlet is a strident attack on Kennett and a sermon he preached in February 1710 at St Paul's Cathedral (Kennett 1711). In that sermon Kennett spoke in turn of an earlier attack on one of his sermons thus: "To be sure, the Dean is mov'd to nothing but Pity upon the Scribler, for such Remarks upon his Sermon" (37) and mentions his familiarity with such responses from among others "the Reverend Dr. George Hicks" (37). *Postscript for Postscript* was in all probability written by Hicke, as it mentions an earlier work of his.<sup>43</sup> George Hicke (1642-1715) was a non-juror whose official ecclesiastical preferment ended with the arrival of William III (1650-1702), although he became suffragan bishop of Thetford in the clandestine network of clerics organized by James II (1633-1701). Kennett by contrast thrived under William III and Anne. Curiously, after being deposed as Dean of Worcester in 1689, Hicke went on the run and was sheltered by Kennett. It was also the latter who gave him the idea for his outstanding work of philology and archaeology.<sup>44</sup> The Sham-Scribler takes up the word "scribler" in his pamphlet

---

<sup>42</sup> "And when at last the Secret was out, some *Proposals* were then immediately Printed in the *Post-Boy*, not as a Project upon which Men might deliberate, or to which they might object, but as a Sentence which they must patiently submit to. The Allies were all threatened, alarm'd and insulted in that Paper: And if any of their Ministers pretended to remonstrate, he was first corrected by that Scribler, and afterwards *Reasons* were given for ordering his *Departure*" (*An Account of the Occasion and End of the War, with Remarks on the Present Treaty of Peace begun between Britain and France* [London, 1711] 12).

<sup>43</sup> *Two Treatises on the Christian Priesthood and on the Dignity of the Episcopal Order: With a Preparatory Discourse or Answer to a Book Entitled The Rights of the Christian Church, &c., and an Appendix* (London, 1707).

<sup>44</sup> *Linguarum veterum septentrionallium thesaurus grammatico-criticus et archaeologicus* (Oxford: Printed at the Sheldonian Theatre, 1705). An English translation of the title is given in Wotton's 1735 critique: *Grammatico-critical and Archaeological Treasury of the Ancient Northern Languages*.

when he writes that he supposes that Kennett will call him “the Sham Scribler” (3). While the content of the polemic need not overly detain us, the pseudonym “The Sham-Scribler” may well have come to the attention of Arbuthnot and Swift and been a part of the ferment of ideas that led to the creation of Martinus Scriblerus. It is the occurrence in one pseudonym of the word “scribler” and the notion of the “sham” that are highly suggestive. All of the usages of the word “scribler” documented here point to polemical writing in pamphlets or newspapers. This sort of ephemeral writing was done quickly and often, in the view of the Scriblerians, badly. It is this network of associations that the Scriblerians are seeking to evoke by choosing the surname Scriblerus, as a way of denigrating both the character as well as what he writes and does.

#### *6.1.4. The Political Dimension*

The mixture of writers and politicians which was a feature of the Scriblerus Club was anticipated in the composition of an earlier Tory club. This was the Brothers Club, of which Swift and Arbuthnot were members. Swift had come to London in 1710 at the behest of the Irish bishops to pursue their interests with the Tory ministry. He met Robert Harley (later the Earl of Oxford and Mortimer) on 4 October 1710 when Harley was serving as Chancellor of the Exchequer.<sup>45</sup> As Leslie Stephen wrote in his article on Swift in *The Dictionary of National Biography*, Harley welcomed him and after a week was treating him as a close friend (19: 213). Swift then took on the writing of the journal *The Examiner* from 2 November 1710 to 14 June 1711 with outstanding results. Henry St. John, another leading Tory politician, was serving as secretary of state with Harley at this time and it was he who founded the Brothers Club in June 1711.<sup>46</sup> This was a Tory dining club which brought together St. John (later Viscount Bolingbroke), some Tory peers and a number of writers favourable to the Tory cause, including Swift and Arbuthnot. One notable feature was the exclusion of Harley, although his son was a member. In this way Swift became close to those in power and eventually much involved in trying to reconcile the differences between Oxford and Bolingbroke, when their relationship foundered in 1714. Once the two statesmen became irreconcilable, this marked the end of Swift’s active participation in the Scriblerus Club, as it

---

<sup>45</sup> Robert Harley (1661-1724) was appointed Chancellor of the Exchequer on 10 August 1710. Stabbed by de Guiscard on 8 March 1711, he was made First Earl of Oxford & Earl Mortimer on 23 May 1711 and became Lord Treasurer on 29 May 1711.

<sup>46</sup> Henry St. John (1678-1751) was made First Viscount Bolingbroke in July 1711. This was a disappointment to him given that Harley had been given an Earldom.

was at this time that he withdrew to Letcombe, arriving there in June 1714. This was the principal reason why he became disenchanted with active politics, but there was another factor. The politicians to whom he gave a social lustre and polemical engagement had failed to support one of his most cherished proposals. It was Swift's idea that an academy be founded to correct the English language, in line with his pamphlet *A Proposal for Correcting the English Tongue*, the only pamphlet to which he put his name during his lifetime. That Harley did not take up the proposal can only have left Swift with an added sense of disappointment with politicians and politics.

As a member of the earlier Brothers Club, Swift had envisaged arranging a certain amount of financial support for needy poets. As has been mentioned before, among the Scriblerians high preferment might be expected for Parnell, Gay and Pope once Oxford had become acquainted with them, given that Oxford was the Lord Treasurer. However, on balance it seems that Harley's involvement in the Scriblerus Club was part of the pattern of reciprocity which marked Swift's relationship with him. That Harley benefitted more from Swift seems clear, given Swift's success with *The Examiner*. The death of Queen Anne on 1 August 1714 caused the dispersal of her court and thereby the loss of Arbuthnot's rooms in St James's Palace, which had served as the meeting place of the Scriblerus Club during the last months of her reign.

#### 6.1.5. *How They Wrote*

We have little real idea of how the Scriblerians went about writing the *Memoirs*. This makes it difficult to apportion the work to the individuals involved, but then this is in the very nature of a collaborative work. Kerby-Miller provides a fairly detailed account of how he envisaged the writing process for the Scriblerians, but we have no real proof that it was done in the way he suggests.<sup>47</sup> On the evidence of some of the correspondence between the individual members we can to a certain extent see how ideas were transmitted between them and how one member might hope for or invite a creative response from another. One entertaining example of this is what Arbuthnot calls "an Episode of the Burning glass" in a letter to Swift dated 17 July 1714 (191). This comes from the newsletter prepared by Pope as

---

<sup>47</sup> "It is to be assumed that the business of the formal meetings was to shape the project as a whole and to pass upon the suggestions and drafts offered by individual members. According to Pope, Gay "often held the pen" for the group . . . but it is doubtful if he did more than make fair copies of manuscripts and record suggestions, criticisms, and passing witticisms. The real work must have been done between the meetings, with the task of weaving materials together left in the hands of the more experienced writers such as Swift" (*Memoirs* 28).



a result of his visit to Swift at Letcombe in early July 1714. It was Swift's custom to spend an hour at around midday burning paper with the rays of the sun as they passed through "an Orbicular Glass" (186). The papers he burns are Parliamentary ones. Pope takes great delight in listing Swift's targets: the Speaker Thomas Hanmer (1677-1746), John Barber (*bap.* 1675-1741), as well as the Bill of Schism and the Proclamation of the Pretender. Pope comments wryly: "I doubt not but these marks of his are mysticall, and that the Figures he makes this way are a significant Cypher to those who have the skill to explain 'em – " (187). Swift's pastime can be interpreted as a part of his disaffection with politics at this moment, when he had realized how difficult it was to reconcile Oxford and Bolingbroke. Arbuthnot writes to Swift on 17 July: "I was going to make an EpiGramm upon the imagination of your Burning your own History wt a Burning glass. I wish pope or parnell would putt it into Rhyme [sic]" (191). Arbuthnot then details his idea for the content of his epigram which involves Apollo and then invites Swift to close the poem with a simile. Swift's reply to Arbuthnot from Letcombe on 25 July is instructive: "I defy Pope and his Burning glasses; a man cannot amuse himself 50 miles from London after four years jading himself with Ministers of State, but all the Town must hear of it. However, if Pope makes the right use of Your Hint for an Epigram, or a longer Copy, I shall not be angry – " (195).

We see here how an anecdote about Swift causes hilarity as Pope reports it to Arbuthnot. The Doctor in turn takes delight in the details and writes to Swift to say he would like Pope or Parnell to write a rhyming version of his own idea for an epigram on the subject. He then details his idea for the content of that epigram to Swift and invites the latter to end the poem with a simile. Swift complains about Pope's reporting of his new hobby but says he will not be angry if Pope takes up Arbuthnot's idea for writing an epigram. On the evidence of these letters, written at a time when Swift had withdrawn to the country, one can only imagine the rapidity with which ideas, proposals, images and the responsibility for writing passed between the Club members when they met together in London.

#### 6.1.6. *Who Brought What to the Table?*

Much has been written about the authorship of the *Memoirs*. A brief review of critical opinion is in order here before I advance my own approach to this difficult question. Dr Johnson, whose negative comments on the work are to be found in his life of Pope, wrote that they seemed to be "the production of Arbuthnot, with a few touches perhaps by Pope" (4: 47). This view was largely shared by Aitken, for whom the *Memoirs* "seems to be almost entirely by Arbuthnot, but he was helped by Pope and others" (57). Allen offers a more

complex account of things, suggesting that “it is possible to do little more than outline the probabilities” (274). Interestingly, as his focus is more on the Club than any individual member, he observes: “. . . there is what amounts to an admission of the plurality of authorship in the introduction, which concludes archly: I dare promise the reader, that whenever he begins to think any one chapter dull, the style will be immediately changed in the next” (274).

Allen quotes the celebrated account of the respective propensities of the members of the Club by Swift in a letter to Arbuthnot from Letcombe dated 3 July 1714, here reproduced in the original spelling in Ross’s modern edition of Arbuthnot’s correspondence:

To talk of Martin in any hands but Yours, is a Folly. You every day give better hints than all of us together could do in a twelvemonth: And to say the Truth, Pope who first thought of the Hint has no Genius at all to it, in my mind Gay is too young; Parnel has some Ideas of it, but is idle; I could putt together, and lard, and strike out well enough, but all that relates to the Sciences [learning] must be from you. (*Correspondence* 181)

Allen regarded the input of Swift and Parnell as “mainly verbal and general,” although it is hard to see how he reaches this conclusion; Arbuthnot for this critic “was by far the most ingenious and prolific of the collaborators” (275). He is confident enough to attribute a number of chapters to Arbuthnot, namely parts of Chapters One and Two, Chapter Three (Woodward’s shield), Chapters Eight and Nine, both of which display great scientific knowledge, as well as Chapter Seventeen, which details the discoveries and works of Martinus “in the light of his ability at projecting new works” (276). Allen records Swift’s opinion that “the honor of conceiving Scriblerus belongs . . . to Pope” (276), but perhaps he is referring to the proposal for *The Works of the Unlearned* here. Allen makes Pope’s role an editorial one and suggests that the coherence of the *Memoirs* was thanks to Pope’s final stewardship of the project.

Kerby-Miller has the most complex assessment of all where authorship of the *Memoirs* is concerned. He takes Swift’s assessment from his letter to Arbuthnot from Letcombe as the starting point for his account. Of Swift he writes:

That Swift’s role in the planning and even the writing of the *Memoirs* is far greater than he suggests by his offer to do editing is a safe guess. Probably, in fact, he was chiefly responsible for changing Pope’s plan into the Scriblerus scheme and for setting up the basic style of humor in the *Memoirs*, which has several significant points in common with some of Swift’s earlier burlesques. (58)

Kerby-Miller acknowledges Arbuthnot’s intellectual brilliance, but in contrast to earlier critics he stresses the “fragmentary character of the ideas he offered” and suggests that “his ability

to produce suggestions is not to be confused with actual authorship" (58). He emphasizes the role of other Scriblerians in making any cohesive whole of Arbuthnot's input. Parnell does not appear to have contributed much and in Kerby-Miller's account Gay's role is a secretarial one. His reading of Pope's role is an interesting one:

Pope's limitations are of critical significance for the *Memoirs* and the whole Scriblerus project because, as has been indicated, he became the leader of the project after Swift's departure and all that the club had done or was to do underwent revision at his hands. Hence, though he may have contributed relatively little to the first drafts of the sections completed in 1714 he properly listed himself as one of their principal authors in their present form. (59)

Where does all of this speculation leave us, for after all we can only speculate more or less intelligently about which Scriblerian wrote what? My own view is that the most constructive approach is to characterize the preferences and abilities of each of the contributors, and to look for features of the *Memoirs* for which they may have been responsible. The question of authorship of the *Memoirs* is important insofar as it might help us to understand the way in which the virtuoso and – as we shall see later on – the textual critic are both satirized. It is for that reason that I would suggest that Swift's role in the actual writing of the *Memoirs* was limited. He may have been responsible for the shift to the Scriblerus programme from Pope's project for *The Works of the Unlearned* and may have had important things to say about the overall shape of the *Memoirs*, since the configuration of the whole project and the *Memoirs* as a sham is highly characteristic of Swift, as I shall argue. But in the style of the *Memoirs* I can see little of his abrasive brand of satire. An exception might be the speech made by Cornelius in Chapter Two after the birth of Martin. This boastful speech has the characteristics of one of Swift's dramatic monologues parodying the manias of a projector. It builds to a brilliantly exaggerated climax, enumerating various future achievements of Martin imagined by Cornelius. Apart from this, the history of Swift's involvement in the Scriblerus Club may be the opposite of an involvement, namely a story of initial commitment and a considerable influence in setting up the Club but then a withdrawal. I would suggest that it was Swift who shaped the Scriblerus Club and its membership and brought Oxford to its table, but I do not see his hand stylistically in any sustained way in the *Memoirs*. After the Club days when Swift had returned to Ireland there was some correspondence between him and the others between 1716 and 1722, during which time Gay, Arbuthnot and Pope worked on *Three Hours after Marriage*. When Swift returned to England in 1726 and 1727, the main purpose of the

visit was to expedite the publication of the Swift-Pope *Miscellanies* as well as *Gulliver's Travels*.<sup>48</sup>

"To talk of Martin in any hands but Yours, is a Folly." If we pause to contemplate that phrase in the letter from Swift to Arbuthnot dated 3 July 1714, it seems clear that Arbuthnot's was the genius which most informed the *Memoirs*. Arbuthnot's reaction to the third part of *Gulliver's Travels* was that it was quite wanting, and by contrast the *Memoirs* have an abundance of material relating to natural philosophy. Satire of the textual critic is more marginal in the *Memoirs* and the passages which relate to it are surely more the work of Pope. Given his disposition and the range of subjects which he can comment on, when it came to the writing of the *Memoirs* I suspect that they were to a considerable extent the work of Arbuthnot. In a very real sense he was a virtuoso himself.<sup>49</sup> One of his early publications was an essay drawing attention to the shortcomings in John Woodward's theory about the deluge. He became a fellow of the Royal Society in 1704 and was one of the leading doctors of his day. In 1705 he had published the first edition of his *Tables of the Grecian, Roman and Jewish Measures, Weights and Coins: Reduced to the English Standard*. He became involved in the difficult situation surrounding the unauthorized publication in 1712 of the catalogue of stars made by the first Astronomer Royal John Flamsteed (1646-1719). There are many reasons for thinking him the principal author of the *Memoirs*, even if it was really Pope who gave the work its final form.

We have already noted the plastic quality evident in Arbuthnot's description of the soul in *The Art of Political Lying*. It was this ability on the part of Arbuthnot to give expression to abstract ideas along with his considerable sense of humour which were regarded by Swift as something unique. He put this into words in a letter written in reply to Arbuthnot in July 1714, not long before the meetings of the Club at Arbuthnot's room in St James's Palace came to an end. Arbuthnot had written to Swift complaining that William Whiston (1667-1752) had deprived him of one of his ideas for the Scriblerus Club, a proposal to solve the problem of finding the longitude. In 1714 William Whiston and Humphry Ditton (1675-1714) published their *A New Method for Discovering the Longitude both at Sea and Land, humbly proposed to the Consideration of the Publick*. This was the occasion of one of Arbuthnot's

---

<sup>48</sup> Kerby-Miller speculates that by this time the Scriblerus materials would have seemed hopelessly out of date to Swift and that the idea of publishing the *Memoirs* would have worked against his own interests as he was seeking the publication of *Gulliver's Travels* (52-3).

<sup>49</sup> "Recognized as a scholar of attainment by antiquaries and men of science, Arbuthnot was elected a Fellow of the Royal Society in 1704, soon after the elevation of Newton to the presidency" (Beattie 5).

most fascinating letters to Swift. He calls Whiston “Whetsone” for humorous effect.

Arbuthnot wrote from London as follows to Swift on 17 July 1714:

Whetstone has at last publish'd his project of the longitude, the most ridiculous thing that ever was thought on; but a pox on him, he has spoild one of my papers of Scriblerus, which was a proposal for the longitude to this purpose, not very unlike his, that since there was no pole for East and west that all the princes of Europe should joyn and build two prodigious poles upon high mountains with a vast light-house to serve for a pole star I was thinking of a calculation of the time, charges *and* dimensions: Now you must understand his project is by light-houses and explosions of bombs, at a certain hour. (*Correspondence* 191-2)

The relevant part of Swift's reply from Letcombe on 25 July 1714 is as follows:

It was a malicious Satyr of yours upon Whiston, that what you intended as a Ridicule, should be any way struck upon by him for a Reality. – Go on for the sake of Wit and Humour, and cultivate that Vein which no Man alive possesses but your self, and which lay like a Mine in the Earth, which the Owner for a long time never knew of. (*Correspondence* 195)

Arbuthnot's own humorous proposal shows how attentive he was to the nature of the various subjects on which he wrote.

Parnell is often regarded as marginal to the process of authorship in the Scriblerus Club. He was originally an acquaintance of Swift. The two men had met as clerics when Parnell was made a minor canon at St. Patrick's Cathedral in Dublin, where Swift was already installed as prebend of Dunlavin. His early lyric poetry is accomplished and shows a familiarity with classical literature. In 1713 he published a longer poem entitled *An Essay on the Different Styles of Poetry*. This is in part descriptive of the qualities of classical poetry and in part proscriptive and again shows Parnell's knowledge in particular of ancient Greek poetry. Parnell worked on the notes for Pope's translation of *The Iliad* and through his knowledge of ancient Greek was able to provide access to some of the finer points of the commentaries on Homer. This was particularly the case with Eustathius of Thessalonica (c.1115-95/6), a Greek bishop and scholar renowned for his Homeric commentaries. Material from Eustathius finds its way into the *Memoirs* (99 & 106). Parnell also provided *An Essay on the Life, Writings and Learning, of Homer* which was published in the first volume of Pope's translation of *The Iliad* in 1715. The opening statements in the essay on Homer are reminiscent of Sir William Temple's sentiments about ancient literature in *An Essay upon the Ancient and Modern Learning*. Both men have a sense of communing with the ancients. As Parnell puts it we experience “a kind of Complacency in their Company, when we retire to enjoy what they have left” (1). On receipt of Parnell's manuscript Pope is said to have found the style of the essay

on Homer rather plodding and in need of rewriting. Parnell really got into his stride with his translation of the *Batrachomyomachia*, or *The Battle of the Frogs and Mice*, a mock-epic poem often attributed to Homer. The full title of Parnell's 1717 volume is *Homer's Battle of the Frogs and Mice with the Remarks of Zoilus. To Which is Prefixed The Life of the Said Zoilus*. *The Battle of the Frogs and Mice* joins the family of the burlesque, or mock-epic writings to which Pope had already contributed *The Rape of the Lock* (1712 and 1714) and would subsequently add *The Dunciad* (1728) and *The Dunciad Variorum* (1729). And with the material relating to Zoilus, Parnell was entering into the fray of relations between critic and poet. Zoilus of Amphipolis was a Greek critic of the fourth century BC who was known as *Homeromastix*, "the scourge of Homer". He found fault with Homer's poetry on grounds both of verisimilitude and grammar, but the fruit of his labours was for his name to become synonymous with the carping critic. Rogers suggests that it has "always been recognized that Parnell undertook the task as a pendant to [Pope's] translation of the *Iliad*, then under way, and that the material on Zoilus was inspired by hostile comments on AP[Pope]'s version" (Rogers 22). Parnell wrote the *Life of Zoilus*, using it as a vehicle in which to convey his disapproval of critics of his own day, in particular Richard Bentley and John Dennis (1658-1734), both of whom were hostile to Pope.<sup>50</sup> It is more difficult to say whether the *Remarks of Zoilus* are a translation, a compilation or an invention. They are presented as an anthology of real remarks by Zoilus on the *Batrachomyomachia* but could equally be an invention on Parnell's part. He died in 1718. His biographer Oliver Goldsmith wrote emotively: "It is probable the club began with him, and his death ended the connexion" (qtd. in Allen 267). His fellow Scriblerians were certainly greatly saddened by his death and Pope produced a posthumous edition of Parnell's poetry which included the Zoilus sequence. I think in all probability Parnell provided more material for the *Memoirs* and the shorter pieces associated with them than is generally reckoned. His knowledge of classical literature and especially ancient Greek literature was extensive. The *Memoirs* draw extensively on both ancient Greek and Latin sources and it seems likely that his knowledge of both provided at least the raw material for some passages.

As with Parnell, we also hear little of Gay in terms of creative input. Pope's words to Spence may tell the whole story: "Gay often held the pen" (Spence 1: 56). Swift thought him

---

<sup>50</sup> See Parnell's *Collected Poems* where the following is suggested in the commentary: "Through the historical Zoilus, Thomas Parnell seems to have been attacking three contemporaries in particular: Sir Richard Blackmore, Richard Bentley, and John Dennis" (444).

too young (*Arbuthnot's Correspondence* 182). Although he may not have contributed much to the *Memoirs*, it appears from his play *Three Hours after Marriage* that Gay had learned a very great deal from those around him during the meetings which took place in 1714. Gay, Arbuthnot and Pope worked on the play in 1716-7. If the talk at Club meetings had been of the foolish ways of the virtuoso, Gay took all of this in and created something extraordinary in his comedy. The play is fascinating for the collision between the worlds of Fossile, the virtuoso and antiquarian and Townley, the inappropriate wife of convenience. Gay creates some powerful caricatures of the figure of the virtuoso and makes humorous use of the notion of the cabinet of curiosities, as we shall see in Chapter Seven.

In the mid-1720s Swift had encouraged Pope in the writing of *The Dunciad* and Pope had been working on the *Peri Bathous* as a way of flushing out more insults from his poetical enemies. It was around this time that the character of Martinus Scriblerus developed in a new direction, exclusively in the hands of Pope. The voice of Scriblerus in the *Peri Bathous* has a different tone to that in the shorter pieces and is different again to the later Scriblerus of the editorial apparatus of *The Dunciad Variorum*. It should be remembered that among the first appearance in print of the character of Martinus Scriblerus was in the *Peri Bathous*, a work which parodies Longinus's *On the Sublime* (1<sup>st</sup> century AD). When Arbuthnot saw that Pope's agenda in the *Peri Bathous* involved a satirical treatment of Pope's enemies, he lost interest in the project given his preference for more general satire. And so Pope and Pope alone took the character of Scriblerus in a different direction, one reminiscent of his original proposal for a journal called *The Works of the Unlearned*. He made the Scriblerus of *The Dunciad Variorum* into an editor and commentator and thereby part of a satirical response to the textual critics Richard Bentley and Lewis Theobald. Pope became the sole proprietor of the *Memoirs* after the death of Arbuthnot in 1735. And so after some further delay, the publication of the work finally came about in 1741. There, the central character tends to be referred to as Martinus when a writer and as Martin as an individual.

## 6.2. THE *MEMOIRS* OF SCRIBLERUS

Pope's proposal for a publication entitled *The Works of the Unlearned* gave way to a satirical programme which was wider in scope and more elaborate in its strategies. If it had been realized, Pope's projected journal would have contained topical responses to the publications that appeared before each number. Such satire would have been somewhat different to the subsequent aim and principal undertaking of the Scriblerians, which was to satirize all forms of what they regarded as false learning. The means to this end was the

creation of a fictitious virtuoso who was pedantic in character and about whom a kind of biography would appear. Firstly, the *Memoirs* were to be a work written in the third person and so an account of the life and works of Martinus, rather than his own memoirs. Secondly, certain works written expressly for the purpose would be attributed to him. And thirdly, the Club would claim works by other writers for Martinus. This was a way of suggesting the position of the Club towards the original authors of such works, namely that any such author was worthy of satirical appraisal. A very recent critical account of Swift's hoaxes and parodies by Valerie Rumbold makes the useful suggestion during a discussion of the Bickerstaff papers that a parody is sometimes a hoax that has been discovered and appreciated (*Parodies* xxxviii). While the Scriblerian satirical programme is too large to be called a parody, it certainly has parodic features and individual examples of Scriblerian writing are certainly parodies of existing genres and forms. We now know that the character of Martinus Scriblerus was an invention of the Scriblerus Club and can still appreciate the intricate construction and execution of the *Memoirs* and the occasional pieces attributed to Martin as parodies in their own right. The aim of the overall project was to create a hoax about a virtuoso who did not exist, having signalled Martin's existence as a real virtuoso and critic through the publication of shorter works which were attributed to him. The overall strategy was in line with a sceptical approach to texts in the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, although the *Memoirs* themselves were not published until much later (Loveman 189). The delay in the publication of the fictitious biography negated the intention that it would appear before those works which were attributed to Scriblerus. The result of this was to undermine the satirical programme. In the print culture of the eighteenth century the identity of published authors was often unknown or unclear and the figure of Scriblerus sits very comfortably in this context. The Scriblerians intended that he take his place among the other authors of the day in all his fictitiousness.

#### 6.2.1. *Summary of the Contents*

Before proceeding to an analysis of the *Memoirs*, I will first provide a summary of the contents of the *Memoirs of the Extraordinary Life, Works, and Discoveries of Martinus Scriblerus* for convenience. The *Memoirs* consist of an introduction and seventeen chapters. Clearly meant to be a part of a larger whole with another volume or perhaps even two more volumes, any papers relating to the larger extension of the work were ordered to be burnt by Pope. The character of Martin Scriblerus is first presented to us in the Introduction as an adult who has behind him not only the experiences described in the seventeen chapters which



follow but also further experiences abroad after he leaves England. He is presented as gaunt and mysterious and often to be seen outside the Palace of St James in London. He is described as being “generally taken for a decay’d Gentleman of Spain” (91). Part of the purpose of the Introduction is to provide the means for the narrator of the Introduction to tell the story of Martin’s life and work. The device of the mislaid manuscript is usually employed to provide the narrator with what he needs, but here the mislaid manuscript also gives the narrator the possibility of meeting Martin. The latter drops the *Codicillus, seu Liber Memorialis, Martini Scribleri* and the narrator’s servant finds it and brings it to his master. The anonymous narrator presents himself to Martin and the latter replies: “Courteous stranger, whoever thou art, I embrace thee as my best friend; for either the Stars and my Art are deceitful, or the destin’d time is come which is to manifest Martinus Scriblerus to the world, and thou the person chosen by Fate for this task” (92). Martin presents himself as inhabiting “a body exhausted by the labours of the mind” and as someone who has lived under assumed names and in disguise to shield himself “from the envy and malice which mankind express against those who are possessed of the *Arcanum Magnum*” (92). He then tells the story of how he has been pursued for some time by a “cruel Spaniard” because of something which happened a few years previously in Madrid (93). Martin had heard of a representation of a pomegranate on an intimate part of the anatomy of a Spanish woman: “a Pomegranate upon the inside of her right Thigh, which blossom’d and as it were, seem’d to ripen in the due season” (93). After succeeding in seeing this, the lady’s husband had taken exception and begun to pursue Martin, who was now waiting to board a ship to Jamaica under the English flag, thus to escape the Spaniard’s attention. The narrator sets out the Scriblerian stall with word of the memoirs which are about to be narrated, and various other written works attributed to Martinus:

Tho’ I was thus to my eternal grief depriv’d of his conversation, he for some years continued his Correspondence, and communicated to me many of his Projects for the benefit of mankind. He sent me some of his Writings, and recommended to my care the recovery of others, straggling about the world, and assumed by other men. The last time I heard from him was on occasion of his Strictures on the Dunciad; since when, several years being elaps’d, I have reason to believe this excellent Person is either dead, or carry’d by his vehement thirst of knowledge into some remote, or perhaps undiscover’d Region of the world. (93-94)

The first chapter provides a portrait of Martin’s parents as well as an account of the genealogy of the Scriblerus family. It is a typical feature of romance to provide the hero’s genealogy. Martin’s father is the antiquary Cornelius Scriblerus. His father represents the

antiquarian aspect of the virtuoso's interests, as well as a mania for classical learning. We never learn the name of Martin's mother. We learn that Cornelius "never had cohabitation with his spouse, but he ponder'd on the Rules of the Ancients, for the Generation of Children of Wit" (96). Mrs Scriblerus has one miscarriage and Cornelius "disdained not to treasure up the Embryo in a vial, among the curiosities of his family" (96). The conception of Martin is achieved under the tutelage of Aristotle. An inheritance from a wealthy Jewish uncle who has died in London takes Cornelius and his wife to that city. We learn that Cornelius intends to spend the inheritance on manuscripts, coins and mummies. And he writes two treatises of education, one for a daughter and one for a son. Martin is born in the Seven Dials district of London, an area associated with astrologers, and several prodigies which burlesque classical precedents attend his birth. In the second chapter Cornelius is pleased to discover that the body of Martin bears the same deformities as several important figures in the classical world. Most of the chapter is taken up with a lengthy and vigorous speech by Cornelius objecting to the swaddling of his son and advocating that the boy will in future roam the earth and "at least make the Tour of the whole System of the Sun" (101). Cornelius's speech ends with the suggestion that Martin search for the fountains of fresh water on the bed of the oceans, a notion which causes Mrs Scriblerus to have a fit. The women unite and expel Cornelius from the room. In the third chapter Martin is presented at his christening in a shield which is in Cornelius's possession, an observance suggested by his reading of Theocritus. Cornelius is distressed when he sees that the maid has cleaned the rust from the shield, the rust in Cornelius's view giving the shield its lustre of antiquity. The fourth chapter details the diet given to the suckling infant Martin and the arguments between Cornelius, his wife and the nurse over the choice of aliment. The beginnings of Cornelius's programme of education for Martin are described. The fifth chapter is called "A Dissertation upon Play-things" and in it Cornelius sets out his preferences for the games and toys which his son might use. Unsurprisingly, his preference is for games and toys originating in classical antiquity. He does permit a few modern toys, since they provide a first instruction in the sciences. The first example given is that of marbles, which teach percussion and the laws of motion. In Chapter Six we learn what gymnastics Martin practised. Mrs Scriblerus summons Cornelius's brother Albertus to dissuade Cornelius from his intention to have Martin's spleen cauterized. Albertus succeeds. Cornelius gives a musical performance according to ancient practice. In Chapter Seven we hear about rhetoric, logic and metaphysics. The *Peri Bathous* is mentioned and stands for Martin's interest in rhetoric. Cornelius seeks out a companion for Martin in the study of logic and metaphysics. Conradus Crambe, with his love of words and propensity to

pun, enters the life of Martin. Once trained in logic, Martin and Crambe play with a number of metaphysical propositions selected from the works of St Thomas Aquinas and the Spanish Jesuit Francisco Suárez (1548-1617), who was best known for his *Disputationes metaphysicae*, which were published in Salamanca in 1597. The satire is in line with the general discontent over the philosophical training of the day in English and Irish universities, which was based on scholasticism.

Up until now the *Memoirs* have been more concerned with Martin's father Cornelius. Martin comes to the fore in Chapter Eight, which is taken up with the macabre comedy of the story involving the corpse Martin has acquired for the purpose of dissection. Crambe takes it to a room hired near the Pest-Fields in St Giles, a neighbourhood of ill-repute. As he is carrying the body up the stairs he tightens his grip on it around the stomach, causing air in the body to exit through the anus. Crambe becomes terrified, thinking that the body is not a corpse but a living person. This initiates a darkly comic sequence of events in which the neighbours emerge to discover the cause of the commotion and Martin and Crambe are seized by the Watch as likely murderers. The discovery of medical instruments for dissection about the persons of Martin and Crambe put them further in the frame as murderers. To make matters worse Crambe launches into a bizarre confession full of word-play related to the human body. Finally, the corpse is shown to have been purchased legally with the result that Martin and Crambe are free to go. Martin dismisses Crambe from his service because of the confession he made but when Crambe pleads that he has learned his punning from classical masters such as Cicero, Martin reinstates him. Chapter Nine is a brief account of how Martin becomes a great critic. Making every trifle into something serious, he turns Crambe's puns into the skill of assembling parallel sounds in the form of syllables or words and makes this the basis of the emendation and correction of ancient authors. This is a parody of Richard Bentley's approach to textual scholarship, as practised in his edition of Horace (1711). Chapter Ten is a continuation of Martin's study of physic, or medicine, and focusses largely on diseases of the mind. Martin has given up on conditions of the body, especially after a year-long course of induced vomits with Dr Woodward. He seeks to delineate the physiognomy of the passions and finds that every passion in mankind is expressed through the motion of particular muscles. Among the many states of mind discussed and the corrective treatments recommended are the tying to a tree of flatterers who are always bowing, the correction of the rolling eye of the enamoured by looking through spectacles and the administration of relaxants to the calves of those males who have the habit of jumping on tables or cutting capers. The chapter closes with the mention of two conditions Martin found difficult or

impossible to treat: affectation and laughter. Affectation is expressed through the distorted posture of so many parts of the body that is difficult to treat, whereas Martin gives up for lost those patients whose immoderate laughter results in such a thoroughgoing distortion of the human form.

Chapter Twelve is entitled "The Case of a Young Nobleman at Court with the Doctor's Prescription for the Same". It is an account of a young man who turns out to be in love and is then diagnosed as suffering from self-love. Here the *Memoirs* are becoming perhaps overly episodic as the story of Martin is told. Chapter Thirteen consists of Martin's search for the seat of the soul, which he locates in the pineal gland, a parodic reception of Descartes. The chapter also contains a letter from The Society of Free-Thinkers which culminates in the description of their commission for the construction of an artificial man. Chapters Fourteen and Fifteen represent perhaps the climax of the satirical treatment of the virtuoso in the *Memoirs*, placing Martin so much in jeopardy that he marries improbably in one chapter and in the next experiences the trauma of hearing his marriage legally dissolved in court. Chapter Fourteen, which is known as the Double Mistress chapter, begins with the statement that the successful course of Martin's studies was interrupted by love and records his visit to Mr Randal's show of curiosities near the Palace of Whitehall in romantically charged prose. Advertised outside are the Libyan Leopard, the Lion, the Jackall, the black Prince of Monomotapa, the Cat-a-mountain, the Porcupine and the Manteger, as well as "two Bohemian Damsels, whom Nature had as closely united as the ancient Hermaphroditus and Salmacis; and whom it was impossible to divide, as the mingled waters of the gentle Thames and the amorous Isis" (143). Ever vigilant for the "Curiosities of Nature," Martin enters and encounters the animals of the collection and enters into conversation with Mr Randal. When Martin sees the Bohemian twins, who are called Lindamira and Indamora, he falls in love with Lindamira and declares his love for her in a letter. He decides to free Lindamira from her captivity as an exhibit and to marry her. He forms a plan to remove the twins with the help of Crambe. The twins become trapped in a window and the manteger mounts Indamora. Martin kills the manteger and they escape. They are married disreputably in the Fleet. In Chapter Fifteen Mr Randal brings a legal action for the recovery of the twins as his own property and after much discourse in which the legal process is parodied, the marriage is annulled. Chapter Sixteen records Martin's resolve to leave the country after the emotional trauma of his marriage and separation from Lindamira. The travels which Martin undertakes are described and are recognizably those of Lemuel Gulliver. Chapter Seventeen is a record of the discoveries and works of Martinus both present and future.

### 6.2.2. *The Satirical Reception of the Ancients and Moderns*

The characters of Cornelius and Martinus Scriblerus are respectively satirical representations of the Ancients and the Moderns.<sup>51</sup>

[Passage omitted]

### 6.2.3. *Curiosity and the Unworldly Virtuoso in the Double Mistress Chapter*

The curious perspective makes monsters private entertainment, not a public warning.

Barbara Benedict, *Curiosity: A Cultural History of Early Modern Inquiry* (2001), 8.

The Double Mistress chapter of the *Memoirs* is so-called because during this chapter Martinus falls in love with Lindamira, one of a pair of Bohemian sisters who are joined together anatomically like Siamese twins (143-53). Lindamira's sister is called Indamora and they are exhibited in Whitehall along with the African Prince of Monomotapa and a few animals. The fictitious sisters are based on two real ones who were exhibited in London in 1708. By calling them Lindamira and Indamora, the Scriblerians are referencing a sentimental romance called *The Adventures of Lindamira, A Lady of Quality*, which was first published in 1702. Although the character Indamora does not appear in the novel – it is her role to receive Lindamira's letters – the sonorous yet slightly asymmetrical affinity between the two names makes them an ideal choice as the names of twins.<sup>52</sup> What lies behind Martin's fascination for Lindamira is the cult of curiosity, something which, as we have already seen, flavours other works under consideration in this thesis.

[Passage omitted]

---

<sup>51</sup> Condren suggests this interpretation, but argues the point more widely, suggesting that “he is trying to reconceptualise the history of early modern philosophy through explorations of the philosophic persona” (1). It is the scrutiny of this persona which shows “how satire could be an idiom of philosophizing, being used to shape and maintain an intellectual community” (1). The purpose of satire in such a situation is to engage and ridicule a group of victims of a philosophical nature (16). And finally, he suggests that the notion of the absurd operated as such a criterion of philosophical demarcation (17).

<sup>52</sup> Lady Mary Pierrepont, who later became Lady Mary Wortley Montagu (1689-1762) was inspired when young to write some letters in the hand of Indamora to Lindamira. These have been published as Lady Mary Pierrepont, *Indamora to Lindamira*, ed. Isobel Grundy (Edmonton, Alta.: Juvenilia Press, Dept. of English, University of Alberta, 1994).

#### 6.2.4. *The Memoirs of Scriblerus as a Sham*

As we have seen, in the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries the dominant critical discourse relied on a highly sceptical approach to texts – a critic had to be a detector of frauds as much as an appraiser of varieties of literary merit. The principal model for classifying readers was to envision an elite group of canny, incredulous readers and below them a mass of gullible readers.

Kate Loveman. *Reading Fictions, 1660-1740: Deception in English Literary and Political Culture* (2008), 189.

The *Memoirs* and the related pieces attributed to Martin Scriblerus belong to a genre that had become well established by the beginning of the eighteenth century. This was the sham, or the hoax, or in Swift's parlance the bite. Shams could be social or written and the inclination to indulge in social shams was a good qualification for entering into the creation of written ones. The word "sham" became current in the second half of the seventeenth century and appears to have its origin in the word "shame". One who was shammed was shamed.<sup>53</sup> Broadly speaking, a sham is an invention presented as a truth which turns out to be an imposture or a lie at the expense of those who fall for the ruse. An example of a social sham which took place in 1661 was the theft of a tankard belonging to the naval commissioner Sir William Penn (*bap.* 1621-70). Samuel Pepys was responsible for the letter sent by "the thief" to Penn, while it had been stolen in the first place by the naval officer Sir William Batten (1600/01-1667). The "thief" proposed a ransom of thirty shillings, which Penn paid. Intent on drinking the ransom, Pepys, along with many friends, went to the Dolphin Tavern, where they were joined by Penn, who was too drunk to understand what was going on when it was explained to him that he was paying for all the drinks. Penn was later heard to be angry because he had been credulous, had been abused by a fiction and had been laughed at by his peers which resulted in degrading contempt towards him (Loveman 1). We can see from this example how even in social shams, the literary was not far away. A recent study of literary shams has identified five principal features of the genre, which are as follows (Loveman 57-9). In the first place, the meaning of any sham was arrived at by the interpretation of a number of readers who probably knew each other, while the success of a sham was measured by the uproar it caused. Secondly, while remaining anonymous, the artistry of the work and the way in which the sham was constructed advertised the abilities of the author among an informed

---

<sup>53</sup> "It was perhaps sham's foregrounding of the social stigma of deception which ensured its popularity and gave it wide application" (Loveman 12).

readership. Thirdly, hoaxes were thought to be political in character or to deal with a subject the reader might not otherwise have engaged with, perhaps because of its polemical character. Fourthly, a sham tended to undermine the authority of the texts it resembled. And finally, shams were thought to originate either in the tavern or through the involvement of a club.

An early example of a sham is that of Thomas Chaloner's *A True and Exact Relation of the Strange Finding Out of Moses his Tombe*. This work appeared anonymously in December 1656 in London and told the story of the discovery in a valley near Mount Nebo in modern Jordan of the tomb of Moses, the Old Testament patriarch whose last resting place is described in the Bible as unknown. As a text *The Strange Finding Out of Moses his Tombe* had the appearance of authority since it was presented as an account by an English gentleman living in the Middle East and was full of convincing details about the region. The pamphlet details the squabbles between the local Christian communities over who is to have custody of the tomb. The pamphlet records that the Jesuits resolve to steal the body when it is moved and they hire local Druse men to do this for them in order to conceal their intentions, only to discover that the sarcophagus is empty. The different local Christian communities come up with various explanations as to why the body should have disappeared, and it is the suggestion of a local Jewish scholar that prevails. He suggests that this was not the tomb of the real Moses, but of a later Moses, since the name of the real Moses would never have been written on the wall of the tomb. The pamphlet certainly caused a commotion in Puritan England and achieved a strong purchase on the reading public for many reasons which Chaloner (1595-1660) had known how to exploit. In terms of the content of the hoax these included the fictitious arrival of the manuscript from the English merchant who wrote it by way of the established trade routes between Palestine and London, as well as the nefarious behaviour of the Jesuits. The latter was a commonplace among Protestant expectations about the Society of Jesus. In terms of the marketing of the pamphlet in London, it was advertised in *The Publick Intelligencer*, a Government publication, at a time when most printed matter was suppressed. This was a stroke of genius since it gave the pamphlet an air of authority it might not otherwise have had. Once it was revealed as a sham, *The Strange Finding Out of Moses his Tombe* won a mixture of condemnation and respect for Chaloner.<sup>54</sup> This sham was political

---

<sup>54</sup> "Chaloner rejected the complete truthfulness hailed in a gentleman and instead cultivated the reputation of a socially adept wit who possessed a superior command of rhetoric, knowledge and information networks" (Loveman 58).

in character because Chaloner belonged to a group of disaffected Republican freethinkers which had been excluded from Parliament in September 1656. The key to interpreting Chaloner's satirical strategy is that satires of the day referred to Parliamentarians as Jews.<sup>55</sup> So despite the apparent veracity of the pamphlet there was a complex set of encoded associations at work in *Moses his Tombe* which had to be deciphered and interpreted. Once it was revealed as a sham this had the effect of casting into sceptical relief the other beliefs of those who had been taken in by Chaloner's sham.<sup>56</sup>

According to Aubrey, it was Chaloner's habit to go to Parliament Hall and start a rumour in the morning, returning in the afternoon to hear how the story had developed during the intervening period (Aubrey 221). This disposition to disseminating false stories is characteristic of the writers of shams and in this respect Jonathan Swift and John Arbuthnot were no exception. By the time Swift first encountered the practice it was referred to as a "bite". He explains the phenomenon in this passage from a letter written to William Tisdall (1669-1735) on 16 December 1703:

A new-fashion'd way of being witty, and they call it a bite. You must ask a bantering question, or tell some damned lie in a serious manner, and then [Mrs Johnson] will answer or speak as if you were in earnest: and then cry you, 'Madam, there's a bite.' I would not have you undervalue this, for it is the constant amusement in Court, and every where (sic) else among the great people; and I let you know it, in order to have it obtain among you, and teach a new refinement. (l: 40)<sup>57</sup>

The practice of deliberately setting out to deceive at court might at first appear odd. As we shall see shortly the practice had its limitations, but it should be seen against the backdrop of privilege and preferment that informed court life. How did such privilege and preferment work in practice? A potent example which is of considerable relevance to any study of the Scriblerians is that of the fate of Robert Harley, the Earl of Oxford. At the court of Queen Anne, where Swift, Arbuthnot and the other Scriblerians had their season of preferment, it

---

<sup>55</sup> "It was an established satiric trope to describe Parliamentarians and their sympathisers as Jews, ridiculing their covenants, patriarchs, synagogues and, of course, their rabbis" (Loveman 56).

<sup>56</sup> "Once the pamphlet was recognised as a deception, it was the English Protestants who replaced the Jesuits as the principal objects of satire. The depiction of the several religious groups in the Ottoman Empire squabbling over divine truth bore an uncomfortable resemblance to the strife between Protestant denominations under Cromwell. If, as seems likely, the English religious authorities took the pamphlet to be genuine, they exceeded the gullibility of all the religious groups described in *Moses his Tombe*. The Jesuits, Armenians, Greeks, Franciscans and so on, were only represented as credulous; the English divines, in crediting the pamphlet, actually provided evidence of their own foolishness" (Loveman 56).

<sup>57</sup> Swift to William Tisdall, 16 December 1703, in *The Correspondence of Jonathan Swift*, ed. Harold Williams, 5 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963-65), 1: 40.



may come as a surprise to know that the fate of Oxford may have lain in the hands of Lady Masham, the Queen's favourite (1670?-1734).<sup>58</sup> She was related to Oxford, who communicated with the Queen through Lady Masham when he was out of office. By June 1714 Lady Masham was refusing to act as an intermediary between Oxford and Queen Anne (*Correspondence* 175, n. 3). His ministry fell shortly thereafter. Evidently preferment and favour could be withdrawn at any time. It is against this background that a practise such as shamming or biting should be seen. With a constant need to excel or stand out at court to impress by the quickness of one's wit or the elegance of one's deceptions, courtiers would willingly make the use of socially accepted ruses such as the "bite" in order to improve their status. The practice may also have been a safety valve which allowed the preservation of the status quo. However, "biting" had its limits, as we shall now see.

Between 19 September and 5 October 1711 in the *Journal to Stella* Swift mentions a bite that Arbuthnot has pressed upon him which had as its target the maids of honour at Queen Anne's court. In the entry for 19 September 1711 he describes how Arbuthnot gets him to prepare "a sham subscription" for a book entitled *A History of the Maids of Honour since Harry the Eighth*. The book contains a list of all the maids of honour since Henry VIII and shows that they make the best wives. Subscribers are asked to put up one crown by way of subscription with a second crown due on delivery of the book. Since Swift's handwriting is known someone else is enlisted to make a fair copy of the subscription. At this stage Swift is full of enthusiasm for the ruse and says that "If they bite at it, it will be a very good Court jest; and the Queen will certainly have it: we did not tell Mrs Hill." Although Swift is sure the Queen will sign up, he does mention that they do not approach Mrs Hill, as if she would not approve.<sup>59</sup> On 21 September Swift writes that the "maids of honour are bit" and are urging other people to subscribe to it. On 23 September Swift records that he has spoken to the Lord Keeper and the Lord Treasurer about it and says that the "rogue Arbuthnot puts it all upon me." However, by 5 October Swift records he is being chastised by a Mrs Forester over the bite. Swift denies being the originator, as he has done all along in his written account but

---

<sup>58</sup> Originally Abigail Hill, she married Samuel Masham in Arbuthnot's apartments in 1707. Masham was made a baron in December 1711 to swell Harley's majority in the Lords in order to ensure the successful passage of the Peace with France. Lady Masham had won royal favour thanks to the influence of her cousin the Duchess of Marlborough (1660-1744), becoming bedchamber woman to the Queen in around 1704. Lady Masham slowly replaced the Duchess of Marlborough in the Queen's affections.

<sup>59</sup> This is presumably Alice Hill (1685-1762), woman of the bedchamber to the Queen and younger sister to Abigail Hill who became Lady Masham in December 1711.

it is apparent that the hoax has backfired, as Swift observes “for I found they did not relish it altogether well.”<sup>60</sup>

So we see that Swift and Arbuthnot were involved in shamming or biting at court. And it was Swift who had pulled off one of the most celebrated shams, or bites of the new eighteenth century (Loveman 159-60).<sup>61</sup> His target was John Partridge (1644-1715), the Whig and popular astrologer. Swift created a bite that would unfold in stages with the publication of more than one pamphlet. This was a new development in the literary bite. Chaloners pamphlet had done its work as a single publication, but the Bickerstaff hoax was more complex, involving a series of publications and so Swift developed the genre into something more sophisticated. Firstly, some words of introduction about Swift’s target are necessary. Partridge had begun publishing a regular almanac in 1681 and settled on the title *Merlinus liberatus* from 1690 onwards. In exile in Holland, he came back to England with the forces of William of Orange in November 1688 and attended the coronation of William and Mary. On account of Partridge’s predictions for 1687 and 1688, selections were published in London under the title of *Annus Mirabilis* in 1689: *Annus Mirabilis or Strange and Wonderful Predictions and Observations gathered out of Mr. J. Partridge’s Almanac 1688. With some Remarks also, out of his Almanack 1687*. He appears to forecast the accession of Mary to the British throne and the ousting of James II in the following passage from the prediction for November 1688:

This month begins with two remarkable Aspects the first is the *sextile* of the *Sun* and *Jupiter*; this shews that there is a *very great Lady* in *Europe*, that will shortly *Ascend to a very great degree of Honour and Grandeur*, and *Long may she enjoy it with peace and plenty*; it is the Effects of her

---

<sup>60</sup> The complete passage reads as follows. Swift writes to Stella:

1711, September 19. “Arbuthnot made me draw up a sham subscription for a book called A History of the Maids of Honour since Harry the Eighth, showing they made the best wives, with a list of all the maids of honour since, etc.; to pay a crown in hand, and the other crown upon delivery of the book; and all in common forms of those things. We got a gentleman to write it fair, because my hand is known; and we sent it to the maids of honour, when they came to supper. If they bite at it, it will be a very good Court jest; and the Queen will certainly have it: we did not tell Mrs Hill.”

Sept. 21. “The maids of honour are bit, and have all contributed their crowns, and are teasing others to subscribe for the book. I will tell Lord Keeper and Lord Treasurer tomorrow; and I believe the Queen will have it.”

Sept. 23. “I was to see Lord Keeper this morning, and told him the jest of the maids of honour; and Lord Treasurer had it last night. The rogue Arbuthnot puts it all upon me.”

Oct. 5. “Mrs. Forester taxed me yesterday about the *History of the Maids of Honour*; but I told her fairly it was no jest of mine; for I found they did not relish it altogether well” (qtd in *A Miscellany of the Wits*, xxiii-xxiv).

<sup>61</sup> For the texts of the Bickerstaff pamphlets, see Swift, *Parodies*.

*Midheaven to the body of the Moon and Sextile of Venus, the Trine of Jupiter not being far of: the second is the Conjunction of Saturn and Mars on the place of the Last Eclipse; This shews the ruin and destruction of many men that a few Months ago did little think thereof, and these, men of no small quality; it falls in Scorpio the dignity of Mars and a fixt Sign, and will be therefore both violent and durable: Let them look to the Consequence thereof. These two Aspects would take up a whole treatise to Explain them, but I am Confin'd to a small space of Paper, and I need not tell you any more Effects of this Month, for these very actions will drown all other affairs. God keep all quiet at home. (17-18)*

This passage conveys the tone and style of Partridge's writing, although elsewhere in his work he includes more astrological detail on the aspects of the planets. For example, in the entry for April Partridge writes: "From the *opposition* of the *Sun* and *Saturn* at the end of last month you may expect more *changes* and *turnings* among those called *Ministers of State* . . . *Mars* now in *Gemini* puts the *City of London* in fear, and there is good ground for it too" (12-13). So, from these examples it is apparent that Partridge bases his written predictions firmly on astrological conjunctions and spells out the possible results of those conjunctions in human terms.

Of Swift's Bickerstaff papers, the first appeared in February 1708. This was the pamphlet *Predictions for the Year 1708: Wherein the Month and Day of the Month are Set Down, the Persons Named, and the Great Actions and Events of Next Year Particularly Related, as They Will Come to Pass. Written to Prevent the People of England from Being Further Impos'd on by Vulgar Almanac-Makers*, attributed to Isaac Bickerstaff. The pamphlet accuses contemporary astrologers of introducing a lot of nonsense into their publications (43). He also berates them for writing in such general terms that what they predict is almost bound to happen (43). He also criticizes their poor grasp of the English Language (45). He sets out the parameters of what he is willing to predict, saying he is unwilling to disclose "Secrets of State" (47). However, he is willing to forecast events abroad, namely "in France, Flanders, Italy and Spain" and will use the Julian calendar to do so, allowing his readers to compare real events as they occur and are reported in English newspapers. Most of the pamphlet is taken up with forecasting the deaths of members of the French and Spanish royal families, such as Louis XIV (1638-1715), Louis the Grand Dauphin (1661-1711) and Luis, Prince of Asturias (1707-24), as well as military figures such as the Cardinal de Noailles (1651-1729). But Swift opens with his principal prediction, that John Partridge will die on 29 March 1708. In fact, the death of Partridge and the decimation of the French royal family were two postulates linked by Swift's political orientation as a Tory. The whole Bickerstaff adventure

was politically motivated on Swift's part. In this pamphlet he masters the language of prognostication well and turns this to his own political ends, interspersing specific predictions of the death of Louis XIV and Louis the Grand Dauphin with forecasts such as the following: "JULY. The 6<sup>th</sup> of this Month, a *certain General* will, by a Glorious Action recover the Reputation he lost by former Misfortunes" (52). The point of forecasting death and unrest in France is to question the Whig resolve to remain at war with the French and their allies. Swift also makes use of Virgilian augury, whereby to cast the oracle one opens an edition of Virgil at random. He also mentions the possibility of publishing his work in Holland in Latin in order to address a learned audience. This is a backhanded reference to the fact that Partridge did publish contentious material there when he was exiled under the rule of James II.

Bickerstaff introduces his own astrological system which he says will reveal the spurious nature of the predictions in popular almanacs. Having forecast the death of Partridge on 29 March at 11pm, he subsequently reports this prediction as fulfilled in the second pamphlet in the sequence, *The Accomplishment of the First of Mr Bickerstaff's Predictions. Being an Account of the Death of Mr. Partridge, the Almanac-maker, upon the 29<sup>th</sup> inst, in a Letter to a Person of Honour*. The timing of the publication just before April Fools' Day has been well noted (Mayhew 1964: 270-80). Finally, the pamphlet which closes the sequence is *A Vindication of Isaac Bickerstaff Esq; Against What is Objected to Him by Mr Partridge, in his Almanack for the Present Year 1709. By the said Isaac Bickerstaff Esq*. All the Bickerstaff papers except the last were published in 1708, the last in 1709. Swift is making use of the almanac and pamphlet formats in the Bickerstaff papers and so at first sight it is surprising that he writes with such finesse. And by spreading the hoax across three pamphlets, he also gives himself the opportunity to present three different perspectives. He is also able to vary the tone of his attack on Partridge. In the first one he adopts a combative stance, arguing that Partridge is among those who import "Nonsense, Lies, Folly and Impertinence" from the stars (43). In the second, *The Accomplishment of the First of Mr. Bickerstaff's Predictions*, Partridge appears in a cameo in which he speaks to the author, a former civil servant writing to commission about Partridge's death. He is portrayed as a lowly shoemaker. In words put into his mouth by Swift he says: "I am a Poor Ignorant Fellow, Bred to a Mean Trade" (63). He defers to his superiors: "because the Wise and the Learned, who can only know whether there be any Truth in this Science, do all unanimously agree to laugh at and despise it" (63). As Valerie Rumbold points out in a footnote to this passage, the real Partridge as a matter of course wrote about the workings of astrology and astrological interpretations (63, n. 10). So Swift's characterization of Partridge is a vast oversimplification

and an example of reductive satire. In the third Bickerstaff paper, *A Vindication of Isaac Bickerstaff Esq.*, Swift moves Bickerstaff's stance markedly upwards in terms of cultural discourse. Bickerstaff has received scholarly correspondence from overseas in praise of his astrology (68). This includes three letters from the German philosopher Leibnitz (1646-1716). When he turns this higher level of cultural discourse on Partridge, surely the intention is ironic. Bickerstaff reproaches Partridge's acerbic tone towards him in the following terms: "Such Usage is very Undecent from *one Gentleman to another*" (67). Similarly, Bickerstaff reproaches Partridge for not contributing "to the Discovery of Truth, which ought to be the great End in all Disputes of the *Learned*" (67).

The main purpose of the *Vindication* is to show how it is that Partridge is dead, given that a number of factors indicate the contrary. Forecasting Partridge's death was also the main purpose of publishing the *Predictions for the Year 1708*. At the heart of the Bickerstaff hoax lies the following statement, which is attributed to those gentlemen who have bought Partridge's almanac in order to read what he says about Bickerstaff: "*They were sure no Man alive ever writ such damn'd Stuff as this*" (71). Another ingenious argument concerns how Partridge can continue to publish his almanac if he is dead. Bickerstaff cleverly points out that a number of almanacs continue to appear under the names of their founders, "tho' several of them have been dead since before the Revolution" (73). The principle example of this is John Gadbury (1627-1704). Gadbury's death in 1704 gives the lie to Bickerstaff's assertion, but his almanac had certainly appeared after his death. All in all, Swift's sham was a tremendous success as a piece of satire, although it has been argued that it had no effect on the sales of the astrologer's almanacs, while acknowledging that it marked the end of the pursuit of and interest in astrology among the middle and upper classes. Swift's technique is blunt. He grants Bickerstaff a new system of divination and then predicts the death of his satirical target. When his satirical target responds in the flesh to the effect that he is not dead, Swift provides the humorous twist to his undertaking that no man alive could write such nonsense as that attributed to Bickerstaff. Swift's technique culminates in the imaginary elimination of his satirical target, parodying the predictions of death commonly made by astrologers.

All of this suggests that it was largely Swift's doing that Pope's original proposal gave way to the Scriblerian satirical programme. There are resemblances between the Bickerstaff bite and the shape of the Scriblerus project in that it made use of separate publications to achieve an overall effect. April Fools' Day also plays its part in the *Memoirs*, being a day on which Martinus, while still in his mother's womb, "was observed to leap and kick exceedingly"

(97). The Scriblerus project represents a further advance over the Bickerstaff papers in that the shorter pieces attributed to Martinus Scriblerus were intended to establish the case for his existence, prior to the appearance of the *Memoirs*, as well as being parodic in themselves. Ironically, it was the more partisan Martinus Scriblerus of the *Dunciad Variorum* who became better known first with the publication of that work in 1729, before the *Memoirs* appeared in 1741, representing a return to the kind of satire Pope had originally envisaged in *The Works of the Unlearned*.

My own reconstruction of what the intention was which lay behind configuring the *Memoirs* as a sham is as follows. Had they been completed and published in the 1710s as was originally intended, the *Memoirs* would have been received initially at face value, as the portrait of a Modern critic and philosopher. Appreciated as a Modern with a somewhat eccentric father who is an Ancient, eventually something would have triggered the insight that the *Memoirs* were a sham. A revaluation of the work would have followed and a more critical relationship with it would have resulted. The main consequence of this would have been the realization that there was no real Martinus Scriblerus, nor was there any real Cornelius Scriblerus and that the characters which readers had taken at face value were in fact the subject of some criticism from within the work. Then the *Memoirs* would have been perceived as a satirical portrait of a Modern virtuoso and critic whose eccentricities derived from the educational programme of his father.

Turning to the five characteristics of shams mentioned above, how does the Scriblerus project fare? The effect of the sham did perhaps lose something in timeliness due to the delay in publishing the *Memoirs*. The name Martin Scriblerus began to appear in print from 1729 onwards with the publication of *The Dunciad Variorum* and the Swift-Pope *Miscellanies* with the *Memoirs* finally appearing in 1741. The work certainly demonstrated the abilities of Arbuthnot and Pope to their readership. While not explicitly political in character, the general outlook of the Scriblerians was a conservative one. More importantly here, the aim of the sham was to get the reading public to engage with Martin as a virtuoso and a textual critic, not subjects which were always first and foremost in readers' minds. A reading of the *Memoirs* was certainly intended to rob the contemporary figure of the virtuoso of his credibility, in both his actions and words. The fifth characteristic of a sham is that it may have involved the participation of a club. In this case there is no doubt that it was the great invention of the Scriblerus Club.

It is the idea that a sham tended to undermine the authority of the texts it resembled which would have been the most important; not only the texts, in the case of the *Memoirs*,

but also the individuals targeted in the satire. The Scriblerians did not approve of the activities of the antiquarians and Chapter Three with the entertaining story of Cornelius's shield might have been read the first time as the comic account of Martinus's christening, but once it had been appreciated that it was part of a larger sham, readers would have gone back to it to read it as a criticism of the antiquarian and his preoccupation with rust. Cornelius's shield is sold to Dr Woodward, who in real life was the protagonist of the story and the advocate of his shield's ancient credentials. In Chapter Ten, which continues Martin's study of physic, we learn that he has stopped studying physical conditions in order to concentrate on diseases of the mind, particularly after a series of induced vomits, which were administered by Dr Woodward and which lasted a year. Woodward was a substantial target for the Scriblerians, as we shall see in the next chapter. It is where Martin is portrayed in the *Memoirs* as displaying curiosity that would have reflected badly on him. The way in which he relates to other people, and women in particular, shows his unworldliness in a comical and disastrous light. The story of the pomegranate on the inner thigh of the woman in Madrid shows him taking curiosity much too far, and the same can be said of his marriage to Lindamira.

If this was the Scriblerian macrocosm, let us now turn to the Scriblerian microcosm in the form of one of the occasional works attributed to Martinus Scriblerus to see what it can tell us about Scriblerian satire.

#### 6.2.5. *Annus Mirabilis as a Sham and a Parody*

Let us now turn to *Annus Mirabilis: Or, The Wonderful Effects of the approaching Conjunction of the Planets Jupiter, Mars, and Saturn*. This text is ascribed to Arbuthnot and was published twice in pamphlet form in the early 1720s. It appeared as a half-folio pamphlet in London in 1722 with the author given as Abraham Gunter, who was described as a "Philomath and a Well-Wisher to the Mathematicks," as well as in Dublin in 1722-3, where the edition was in quarto with the text arranged in two columns on each page. In both of these editions it had the appearance of any pamphlet concerned with astrology. It was therefore a sham very much along the lines of Chaloner's *The Strange Finding Out of Moses his Tombe*. It was first collected with textual differences in the third volume of the Jonathan Swift and Alexander Pope *Miscellanies*, first published in 1732. There *Annus Mirabilis* was claimed for Martinus Scriblerus, appearing alongside two other works attributed to him. The first of these was *An Essay of the Learned Martinus Scriblerus, Concerning the Origine of the Sciences. Written to the most Learned Dr. ----- F.R.S. from the Deserts of Nubia*; the second is

the sham proposal for textual improvements to Virgil's Aeneid, entitled *Virgilius Restauratus: Seu Martini Scribleri Summi Critici Castigationum in Aeneidem Specimen*. Both are entries in Scriblerus's bibliography to which I shall return later.

To Martinus Scriblerus as an author, the Scriblerians could attribute works on any subject they wished to satirize. On the one hand this was in line with their characterization of the younger Scriblerus as a misguided virtuoso and pedant, but the aim was also to undermine the credibility of their chosen satirical target, which in this case is astrology. And beyond the construction of the sham, the literary means chosen in the shorter pieces is parody. Turning to Margaret A. Rose's definition, "parody may be defined in general terms as the comic refunctioning of preformed linguistic or artistic material" where "refunctioning" refers "to the new set of functions given to parodied material in the parody and may also entail some criticism of the parodied work" (52). In the case of *Annus Mirabilis* we are talking about a general parody, since Arbuthnot had in mind the entire class of astrological pamphlets, rather than any one specific pamphlet. This can be contrasted with *The Origine of Sciences*, which is a specific parody of an essay by John Woodward. The satirical technique in the case of *Annus Mirabilis* consists in the construction of a piece of writing forecasting a miraculous transformation in line with the stars. While it is a sham, the sham is arguably exploded fairly early on because of the absurdity of the central tenet, that at an appointed moment all men will turn into women and vice versa. Clearly the intention is to undermine the credibility of astrology, the satirical target, while also revelling in the comic potential of the idea.

Before looking at the text in detail, let us review the topos of the *Annus Mirabilis* in the literature of prognostication and astrology. It is this which provides Arbuthnot's pretext. The title *Annus Mirabilis* was familiar to seventeenth- and eighteenth-century readers as a title of records of omens and almanacs. In 1661 a work was published which had the two words in the title but in reverse order: *Eniaytos terastios Mirabilis Annus, or, The Year of Prodigies and Wonders, Being a Faithful and Impartial Collection of Severall Signs That Have Been Seen in the Heavens, in the Earth, and in the Waters, together with Many Remarkable Accidents, and Judgements Befalling Divers Persons, According as They Have Been Testified by Very Credible Hands, all which Have Happened within the Space of One Year Last Past, and Are now Made Publick for a Seasonable Warning to the People of these Three Kingdoms Speedily to Repent and Turn to the Lord, whose Hand is Lifted up amongst Us*. This lengthy title encapsulates the aim of the work, to provide anecdotal evidence of prodigies and apparitions, as well as strange and unusual accidents with a view to rallying the reader in his



Christianity. A late work of the Puritan Interregnum, it is markedly anti-Catholic in sentiment. In the preface the authors state that they will not “apply Prodigies to particular Persons” but allow that “the raining of blood may signifie much slaughter, the noise of Guns and the apparition of Armies in the Air, Wars and Commotion.” Not a work of astrology, it is fascinating to read how the portents described are yoked to nadirs for the Protestant faith. At the very beginning of the work are listed examples of sighting two suns in the sky, something said to occur when strife and bloodshed is at hand. Among the few examples given are “two Suns seen in England at one time . . . in the beginning of Queen Marie’s reign” (1), as well as several seen near Prague around the time of the persecution of Protestants by the Catholics (1). Other examples are a rainbow seen at night, multiple moons (5) and a dark cloud out of which came a sword “which grew bigger and bigger, till it came to the exact form of a Steeple” (34). The part of the work dealing with prodigies and apparitions seen in the heavens consists of a mixture of anecdote and precedent, as well as interpretation of the phenomena in question.

The most consulted astrologer of the Puritan interregnum was William Lilly (1602-81), whom we have previously encountered as a possible model for Sidrophel the astrologer in Samuel Butler’s *Hudibras*. Lilly regularly published his *Merlini Anglici Ephemeris, or Astrological Judgements for the Year* between 1647 and 1685. Lilly did publish an *Annus tenebrosus, or, The Dark Year, or Astrological Judgements upon Two Lunar Eclipses, and One Admirable Eclips [sic] of the Sun, All Visible in England, 1652*, but I have found no mention of the *annus mirabilis* among his work. The best-known astrologer after Lilly was probably John Partridge, whom we have already encountered earlier in this chapter.

In the Scriblerian *Annus Mirabilis: Or, The Wonderful Effects of the approaching Conjunction of the Planets Jupiter, Mars, and Saturn*, the approach to astrology is strongly parodic.<sup>62</sup> In the Swift-Pope *Miscellanies* the text is attributed to Martinus Scriblerus, who is further described as a Philomath and “A Well-Wisher to the Mathematicks”. The pamphlet begins as follows:

I suppose every Body is sufficiently appriz’d of, and duly prepar’d for the famous Conjunction to be celebrated the 29<sup>th</sup> of this Instant *December*, 1722, foretold by all the Sages of Antiquity, under the Name of the *Annus Mirabilis*, or the *Metamorphostical* Conjunction; a Word which denotes the mutual Transformation of Sexes, (the Effect of that Configuration of the Celestial Bodies) the human Males being to be turn’d into Females, and the human Females into Males. (85-6)

---

<sup>62</sup> I refer to the text in the Swift-Pope *Miscellanies*, vol. 3 (London, 1727-32).

This is about as much astrology as is to be found in the piece, which is largely taken up with the humorous development of the idea of “human Males being to be turn’d into Females, and the human Females into Males” (86). “Metamorphostical” is surely a humorous coinage by Arbuthnot.<sup>63</sup> The *Annus Mirabilis* is an exuberantly narrated and comic treatment of the central idea which refers to a number of contemporary phenomena, ranging from the celebrated castrato singer Senesino to the Calico Act of 1721 and the standing armies of Europe. The “Metamorphostical Conjunction” is expected on 29 December 1722 and this is the year commentators give as the year in which the piece was written. The signal for the transformation is to be given by the Italian alto castrato Senesino – spelled Senezino in *Annus Mirabilis* – whose real name was Francesco Bernardi and whose stage name came from his birthplace of Siena. In the early 1720s, Handel brought him to London where Senesino was a highly successful and very well remunerated performer for whom Handel wrote several leading roles.<sup>64</sup> His part in the great transformation will be the following: “Accordingly, about Eight at Night, as *Senezino* shall begin at the opera, *Si videte, Did you but see?* He shall be observ’d to make an *unusual Motion*; upon which the Audience will be affected with a *red Suffusion* over their Countenance” (89). The significance of making Senesino the agency of the transformation is that the opera of the day, of which he was an important part, was the place where the upper echelons of society gathered in public.

The pamphlet contains another authorial gambit. So many “*untouch’d Virgins*” will be created at the Opera that “the Impatience and Curiosity of People to act in their new Capacity” will result in immediate disaster (89-90). Scriblerus sounds a cautionary authorial note: “To prevent the Disorders that may happen upon this Occasion, is the chief Design of this Paper” (90). More contemporary detail can be found in *Annus Mirabilis* in the two references to the Calico Act of 1721. 1690 had seen the first Calico Act passed, the aim of which was to stop the importation from India of calico – a sort of plain white or unbleached cotton cloth – and to foster the domestic British industries producing wool and silk. The 1721 Act was more severe, banning the sale of most cotton: “That the Ministry foresaw this great Change, is plain from the *Callico-Act*; whereby it is now become the Occupation of the Women all over *England*, to convert their useless Female Habits into Beds, Window-Curtains, Chairs, and Joint-stools; *undressing* themselves (as it were) *before their Transformation*” (87).

---

<sup>63</sup> No other example of the word is recorded in the OED.

<sup>64</sup> Arbuthnot was a friend and patron to Handel, who was often at Arbuthnot’s lodgings in 1713 as the composer made the transition from living in Hanover to London (Arbuthnot, *Correspondence* 521).

This is sophisticated satirical writing which draws on contemporary legislation to provide narrative detail in order to lend verisimilitude to a quite impossible concept.

Arbuthnot clearly had a great deal of fun when he wrote this pamphlet, exploring many aspects of the idea that men and women might exchange sexes. One result of the impending transformation is that men have begun to try to persuade women to have sexual relations with them (90). The argument continues to the effect that women who become pregnant will be exempt from transformation until “their lying-in” (90). And what a melancholy thing it will be to give birth to “a posthumous Bastard as it were, to which the *Quondam* Father can be no more than a *dry Nurse*” (90). And this gives rise to the following: “This wonderful Transformation is the Instrument of Nature, to balance Matters between the sexes. The Cruelty of scornful Mistresses shall be return’d; The slighted Maid shall grow into an imperious Gallant, and reward her Undoer with a big Belly, and a Bastard, &c.” (91). He foresees “Disorders amongst Friars and Monks” as vows of chastity only obtain on the sex in which they were made (91). The Pope “must undergo a new groping” (92). Humour with the swapping of sexes urges “the many Fellows, and giggling Girls about Town” not to overreact when they visit “a *General Lying-in* of his first Child; his Officers serving as Midwives, Nurses and Rockers dispensing Caudle” (92). The maids of honour are urged: “do not run wild through all the infamous Houses about Town” (92).

That familiar target of the Scriblerians, war, is also present. The impending transformation will remove the threat of the substantial number of standing forces in Europe:

There are in *Europe* alone, at present, about a Million of sturdy Fellows, under the Denomination of *standing Forces*, with Arms in their Hands: That those are Masters of the Lives, Liberties and Fortunes of all the rest, I believe no body will deny . . . Pray, who is he that will say unto them, *Go and disband your selves?* But lo! By this Transformation it is done at once, and the *Halcyon* Days of publick Tranquility return. (95-6)

The pamphlet closes with the following statement: “That the Ladies may govern the Affairs of the World, and the Gentlemen those of their Houshold, better than either of them have hitherto done, is the hearty desire of, Their Most Sincere Well-Wisher, M.S.” (96-7). The pamphlet as a whole contains a great deal of comic invention in exchanging the roles of the sexes and closes with the ironic hope that women will do better what men have always done and vice versa. Yvonne Noble suggests that one possible significance of Senesino’s performance being on 29 December is that this was when the first revival of the opera *Crispo*, composed by Giovanni Bononcini (1670-1747) and the librettist Paolo Antonio Rolli (1687-1765) was scheduled and Arbuthnot was lending a hand to promote it. For *Annus Mirabilis* to

appear as an astrological pamphlet, when in fact it is a kind of publicity for a performance of an opera, fits with the genre of the sham. Once the sham is exploded, it reflects ironically on the genre of the astrological pamphlet, resulting in diminished credibility for that type of publication. This is a familiar Scriblerian strategy which is discernible as much in the *Memoirs* as in any of the other shorter Scriblerian pieces.

#### 6.2.6. *Scriblerian Satire*

The Scriblerian contribution to satire on the New Learning was a particularly original one. At its heart lies the art of literary ventriloquism.

[Passage omitted]

#### 6.2.7. *The Quixotic Character of the Memoirs*

The Quixotic had been available to English writers as a resource since the early part of the 17<sup>th</sup> century, when Cervantes's novel was first translated into English. For anyone intending to write a satire on reading or knowledge, it was a natural influence to draw upon. Warburton (1698-1779) described his first encounter with the *Memoirs* in the following terms: "a pleasant Drole History in imitation of Don Quixote & Sancho to ridicule all false Learning" (qtd. in *Memoirs* 68).

[Passage

omitted]

## CHAPTER SEVEN. JOHN WOODWARD: THE COMPLETE SCRIBLERIAN VIRTUOSO

This great variety of pursuits, and the number of books written by him, with his large correspondence both at home and abroad, engaged (sic) him in so constant application to his studies, as necessarily employed all his leisure hours, and was continued in some measure almost to the last moments of his life.

John Ward, *The Lives of the Professors of Gresham College* (1740), 301.

The description of John Woodward's interests in the epigraph above conveys the diversity of his activities as a virtuoso as well as their place in his life. The account by John Ward (c. 1679-1758) of Woodward's life provides an even-handed overview of the highlights of Woodward's career both as a virtuoso and as a doctor of medicine, as well as documenting some of the more serious polemic against his work. I shall provide a summary here of Ward's account in order to introduce Woodward's concerns and expand on them later in relation to the polemical, and in particular the satirical responses they attracted. Ward foregrounds the three mainstays of Woodward's career. He begins with the virtuoso's interest in fossils and describes the polemic resulting from *An Essay Toward a Natural History of the Earth*, which was published in 1695. A Latin translation appeared in 1704 and as a result the philosopher Leibnitz began a polemical correspondence with Woodward. Then, Woodward's interest in antiquarianism, which was considerable, is represented by an account of "a small, but very curious iron shield" which Woodward thought was Roman (290).<sup>65</sup> The shield was the subject of much curiosity on the part of the virtuosi and Woodward had several casts and an engraving made to disseminate its image. The scholar Henry Dodwell (1641-1716) wrote a lengthy

---

<sup>65</sup> "The form of it is round; and on the concave side is represented in the upper part the ruins of Rome, when burnt by the Gauls; and below, the weighing out the gold to purchase their retreat, with the arrival of Camillus, and flight of the Gauls; and in the center is a grotesque mask with horns, very large and very prominent. The figures are all chased in a very lively and beautiful manner" (Ward 290).

Latin dissertation on it, entitled *De Parma Equestri Woodwardiana Dissertatio*, which was finished by the librarian and scholar Thomas Hearne (*bap.* 1678-1735) and published in 1713. In Woodward's lifetime it was regarded by many of those who thought it genuine as a votive shield. The third highlight of Woodward's career was his role in the dispute which began in 1717 about the treatment of smallpox. The argument was over the correct treatment of the disease. Woodward proposed the inducement of vomiting, while his opponent Dr Freind (1675-1728) was in favour of purging. This gave rise to some anonymous pamphlets, some attributed spuriously to Dr Arbuthnot. Woodward had become a satirical target during his own lifetime. Indeed, it is more as the subject of this satire than for his own work and achievements that he is now remembered. While it is true that the Scriblerians targeted the virtuosi in general, Woodward was a specific target of their satire on more than one occasion and so it is appropriate to focus here on the reception of Woodward among the Scriblerians and elsewhere.

The satirical reception of Dr Woodward represents an interesting case, since what resulted from it was essentially writing which was personal in nature. One might characterize this type of satire conservatively as *ad hominem*. Dr Woodward was not liked. Dr Woodward was thought to prefer same-sex relationships. Ridiculous stories were told about him. Many mirrors hung in his rooms at Gresham House, an unusual feature redolent of vanity and self-absorption (Uffenbach 178). And so in discussing any satire written about him it is necessary to bear in mind the distinction between satire and lampoon as it developed in the first half of the eighteenth century, since one or two of the texts I will look at in this chapter are regarded as lampoons. Satire was broadly regarded as harsh in tone, general in nature with the aim of reforming its subject. Lampoons were regarded as personal, vindictive and scurrilous. Satire brought mankind into disrepute with a view to reforming it. Lampoons openly abused someone with a view to destroying their reputation. It is necessary in particular to bear these distinctions in mind when assessing the relative worth of two works sometimes attributed to Dr Arbuthnot, namely *The Life and Adventures of Don Bilioso de l'Estomac* (1719) (which is also sometimes attributed to Dr Richard Mead (1673-1754)) and *An Account of the Sickness and Death of Dr. W---dw---rd; And also of what appeared upon opening his body* (1719) and indeed the Scriblerian play *Three Hours after Marriage* (1717). Lampoons were regarded as a lower order of writing, beyond the pale of the moral improvement, or at least the change in behaviour, sought from a particular group which had become a satirical butt.

## 7.1. A WOODWARDIAN PRELUDE

John Woodward (1665/8-1728) was in his lifetime one of the best-known virtuosi of the later 17th-century and the early 18th-century. This was to a certain extent for the wrong reasons, largely to do with his difficult personality.<sup>66</sup> His interests, as we have already noted, were wide-ranging. He was well known as a collector of fossils, as an antiquarian and professionally as a doctor of medicine. Appointed as Gresham Professor of Physic in 1692, a position he held until his death, he clearly commanded professional respect. As a virtuoso he attracted much satirical writing, as well as the animosity of his fellow members of the Royal Society and in the medical profession. It will become apparent in due course how he contrived to lose that respect for himself and how he became something of a paradigm in the satirical treatment of the virtuoso. The historian Joseph M. Levine has been largely responsible for restoring Woodward to view (Levine 1991).

In 1695 Woodward published his first substantial work. This was *An Essay Toward a Natural History of the Earth: and Terrestrial Bodies, especially Minerals; as also of the Sea, Rivers, and Springs, with an Account of the Universal Deluge, and of the Effects that it had upon the Earth*. This was a grand, general and ambitious title. Woodward intended to follow the work with a larger one on the same subject, but this work was never to appear. The writing of the book arose out of a specific problem. Woodward was interested in stones and while on a dig in Sherborne he discovered that shellfish were lodged in the rock there and that there were large deposits of shells in the fields nearby. For Woodward this represented an intellectual challenge. It was as a result of this discovery, Levine observes, that Woodward “became an acknowledged authority in the incipient sciences of geology and palaeontology, an expert on fossils or ‘formed stones’” (24). His research question was the following. How could the shellfish have made their way from the sea to Sherborne and furthermore how could their presence *inside* the rock be explained? The explanation for the phenomenon generally accepted before Woodward’s intervention was that the seashells were so-called *lusus naturae* (sports of nature) (Levine 24). But this was not sufficient for Woodward, who set about creating his

---

<sup>66</sup> In a letter to Richard Richardson dated 12 February 1703, William Vernon wrote of a visit to London “where I’ve met with every body very diligent in carrying on Naturall Philosophy. I’ve been with them all, except Woodward, who is fatally, by his proud and haughty behaviour, abandon’d and laugh’d at by all” (qtd in Beattie 214).

own explanation of the phenomenon, based on an idiosyncratic explanation of the occurrence of the “Universal Deluge” or flood.

In Woodward’s account of the deluge, he explains the phenomenon as being the result of the combination of the waters of the oceans and the water of what he calls “the Abyss” (117). He asserts that there is “a mighty *Collection of Water* inclosed in the *Bowels of the Earth*” and that this is the same “which Moses calls the Great Deep, or *Abyss*: the ancient Gentile Writers, *Erebus*, and *Tartarus*” (117). At the time of the Flood Woodward reckoned that all stone, marble, metals, minerals and fossils were completely dissolved and everything was mixed up together in the waters of the ocean and the abyss, making “one common confused Mass” (75). The seashells – or what Woodward called “Marine Bodies” — would have been projected by the water into the mass at this point. There then followed a precipitation and subsidence of the mass “according to the Laws of Gravity” (75). The result was a series of strata one on top of the other, covered with “the whole Mass of the Water . . . [which] constituted a fluid Sphere environing the Globe” (79-80). After a while these strata were broken by some unspecified force, which Woodward only describes as “seated *within* the Earth” (80). The result was the earth as we now know it. Concerning the seashells, Woodward insists: “. . . by a deliberate and careful Examination of all Circumstances of these Marine Bodies, I was abundantly convinced that they could not have come into those Circumstances by any other means than such a Dissolution of the Earth, and Confusion of things” (82). Among the strata, the heavier seashells were to be found lower down in the earth, while the lighter ones were located nearer the surface. While ingenious, Woodward’s account, which is really a hypothesis, has the obvious shortcoming that the seashells remain intact at the time of the deluge, while all other matter is dissolved. The theory is in effect constructed around the seashells, rather than being formulated entirely from first principles.

Woodward’s essay created a controversy not solely based on the natural processes he described. He described the shortcomings of his rivals in the field as the result of “slothfulness”. There was also an insistence on the correctness of his argument that others took for arrogance. One of the written responses to Woodward’s essay was by John Arbuthnot, published in 1697. It was entitled *An Examination of Dr. Woodward’s Account of the Deluge, &c. With a Comparison between Steno’s Philosophy and the Doctor’s, in the Case of Marine Bodies dug out of the Earth*. Arbuthnot is writing here not as a satirist but as a virtuoso himself. He draws attention to those elements of Woodward’s system which are not fully explained and focuses on what he sees as



deficiencies in Woodward's argument. For example, Arbuthnot speculates on the force which came from within the earth to create irregularities in the strata. What was it? Here is Arbuthnot interrogating Woodward's system:

What brought the Water of the Abyss upon the Surface of the Globe?  
What succeeded in its room? What dissolv'd the Fossils? And at the same  
time spared the Animal and Vegetable Substances? What stopt the  
precipitated Matter in the Descent, so that it did not fill up the Cavity of  
the great Abyss? By what means the *Strata* attain'd their Solidity so soon  
as the Matter whereof they consisted, was arriv'd at the Bottom? What  
effected the Disruption of the *Strata*? (8)

Arbuthnot argues that the alterations to the earth described by Woodward appear "above the Power and contrary to the Laws of Nature" (8). He sees a considerable problem in explaining how the water contained in the Abyss reaches the surface of the earth, since this would be contrary to its natural gravity. Arbuthnot's explanation is "Pulsion or Attraction." Arbuthnot also highlights Woodward's lack of explanation of what it was that descended "into the Cavity of the great Abyss". Arbuthnot thinks it is air but notes Woodward's silence on this point. Woodward's "next Miracle" is "the Dissolution of all Solids . . . into their *constituent Parts*" with the exception of vegetable and animal substances (10). It is worth quoting Arbuthnot in full here:

. . . of this the Doctor says he will assign a plain Physical reason. I must  
beg his pardon if I think it cannot be very plain. I will not trouble myself  
any more with guessing, but this I know, if any Man besides the Doctor  
should have pretended to such a Secret, it would have found the same  
Credit as the Philosophers Stone, Circular Shot, *Perpetuum Mobile*, or  
some such *Chimera*. (10)

The closing words here anticipate the *Memoirs* of Scriblerus in their dismissal of some of the *idées fixes* of antiquity.

When Arbuthnot summarizes his position at the end of *An Examination of Dr. Woodward's Account of the Deluge* it is to say that he sees his work here as corrective: "I cannot forbear to wish that People were more diligent in observing, and more cautious in system-making" (62). Towards the end of the work he writes: "Yea, some there are so fond of an Opinion, that they will take pleasure to cheat themselves and would bring every thing to fit their darling Hypothesis," which fits Woodward's account well (63). In the essay Arbuthnot opposes Woodward with the rational arguments of a fellow virtuoso rather than with parody or satire. He is able to assimilate, review and find wanting the system put forward by his fellow virtuoso Woodward. The piece is squarely attributed to Arbuthnot, but it is noteworthy that rather than being driven to write it on his own

account he had “at last been prevailed upon” to share his thoughts, as Wotton puts it in his appendix to *An Examination* (65). It is a work of natural philosophy rather than of imaginative literature, yet it is doubly interesting for being written in opposition to a position espoused by Woodward. This sets a pattern which is repeated later by the Scriblerians after Arbuthnot takes up the tools of satire and results in the account of Cornelius’s shield in the *Memoirs of Scriblerus*, as well as other satirical gestures aimed at Woodward.

#### 7.2. WOODWARD THE ANTIQUARIAN: THE SHIELD OF CORNELIUS SCRIBLERUS

As we have already seen from my summary above of Woodward’s entry in Ward’s *The Lives of the Professors of Gresham College*, he was well known in particular for owning a Roman shield which became the focus of considerable debate concerning its authenticity. Levine narrates the story of the shield at some length (Levine 1991). For the Scriblerians the reverence of such an object was worthy of satire because their understanding of Roman history derived from written accounts left by classical authors, whereas the interest in antiquities arose out of a desire to understand the past through the acquisition and appreciation of historical artefacts, which was another example of the New Learning. A virtuoso like Woodward was interested in such antiquities because they provided the possibility of understanding the past through a real physical object which provided a supposedly direct link to it. The virtuosi, who were Moderns, wanted to understand and elucidate the past through such objects, rather than understanding the past strictly from a reading of classical literature, as the Ancients preferred. One of the most interesting aspects of the story of Woodward’s shield is how the positive assessments of it which are made on the basis of textual or literary authority give way over time and as the skills of the antiquarians grew, to an understanding that the shield was not Roman at all, but made much later.<sup>67</sup>

As we have already seen above, there is an extended satirical account of Dr Woodward’s shield in Chapter Three of the *Memoirs of Scriblerus*, which is Quixotic in character. Here the shield is placed into the hands of Cornelius Scriblerus, Martin’s virtuoso father. One of the ways in which Cornelius measures the antiquity of the shield

---

<sup>67</sup> Levine sums up the intellectual crux behind the shield thus: “In effect, the basic problem that bothered the Augustans and that underlines much of my story was whether, or in what sense, history was a science, or whether it belonged to literature. That they did not solve it will surprise no one, for the dilemma is with us still” (5).

is by the amount of rust on it and he keeps it in a special case so that it is uncontaminated by modern rust. He gives it to the maid with instructions that Martin be laid in it and covered in a mantle of blue satin. Catastrophe ensues when he realizes that the maid has removed all of the rust. In this satire, the virtuoso is so focused on the veneration of classical tradition and the presentation of his own son in accordance with it, that he overlooks any likely deleterious effect of placing a young child on a bed of rust. The fact that the maid cleans the shield and it loses its allure for Cornelius is an ingenious way of satirizing his reverence for the antiquity of the physical object. It also serves to mock his pretentious wish to act out Theocritus's phrase "the cradle of Hercules was a Shield" by using a rusty shield.<sup>68</sup>

But the cleaning of the shield has another effect. Cornelius laments the shield's departed coating of rust in the following terms:

Where, where is the beautiful Crust that cover'd thee so long? Where those Traces of Time, and Fingers as it were of Antiquity? Where all those beautiful obscurities, the cause of much delightful disputation, where doubt and curiosity went hand in hand, and eternally exercised the speculations of the learned? All this the rude Touch of an ignorant woman hath done away! (103)

Placing these words in the mouth of Cornelius is an example of irony of character, since they actually undermine his own position. The "beautiful obscurities" discerned in the shapes and patterns made by the rust, which were "the cause of much delightful disputation," are revealed as another Quixotic mirage passing across the face of something much more prosaic. The irony of character derives from the fact that the shield turns out to be a mere sconce and the "beautiful obscurities" flights of pure imagination. The end of Cornelius's speech lamenting the loss of the patina of history through the maid's actions concludes as follows:

The *curious Prominence* at the belly of that figure, which some taking for the *Cuspis* of a sword, denominated a Roman Soldier; others accounting the *Insignia Virilia*, pronounc'd to be one of the *Dii Termini*; behold she hath cleaned it in like shameful sort, and shown to be the head of a Nail. O my Shield! My Shield! Well may I say with Horace, *non bene relicta Parmula*. (104)

---

<sup>68</sup> Levine discusses two earlier jokes about rust in literary works (*Dr. Woodward's Shield* 250). They are to be found in William King's *Journey to London* (26) & Thomas D'Urfey's *Madam Fickle* (London, 1677) (26). I look at these examples in Chapter One of this thesis.

The interpretations of this detail of the shield, that it is the point of a sword and so represents a Roman soldier; or that it represents the god Terminus<sup>69</sup> are also wiped away by the maid's efforts. What she reveals is "the head of a Nail". By concentrating on the comic device of the cleaning away of the rust the Scriblerians achieve a far more potent commentary on the practice of interpreting antiquities. They are suggesting here that such interpretations are illusory and bogus. At this point in the narrative the game is up and voices are raised among those present at the christening to the effect that the shield is not what it seems and one gentleman cries out that "'tis nothing but a paultry old Sconce, with the nozzle broke off" (104). The learned gentlemen try to comfort Cornelius with this new description of the shield as a sconce but this only induces a fit in him after which he subsides into "a kind of slumber" (104). As a result of what has happened Cornelius parts company with the shield and the connection with Dr Woodward is made explicit:

[Cornelius] cou'd no longer bear the sight of the Shield, but order'd it should be remov'd for ever from his eyes. It was not long after purchas'd by Dr. Woodward, who, by the assistance of Mr. Kemp incrusted it with a new Rust, and is the same whereof a Cut hath been engraved, and exhibited to the great Contentation of the learned. (105)

It can be argued that the reputation that Woodward created for his shield was largely the result of his own endeavours to talk up its antiquity. There is a resemblance with the position he took up in *An Essay Toward a Natural History of the Earth* over the nature of the Flood in order to account for the distribution of shells and fossils. In both cases although for different reasons the evidence finally is unable to support the theory. This leads us to a consideration of *The Origine of Sciences*, another Scriblerian satire which was directed at Dr Woodward and his tendency to make exaggerated claims.

#### 7.2.1. *The Origine of Sciences*

*The Origine of Sciences*, or to give the text its full title *The Origine of Sciences, An Essay of the Learned Martinus Scriblerus, Concerning the Origine of Sciences. Written to the most Learned Dr.----- F.R.S. from the Deserts of Nubia*, was first published in 1732. Its purpose according to Pope, as he described it to Spence, was "to ridicule such as build general assertions upon two or three loose quotations from the ancients" (qtd. in Beattie

---

<sup>69</sup> The god Terminus "whose principal duty it was to protect the state from foreign invasion" (*Memoirs* 209).

227). The critical consensus is that John Woodward is the target of the satire and in particular because of his tendency to advance bold theories on the basis of evidence not strong enough to support them.<sup>70</sup> In 1713 Woodward published *An Account of Some Roman Urns, and other Antiquities, Lately Digg'd up near Bishops-Gate. With Brief Reflections upon the Antient and Present State of London*. The text is the reconstruction of a letter to Sir Christopher Wren which the latter had originally returned to Woodward, suggesting it be published. Behind it lay one of the debates of the day about the use of antiquities as evidence in writing about history. This is summed up neatly by Levine in his description of the respective positions of Wren and Edward Stillingfleet (1635-1699), who among other things wrote on the Roman history of England: "For Wren, the literary evidence was an aid to what he saw unearthed; for Stillingfleet, the antiquarian evidence was a device to elucidate a text" (Levine 138). Both Wren and Stillingfleet were strongly associated with St Paul's Cathedral in London: Wren was its architect and Stillingfleet was appointed dean in 1678. The specific problem Woodward seeks to address in *An Account of Some Roman Urns* is that of accounting for the origin of London: "there are no Records of it's Original, and . . . we are left to mere Conjecture to determine who were the Projectors and Builders of it" (2). What he offers in the essay is the existence of the urns and their location as an aid to historical understanding. Woodward uses them to describe "the boundaries and organization of Roman London" (Levine 146). In this sense, Pope's stricture against those who build general assertions on "two or three loose quotations from the ancients" is only partly fair at this stage of Woodward's argument. The latter uses his classical sources well in the essay. In Paragraph 21 he tackles the view of Geoffrey of Monmouth that "London [was] a British City, incompass'd with Walls, and fortified with innumerable Towers" (16), dismissing this as untrue and proven so by "the Accounts of Britain left us by Caesar, Tacitus, and other Authors of Judgment and Credit" (17). However, Woodward's argumentation becomes flawed, for example, in what he writes about the Druids. After a lengthy account in Paragraph 22 on the use of mistletoe by the Druids, Woodward makes a rather dubious generalization in the following passage: "This is the main of what Antiquity hath transmitted down to us of the Theology

---

<sup>70</sup> I refer to the text in the *Swift-Pope Miscellanies*, Volume 3. Beattie thought it quite possible, as Aitken had done before him, that Woodward was being used here as "a convenient example of the unscientific antiquarian" (227). Kerby-Miller's perception of the piece was expressed as follows in a note on Chapter Three of the *Memoirs*: "The Greshamite's habit of building elaborate theories on slender evidence was burlesqued in *An Essay on the Origine of Sciences*" (*Memoirs* 205).

and Philosophy of the Druids: and, by this, 'twill not be hard to frame a Judgment of their Science, as to the Stars, the World, Nature, and the Power of the Gods; of which we have not the particulars" (19). There are other instances where Woodward's tendency to generalize and draw conclusions gets the better of him. Having said that there is no extant description of the chariots used by the ancient Britons he writes: "But 'tis most certain their Way of Fighting with them was very wild and extravagant" (23). However, this could be justified by its source in the work of Caesar. As a good Modern, Woodward puts the ancient Greeks, the Romans and "the Britains at this Day" (25) all on an equal footing. But his advocacy for the existence of a historical Temple of Diana near the site of St Paul's Cathedral seems particularly fanciful given that neither Wren nor Stillingfleet were persuaded. Woodward mentions that he owns some artefacts which support his case, as if this advances the argument. He can be praised for his attention to detail in the essay and for the careful observations he makes of the section of Roman wall that is unearthed. But it is the bold generalizations which attract attention, and which form the target for the satirical attack of the Scriblerians.

*The Origine of Sciences* is a satirical reception of Woodward's text which makes use of an invented yet parallel historical scenario. It begins: "It is universally agreed, that Arts and Sciences took their Rise among the Egyptians and Indians; but from whom they first received them, is yet a Secret" (99). The parody of those who "build general assertions upon two or three loose quotations from the ancients" is here: "to gain some knowledge of their History, from whatever dark and broken Hints may in any way be found in ancient Authors concerning them" (99). The existence of an "earlier warlike People call'd the Pygmaeans" as the originators of civilization is then posited (100). As is the following parody of the way in which Woodward raises the flag of speculation above a perceived absence of evidence: "And tho' all we directly hear is of their Military Atchievements, in the brave defence of their Country from the annual Invasions of a Powerful Enemy, yet I cannot doubt but that they excell'd as much in the Arts of peaceful Government, tho' there remain no Traces of their Civil Institutions" (100).

According to Diodorus the historian (90-30 BC), Pan and his followers were discovered in Ethiopia: "a sort of little Satyrs, who were hairy one half of their Body, and whose leader Pan accompany'd him in his Expedition for the civilizing of Mankind"

(101).<sup>71</sup> We then hear of how pygmies accompanied Bacchus on his voyage to India and how their presence there allows them to be the originators of Indian civilization as well. When Orpheus returns to Greece with pygmies, this coincides with the first mention of satyrs. It is then argued that these hirsute progenitors of civilized values account for “two of the strangest reports in all Antiquity,” namely the tradition that beasts followed the music of Orpheus and as an explanation of “all those Fables of the Gods compressing Women in Woods under bestial appearances” (105). Aesop and Socrates are included among the race of pygmies. However, a point is reached which marks the beginning of their decline: “In process of time the women, with whom these Sylvans would have lovingly cohabited, were either taught by mankind, or induced by an abhorrence of their shapes, to shun their embraces; so that our sages were necessitated to mix with beasts” (106). At the time of the Roman attack on the Etruscans the race fell silent. Examples of the pygmies have intermittently been caught since then, including one during the reign of Augustus. Given the company of a young woman the pygmy sang “merrily and instructively. In this Song we have their Doctrine of the Creation . . . ” (109). One line of the pygmies comes to an end with Oran Outang the Great, the last of this line “whose unhappy Chance it was to fall into the Hands of the Europeans” (112).

A real work by Edward Tyson (1650-1708), his *Orang-outang, sive, Homo Sylvestris, or, The Anatomy of a Pygmy Compared with that of a Monkey, an Ape, and a Man to which is Added, A Philological Essay Concerning the Pygmies, the Cynocephali, the Satyrs and Sphinges of the Ancients: Wherein it will Appear that they are all either Apes or Monkeys, and not Men, as Formerly Pretended*. (1699) is cited here, to add verisimilitude. The resulting examination of the body establishes a resemblance between “the Homo Sylvestris and our Humane Body in those Organs by which the rational Soul is exerted” (112), although it is Tyson’s conclusion that pygmies are monkeys, as can be seen from the full title of his account. The pygmies described after the race falls silent are referred to as mute or dumb philosophers, as is the case with Oran Outang: “Oran Outang, whose value was not known to us, for he was a mute philosopher” (112). This recurrence over the centuries of a silent witness to the past greatness of the pygmies is a satirical device which underlines the lack of proof behind the essay’s main argument. Scriblerus laments their debasement thus: “That these, who were our elder Brothers by a Day in the

---

<sup>71</sup> Diodorus of Agyrium, or Diodorus Siculus, was the author of a universal history from the mythological past up until 60BC. Only 15 of the 40 books survive in their entirety. He wrote in Greek.

Creation, whose Kingdom was like the Scheme of Plato govern'd by Philosophers, who flourish'd with learning in Aethiopia and India, are now undistinguish'd from, and known only by the same Appellation, as the Man-Teger and the Monkey!" (97). However, the authors of *The Origine of Sciences* either lose their way or their inventiveness outgrows the purpose of the exercise, which was to satirize Woodward's pamphlet (Beattie 229).

To what extent are the foregoing examples of personal satire? Where do they stand on the spectrum of satire and lampoon? The treatment of Woodward's shield has a hint of the lampoon, although it is sufficiently general not to have to face that charge in earnest. It was aimed at the antiquarians of the day in general, as well as Dr Woodward in person. *The Origine of Sciences* also does not have Woodward in every sentence, although a work of his inspired it. In the first case the purpose of the satire is to suggest that Woodward and the antiquarians are misguided in their reverence of antiquities. In the second it is the narrow basis for a broad assertion perceived as typical of Woodward's style of argumentation that is under attack.

We now turn to writing of a different kind which is much more personal in the attacks it makes on its satirical target. For this reason, it belongs either partly or wholly to the genre of the lampoon. I shall now show that *The Life and Adventures of Don Bilioso de l'Estomac* is more of a satire than a lampoon, although it has elements of the lampoon. The reverse is clearly true of *An Account of the Sickness and Death of Dr. W---dw---rd; As also of what appeared upon opening his Body*.

### 7.3. THE SMALLPOX WAR

As we have already seen, Woodward provided the pretext for several Scriblerian satires. His was the shield with which the Scriblerians made merry in the *Memoirs of Scriblerus*; his essay on Roman urns was the pretext for one of Martinus Scriblerus's miscellanea *The Origine of Sciences*; we will shortly see how he also provided the inspiration for the central character in the play *Three Hours after Marriage*, written by John Gay with the help of Dr Arbuthnot and Alexander Pope. However, the Scriblerians were not the only ones to attack Woodward. The position he took up in the controversy about the treatment of smallpox towards the end of the second decade of the eighteenth century gave rise to the pamphlets *The Life and Adventures of Don Bilioso de l'Estomac* and *An Account of the Sickness and Death of Dr. W---dw---rd; As also of what appeared upon opening his Body*. Both were published in 1719. That Woodward inspired so many satirical works on such different subjects is certainly evidence of his range as a virtuoso.



But there were other factors which made him such an eligible satirical subject. Each work may have been generated by a different set of circumstances, but Woodward was a virtuoso with a difference. He invested the positions he took and the artefacts which he collected with absolute belief. He took very personally any suggestion that the specimens he had collected were not what he said they were. And while he was not the first author to attack his opponents in print, he did so in a particularly provocative way. Woodward's character itself engaged the satirists. As Joseph M. Levine puts it: "Dr. Woodward was too self-confident, too proud, too touchy, and too dogmatic" (Levine 17). Woodward based his ideas on the principle of observation but found it difficult to receive criticism from others (Levine 17). In other words, Woodward was the ideal satirical target, offending all and offended by all.

Smallpox was a matter for serious concern among the practising physicians of the eighteenth century, until a vaccine was found in the 1790s. This was discovered by Edward Jenner (1749-1823) when in 1796 he performed an experiment on the eight-year old James Phipps. The scientific establishment asked for more proof and so Jenner conducted more experiments and published his findings in 1798. The disease had been treated in various ways before then and the competing practitioners experienced a keen rivalry, as we can see from the controversy about the treatment of smallpox which raged in London in 1717-19. The protagonists were Woodward on the one hand and Dr John Freind and Dr Richard Mead on the other. Woodward published his work *The State of Physick: and of Diseases; with an Inquiry into the Causes of the late increase of them: but more particularly of the small-pox. With some considerations upon the new practice of purgeing in that disease* in London in 1718. *The State of Physick* was Woodward's response to an edition of Hippocrates (c. 460-c. 375 BC) published the year before and entitled *De Morbis Popularibus*. Levine summarizes the work thus: "The book consisted of a text and translation of the first and third books of Hippocrates with nine commentaries by Friend appended, the seventh and largest of which was devoted to purging as a cure for smallpox" (301, n. 1).

The basis of the dispute was that while Freind proposed purging to his patients, a treatment also favoured by Mead, Woodward preferred the inducement of vomiting. While Woodward saw his reputation and practice under threat, there were also the accompanying symptoms of provocation on Woodward's part. For example, in the preface to *The State of Physick*, Woodward wrote: "Under these so great Discouragements it cannot well be any Surprize that some should, instead of real

Philosophy, give themselves up wholly to Fiction and Invention; while others consult their Ease and Quiet, and persue their Pleasures . . ." (n.d.). Woodward's preference for the inducement of vomiting as a treatment was based on his theory of illness, which in turn was based on the observation of his patients over a number of years. He outlined his theories in *The State of Physick* and they bear careful explanation here to provide the basis for understanding the satires written against him in the "smallpox war" — a term used by Levine — which followed its publication (11). For Woodward "the great Wisdom, and the Happiness of Man, consists in a due Care of the Stomach, and Digestion: and in rightly ordering and adjusting the Principles there" (34). And if things went out of balance in the stomach, all manner of problems might arise:

But if, by over great Solitude and Care, Study, or Grief, the Salts that serve for Digestion, be taken off from that Work, and other ways imploy'd: or, by Gluttony, and Intemperance, unfit Diet, or some other like Means, they can be confounded, and overpower'd, an Indigestion must needs follow, and a great Part of the Meat, eaten, be not duely thin'd and fined, but reduced only to a coarse Gelly, or Phlegm. Of if, through any of the recited Causes, through a too great indulgence to Sleep or a Sedentary Life, the Phlegm be detain'd in the Stomach, stagnateing, it becomes gradually putrid, and noxious. Besides, by this Stagnation and Delay, a greater Quantity of Salts must, of Course, be separated and drawn out from it: and particularly those that are unnatural and improper . . . Biliose Salts, now both increased in Number, and vitiated. To these are owing several praeternatural symptoms . . . The salts being thus redundant, and deprav'd, their Operations must be more intense, and irregular. (13-14)

The biliose salts which Woodward discusses towards the end of this lengthy passage become an important target in the satirical attacks to be considered shortly.

Woodward's advocacy of vomiting as a cure for disorders is firm:

As those Salts cause these Disorders, so the Removeal of the Salts, particularly by Vomit, puts an End to the Disorders. In which Operation 'tis observeable that the more sick the Patient is, and the more powerfully the Vomit casts up the Biliose Matter, the better Success constantly attends it: the greater Benefit the Patient receives: and the more it contributes to the clearing up of his senses, and reduceing him again to right Reasoning; of which there are Instances, so great, and sudden, as to be very surprizeing. (16-17)

One striking feature of Woodward's understanding of disorders in the human body is the swelling that results from an excess of biliose salts in the stomach. An example is the following:

The Heart, and Lungs, in Order to the secureing to themselves Scope and Freedom of Action, make continual Efforts, push and thrust out the

Breast, sometimes with such Force as to render it finally more than usually big and prominent: and, together with the Pressure of the Stomach, by Degrees, push out the Back, so as to make it, in Time, gibbose and hump'd. (17)

While the vomit may have been his principal prescription, Woodward also believed in the use of oils as the following passage from the preface of *The State of Physick* demonstrates:

Nor will it be thought strange that, in the Course of my Practise, for some Years, I have made so great and frequent Use of Oyls, and Unctuous Remedyes, when it shall be evinced, as I hope it is in the following Papers, that they happily answer several great Ends and Exigencies of Nature: and are of Constitution directly contrary to the main Principle and Cause of Diseases. (n.d.)

What goes before provided an ample armoury for those wishing to satirize Woodward. We will shortly encounter the biliose salts, the oils and the back “gibbose and hump’d” in another rather less reverential context.

### 7.3.1. *The Question of Arbuthnot's Authorship*

Before entering into a discussion of *The Life and Adventures of Don Bilioso de l'Estomac* and *An Account of the Sickness and Death of Dr W---dw---rd* it is necessary to address the question of whether the authorship of both pieces can be attributed to Dr Arbuthnot. The two works appeared anonymously as separate pamphlets in the later 1710s at the time of the polemical exchanges over the treatment of smallpox between Dr Freind and Woodward. They are attributed to Arbuthnot for being included in *The Miscellaneous Works of the Late Dr. Arbuthnot*, which was published in Glasgow in 1751. The difficult question of which works in general are attributable to Dr Arbuthnot was first explored by Leslie Stephen in his entry on Arbuthnot in the *Dictionary of National Biography* (DNB 1: 534-7). It makes sense to review this complex issue here before advancing to a discussion of the respective texts.

The problem is put very well by Stephen: “Arbuthnot was singularly careless of his literary reputation. His witty writings were anonymous; he let his children make kites of his papers, allowed his friends to alter them as they pleased, and took no pains to distinguish his share” (535-6). Under such circumstances one might say that it is difficult to be certain of anything where Arbuthnot's authorship is concerned. However, Stephen advances the case for a body of work which can either be attributed to Arbuthnot wholly or in part and is clear on what is doubtful. Although it does not belong to the group of humorous works in which

we are principally interested, we have already encountered the important early publication *An Examination of Dr. Woodward's Account of the Deluge*, which appeared in the *Philosophical Transactions* in 1697. Stephen attributes authorship of *Three Hours after Marriage* to Arbuthnot, Pope and Gay, calling it a "silly farce . . . which, being unworthy of all the three authors was deservedly damned in 1717" (536). Again, Woodward is the target, while this time the techniques of stage comedy are brought to bear on him. The *Memoirs of Scriblerus* were published by Pope in 1741 and for Stephen "they are mainly, if not exclusively, Arbuthnot's, and give the best specimen of his powers" (535). This view finds convincing support in the opinion of Swift in a letter to Arbuthnot cited by Stephen to the effect that "Arbuthnot was the only man capable of carrying out the plan, which had been originally suggested by Pope" (535). The works mentioned hitherto are for Stephen "Arbuthnot's acknowledged works" (536). Arbuthnot had died in 1735, so the *Miscellaneous Works* appeared some years after his death. His son George "advertised that they were not his father's works, but 'an imposition upon the public'" (536). Stephen says that the "collection has no authority" but that it does include a number of works that were attributable, not least *An Examination of Dr. Woodward's Account of the Deluge*. But for the rest, which includes *The Life and Adventures of Don Bilioso de l'Estomac*, which Stephen names, and *An Account of the Sickness and Death of Dr. W---dw---rd*, which he does not, Stephen dismisses them as "for the most part worthless" and "taken at random on account of the subjects" (536). His conclusion is that they "are at best very doubtful" (536). The case for Arbuthnot's authorship thus appears more secure when the work in question is editorially in the hands of his friends. This was the case of the *Annus Mirabilis* pamphlet which appeared in the Swift-Pope *Miscellanies*. That said, there are interesting editorial differences between the text of the original pamphlet and the version published in the *Miscellanies*. What accounts for the differences is unknown, but it was probably the editorial hand of Pope which intervened. The Scriblerian pieces collected together in Swift's *Miscellanies* of 1727 may at least in part be the work of Arbuthnot, as may some of the notes to *The Dunciad* and the *Virgilius Restauratus*, which is often attributed to him. And he had a hand in *The Origine of Sciences*, along with Pope and Parnell. When it comes to *The Life and Adventures of Don Bilioso de l'Estomac* and *An Account of the Sickness and Death of Dr. W---dw---rd*, we are dealing with pamphlets related in content to the works of the Scriblerians, but not by the Scriblerians themselves. We are entering into the cut and thrust of the world of the anonymous pamphlet once again, as we have already done with *Postscript for Postscript* in the discussion of the origin of the name of Martin Scriblerus.

Authorship of *The Life and Adventures of Don Bilioso de l'Estomac* has also been attributed to Richard Mead. As we have already seen, Mead and Woodward had very different ways of treating smallpox, the former by purging and the latter by the inducement of vomiting. This created a professional rivalry. In fact, such was the animosity between them that they are said to have fought physically in front of Gresham College on the night of 10 June 1719. This led to the publication of a number of accounts of their combat, including a poem written in iambic tetrameters called *Tauronomachia: Or A Description of a Bloody and Terrible Fight between Two Champions, Taurus and Onos, at Gresham College* (London, 1719). In this poem, which was published as a pamphlet of six pages, Mead is represented as Taurus in the poem, while Woodward is given the name of Onos; the suffix *-machia*, means "fighting". The pamphlet is written by a supporter of Mead, as it dwells judgementally on Woodward's activities as a collector of fossils and his theory of the deluge and concludes:

*Fancy'd* Success of these *Odd* Notions  
In *Onos* caus'd such wild Emotions,  
He now sets up for Grave *Physician*,  
And thinks *None* else, besides him, is *One* . . . (4)

The fight does not go well for Onos, who finds himself at the mercy of his rival:

Poor Onos, stunn'd upon the Floor,  
Wounded, and sadly smear'd with Gore;  
His Courage gone; could not withstand  
His Steel's being ravished from his Hand. (6)

The denouement follows with Taurus (Mead) offering to forego his right to slay Onos and the latter replying that he would rather die than beg for his life from Taurus: "If your Life's so vile, / As worthy not One word to save it, / No Honour's gain'd if I should have it" (6). With such powerful sentiments in evidence, it would be easy enough to advance the theory that Mead was the author of *The Life and Adventures of Don Bilioso de l'Estomac*, but there is no evidence that he wrote satires or pamphlets on his own behalf.

### 7.3.2. *The Life and Adventures of Don Bilioso de l'Estomac*

In a recent bibliographical work John B. Blake lists *The Life and Adventures of Don Bilioso de l'Estomac* as consisting of 23 pages, being published in London in 1719 and as "variously and doubtfully attributed to Richard Mead and John Arbuthnot" (Blake 271). The critical and bibliographical consensus is clearly against ascribing the piece to Arbuthnot, but it is obvious why the piece might be attributed to him. Firstly, it attacks a published work written by Dr Woodward. After the *Examination* and *Three Hours after Marriage* alone, Arbuthnot might be a clear candidate. With the advantage of hindsight, the text shows a

considerable acquaintance with *Don Quixote* and given the influence of that work on the *Memoirs* of Scriblerus Arbuthnot's candidacy might be advanced even further.

The full title of the pamphlet is *The Life and Adventures of Don Bilioso de L'Estomac. Translated from the Original Spanish into French; done from the French into English. With a Letter to the College of Physicians*. As the title makes clear, it has two principle parts. These are the letter, written from Dublin in a jaunty tone to the College of Physicians, in which an anonymous correspondent sets out the Cervantean credentials of Woodward's *The State of Physick*. The life and adventures themselves consist of 29 chapter summaries, each of which is followed mainly by page references to Woodward's *The State of Physick*, although the second chapter refers the reader to Woodward's *An Essay Toward a Natural History of the Earth*. *The Life and Adventures of Don Bilioso de L'Estomac* participates in the Anglophone reception of *Don Quixote* in the first half of the eighteenth century in an exemplary fashion. It is in harmony with the satirical understanding of the work characteristic among English authors in the first half of the eighteenth century. Four explicit connections are created with the original *Don Quixote* in the letter to the College of Physicians in London which prefaces the satire itself and is anonymous.

A direct connection is established with the original text of *Don Quixote* when the anonymous writer of the prefatory letter states that Dr Woodward's *The State of Physick* reminds him "of Don Quixote's good Squire Sancho, whose favourite Maxim was, that the Belly kept up the Heart, and not the Heart the Belly" (183). This is a reference to the proverb "Tripas llevan corazón, que no corazón tripas," spoken by Sancho Panza in Chapter 47 of the Second Part of *Don Quixote*. The circumstances are that Sancho is governor of an island, has been forbidden to eat most of a banquet served to him by a physician and has just been warned that the island may be attacked. As a result, it has the sense of "an army marches on its stomach." However, the relevance for the satire is that Woodward's theory of medicine is built around his understanding of the stomach. *Tripas* in the original really refers to "guts" – the revised version of Shelton's translation done by Stevens (1706) is more accurate: "for the Guts uphold the Heart, and not the Heart the Guts" (2: 270) – but the sense is clear in the context of the satirical intention of the pamphlet.

The second connection comes in making use of Thomas Sydenham's famous advice to Sir Richard Blackmore. Harold J. Cook relates Blackmore's own account in his article on Thomas Sydenham (1624-89) in the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*: "When one day I asked him to advise me what Books I should read to qualify me for practice, he replied, 'Read Don Quixot, it is a very good Book, I read it still.' So low an Opinion had this celebrated

Man of the Learning collected out of the Authors, his Predecessors” (online edition, par. 22 of 24). Sydenham proposed and practised the study of diseases and so worked empirically and in the manner of a Modern. In the prefatory letter we have an echo of the story about Sydenham and Blackmore:

I believe I shall prove presently that the Author of *Don Quixote* was also the Author of the State of Physick; for upon dipping a little farther into the Book, I observ'd such a romantick Air through the whole, and a manner of writing so different from any Physician I ever read, that I immediately concluded Dr. W. must be that young Physician, who enquiring of Dr. Sydenham what was the best Book in Physick, was told *Don Quixote*. (183)

The quotation is a satirical comment on the value of Woodward's *The State of Physick*. By comparing it to Cervantes's novel and by comparing Woodward to Blackmore in the anecdote in which Sydenham suggests he read the novel, the anonymous author is suggesting that Woodward's work is fanciful and full of self-deception. Also, through the voice of the anonymous author of the prefatory letter, the pamphlet makes a French translation of a Spanish original the origin of Woodward's *The State of Physick*, a manuscript the anonymous author discovers “by pure Accident” after he peruses all of Don Quixote's library (184). This is the third connection, creating a fictitious link with *Les Aventures Don Bilioso de L'Estomac*, the French translation of a Spanish original. Our commentator remarks that this was the very work he was seeking and that on becoming familiar with it he “found the State of Physick to be a mere Transcript from it” (184). In this way Woodward's *The State of Physick* becomes an English rendering of a Spanish work connected to *Don Quixote*, which makes it explicitly Cervantean or Quixotic.

We have been lacking up to now anything in *Don Bilioso* that displays the monomania of Don Quixote's passion for literary accounts of knight errantry. This is duly supplied in the form of an obsession with bilious salts on the part of the Don Bilioso of the satire, a character who like Don Quixote, and this is the fourth and more interesting connection, becomes obsessed with bilious salts instead of works of chivalry:

The Biliose Salts being very predominant both in Quantity and Quality in this poor Gentleman's Constitution, and (unhappily for him) the Instruments of Cogitation so confounded the cogitative Faculty, that he did not distinguish Jest from Earnest; and his Passion for his Author [Dr Woodward] became so exorbitant (curse on all Biliose Salts) that he [Don Bilioso] neglected all other Books but Romances ever after. (185)

Don Bilioso represents Woodward's approach to smallpox. As stated above, the work is sometimes doubtfully attributed to Richard Mead or Dr Arbuthnot, although there is no

proof for either attribution. The author was surely allied to one of Woodward's enemies in the smallpox war. The satire then continues in the form of 29 chapter summaries. Their content does not bear any marked resemblance to *Don Quixote*, except insofar as they describe a series of adventures experienced by Don Bilioso and involving other characters such as Donna Phlegma (phlegm), Donna Diarrhoea and the giant Variolas (a name derived from the smallpox virus variola), thus resulting in a sort of Cervantean mock romance.<sup>72</sup>

I shall now take some of the content of a number of the chapter summaries and relate them to the pamphleteer's pretext, Woodward's *The State of Physick*. The first chapter speaks of the condition of Don Bilioso's mother when she was pregnant with him: "contrary to other Women, she grew big about the Shoulders, her *Sternum* became prominent, and her Back gibbous, her Belly all this while continuing as lank as a Virgin's" (186). This is a parodic account of the consequences described by Woodward of a surfeit of bilious salts in the stomach, which according to him resulted in swelling in the body. The biliose salts being found in the stomach, it comes as no surprise that Don Bilioso "was miraculously preserved by being cut out of her [his mother's] stomach" as she dies in labour (186). In the summary of Chapter Two there is an amusing take on Woodward's preoccupation with fossils, the reader being referred to *An Essay Toward a Natural History of the Earth*. Don Bilioso is "nurs'd in a Coal-pit" and there is an account of his "strange Inclination of travelling under Ground" (186).

Writing of Hippocrates in *The State of Physick* Woodward says "What he delivers concerning Diseases in general, he applies elsewhere particularly to a Fever: and asserts that this proceeds from Bile and Plegm put into a Heat, and heating the whole Body" (92). In the pamphlet this interaction between bile and phlegm is humorously parodied in the characters of Don Bilioso and Donna Phlegma, who lived together "like Dog and Cat, and she bore him afterwards several very unlucky Children" (186). This is part of the subject matter for Chapter

---

<sup>72</sup> The use of fictitious chapter summaries in this pamphlet is worthy of comment. An examination, for example, of the 1709 English translation of *Don Quixote* does not show the chapter summaries of the English translation to be any the more extensive than those of the original work in Spanish. Beattie discusses the extension of the chapter summaries in *Don Bilioso de l'Estomac* in relation to other of Arbuthnot's works as a possible criterion for the editor to include it in the *Miscellaneous Works* of 1751; he also refers to the extensive chapter headings added to *The History of John Bull* in the 1727 edition of that work, for which he says that Arbuthnot was not responsible, as well as the satirical technique of summarizing the chapters of another work in *The Art of Political Lying*. However, it is probable that comparing the lengths of the various relevant chapter summaries is a distraction. The device of telling the story of Don Bilioso through extended chapter summaries was probably a simple way of creating a parody which hints at a much larger work. The use of marginal page references, in this case to Woodward's original works, are however, highly reminiscent of the satires of William King which I have discussed in Chapter Four. King died in 1712.



Three and is a satirical transformation of their unstable combination and the diseases that result. Chapter Four tells of how Don Bilioso's children "committed several mad Pranks, and how he reclaim'd them by gentle and soft Means, oiling their Sides very well, and liquoring their Boots" (186). This is a humorous reference to Woodward's interest in vegetable oils and the trials he gave them in his medical practice. Chapter Nine parodies an attack on Dr Freind in *The State of Physick*. Woodward wrote originally: "No intelligent Surgeon ever attempts to rectify a Disorder or Hurt of a Joynt, till he hath first fully satisfied himself, whether it be only simply a Bruise, or a Strain, or a Dislocation" (101). The parody has: "How he taught an Intelligent Surgeon to set Bones and cure Bruises" (187). The pamphleteer finds a rather flimsy pretext on which to mention Woodward's homosexuality in a rather aggressive passage. The original is: ". . . yet every wise Physician, that has due humanity, will not unnecessarily go to storm a Distemper, and make Evacuations in a Body that hath been so long harass'd: and is thereby so much reduced and distressed" (130). Compare: "How *Don Bilioso* gave a Dose of Opium to a troublesome Bed-fellow, and after he was asleep, with what Caution and Humanity he attack'd him behind, and made an Evacuation in his Body" (188). The whole ingenious performance is brought to an end when Don Bilioso turns into a mountebank. Not being a practised one, he slips and breaks his neck, "to the Admiration of all Spectators" (191). This appears to be a parodic reading of Woodward's complaint about "Multitudes of unqualified, and of unlicenced Practitioners" (201).

Editors and critics of Arbuthnot's work have had a problem with *Don Bilioso de l'Estomac*. Beattie regarded many of the chapter summaries as "indecent" (255). He also remarked that Aitken did not reprint the pamphlet for this reason (256, n. 2). The perception of a text as indecent is a relative phenomenon. What was considered indecent in the eighteenth century probably rather differs from what is regarded as indecent now. The treatment of Woodward's homosexuality today may well appear offensive, as same-sex relationships are presently accepted. In the same way that the post mortem account of Woodward's body in the text I shall next turn to — *An Account of the Sickness and Death of Dr. W---dw---rd; And also of what Appeared upon Opening his Body* — includes many repulsive details and suggests that Woodward resembled various animals, so in *Don Bilioso de l'Estomac* the indecency is part of the intent to discredit Woodward by the writer of the pamphlet. These tactics, which are explicitly the tactics of the lampoon, are not to be found elsewhere in the works of the Scriblerians. It is their presence which argues most persuasively against either *Don Bilioso de l'Estomac* or *An Account of the Sickness and Death of Dr. W---dw---rd* being the work of Dr Arbuthnot. However, it is my contention that the

former is more concerned with *The State of Physick* because it is concerned with the satirical reception of Woodward's treatment for smallpox, and so is less directly concerned with lampooning Woodward as an individual.

### 7.3.3. *An Account of the Sickness and Death of Dr W---dw---rd*

The other pamphlet in the exchange of salvoes in the smallpox war which was attributed to Dr Arbuthnot was *An Account of the Sickness and Death of Dr. W---dw---rd; And Also of What Appeared upon Opening his Body*. This pamphlet also has two constituent parts. The first, which deals with the fictionalized Woodward's decline and death, is written with polish and a lively turn of phrase. But that part of the pamphlet that describes the post mortem is much darker in character.

[Passage omitted]

## 7.4. *THREE HOURS AFTER MARRIAGE*

### 7.4.1. *Summary of the Plot*

*Three Hours after Marriage* is a comedy in three acts by John Gay, written with the assistance of Dr Arbuthnot and Alexander Pope. It received the first of seven performances in the season at Drury Lane on 16 January 1717 and was published on 21 January 1717. If Gay's role at the meetings of the Scriblerus Club was in truth purely secretarial, by the evidence of this play he learned much in that role about satire and about the satirical representation of the figure of the virtuoso. In *Three Hours after Marriage* the virtuoso is satirized through the creation of the overall comic situation, in the dialogue and in some highly resourceful stagecraft. It is striking that whereas in Shadwell's play *The Virtuoso* the scenes featuring Sir Nicholas Gimcrack and his experiments are almost detachable from the rest of the play, here Gay has created a comedy in which the character of the virtuoso that he wishes to satirize is fully integrated into the plot of the comedy as it unfolds.

Before entering into a discussion of the salient features of *Three Hours after Marriage* it is as well to reprise the plot and the relationship between the main characters. The play is a comedy in three acts, "like the Spanish Comedies," as Gay observes in the Advertisement. The action takes place in the house of Dr Fossile, a doctor with a well-established medical practice. He is also a virtuoso and has a cabinet of curiosities in his home. As the play begins Fossile has just married the prostitute Mrs Townley, who was previously

living in a house of ill-repute in Covent Garden. Fossile's motivation is his intention to father a child in order to disinherit his niece Phoebe Clinket, who lives in the doctor's house. Phoebe is an obsessive writer and first appears with a maid who carries Clinket's writing-desk on her back. An aspiring dramatist, Clinket has written a play called *The Universal Deluge, or the Tragedy of Deucalion and Pyrrha*. This is a clear reference to Dr Woodward's *An Essay Towards a Natural History of the Earth*. A number of suggestions have been made concerning the real-life model of Phoebe Clinket. To my mind the most persuasive is Margaret Cavendish, Duchess of Newcastle-upon-Tyne (1623-73), the writer of scientific texts. But the character may be a composite portrait of a number of individual women writers of the day.<sup>73</sup>

There are a number of subsidiary characters in *Three Hours after Marriage*. On the one hand, some of these provoke the jealousy of the newly married Fossile, and, on the other, serve Gay's satirical intent in sending up the figure of the virtuoso. The character Plotwell, generally considered to be a caricature of Colley Cibber, is interested in helping Phoebe to get her play performed and is also a suitor to Townley. Another suitor to Townley is Underplot, whose name reflects his dramatic function. Also associated with Phoebe is Sir Tremendous Longinus, generally regarded as a caricature of the critic John Dennis. Associated with Fossile are the apothecary Ptsan and the doctors Possum and Nautilus, who are both medical doctors and virtuosi. Fossile has to leave the house on doctor's visits to his patients and it is during these absences that Townley's intrigues unfold. These find their denouement in the third act, at the beginning of which Fossile has taken delivery of a mummy and an alligator, two objects greatly associated with the virtuosi of the day. These are placed in Fossile's private museum, or cabinet of curiosities. Fossile then locks Townley in the museum with the intention of keeping her out of the reach of her suitors. To great comic effect it turns out that Plotwell is concealed inside the mummy and that Underplot is inside the alligator. There follows a sustained satirical treatment of the figure of the virtuoso and his concerns in both action and dialogue. Fossile eventually drives the suitors away and discusses his rather intellectual motives for marrying Townley with her. A further satirical gambit is had with the character of the sailor, who makes his appearance towards the end of the comedy and who is announced as "a Seaman from Deptford" (3.1.336). Virtuosi often used scouts to augment their collections and it is the virtuoso's foreign scout who is parodied in the figure of this sailor who brings a child to Fossile. Fossile mistakes him for "one of my Retale Indian Merchants, I suppose, that allways brings me some odd Thing" (3.1.339-40).

---

<sup>73</sup> For comment on the possible real-life models for the characters, see Gay, *Dramatic Works* 1: 438-43.

But the sailor says: "My Name is *Jack Capstone of Deptford*, and are you not the Man that has the Raree-Show of Oyster-shells and Pebble-stones?" (3.1.351-3). This is a humorous and disrespectful reference to the real-life Woodward's large collection of fossils. The baby which Capstone brings has been born in the brothel where Townley lived previously. It is revealed that Townley is already married to a Lieutenant Bengall, so her marriage to Fossile is void. At the end of the action Fossile is left alone with the child.

I am going to concentrate on the satirical depiction of the figure of the virtuoso in the comedy, and not on its troubled reception,<sup>74</sup> or its resemblance to Edward Ravenscroft's comedy *The Anatomist, or, The Sham Doctor*, to which I will refer in my footnotes.<sup>75</sup>

#### 7.4.2. *The Satirical Reception of the Virtuoso through Action and Dialogue*

Much of the comic effect of *Three Hours after Marriage* is at the expense of its central character, the jealous doctor and virtuoso Fossile. Clearly based on the real doctor and virtuoso Dr John Woodward, as a number of details attest, the protagonist's name itself is said to refer to a story about Woodward, who asked some men working in the gravel-pits in Kensington whether they had discovered any fossils there (Gay 1: 439). Equally, when he first encounters evidence of interest from other men in his wife, Fossile exclaims: "Whom hast thou married, poor *Fossile*? Couldst thou not divert thyself still with the Spoils of Quarries and Coal-pits, thy Serpents and thy Salamanders, but thou must have a living Monster too!" (1.1.142-5). There is also an allusion to Woodward's preference for the inducement of vomiting as a medical cure. One of his patients is called the Countess of

---

<sup>74</sup> See George Sherburn, "The Fortunes and Misfortunes of *Three Hours after Marriage*," *Modern Philology* 24 (1926): 91-109. Pope's comment to Parnell should also be noted: "Gay's play, among the rest, has cost much time and long-suffering to stem a tide of malice and party that authors have raised against it" (99).

<sup>75</sup> See *Oxford Encyclopedia of Theatre and Performance*, ed. Dennis Kennedy (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2003). Ravenscroft (1654?-1707) wrote a number of plays, some modelled on foreign originals. *The Anatomist, or, The Sham Doctor* was first performed in 1697 and revived in 1716. It is a comedy set in the household of a medical doctor, where there is talk predominantly of medicine and dissection. The principal characters are the doctor and his wife, their daughter Angelica and her servant Beatrice, Old Gerald and his son Young Gerald, whose servant Crispin assumes the guise of a doctor during the action of the play and is the sham doctor of the title. The central action of the play concerns Old Gerald's wish to marry Angelica and the efforts of Beatrice and Crispin to make him look foolish and leave the way clear for Young Gerald to marry her. In Act Two there is a parody of a dissection in which Crispin runs the danger that he will be dissected by Angelica's father as he lies concealed on the dissecting table. The roles are reversed in Act Three, when Old Gerald is hidden on the dissecting table and it is Crispin as the sham doctor who announces his intention to dissect the corpse before him, only for Old Gerald to leap up and flee for his life. Some of Ravenscroft's dialogue provided a model for Gay's play, particularly in the case of Crispin's dissimulation of a German or Polish doctor, which finds a strong echo in Gay's Doctor Lubomirski.

Hippekekoane, a name derived from the emetic ipecacuanha.<sup>76</sup> Woodward's account of the deluge in *An Essay toward a Natural History of the Earth* is also mentioned ironically by the character Sir Tremendous at the beginning of the recital of Phoebe Clinket's play *The Universal Deluge, or the Tragedy of Deucalion and Pyrrha*. The stage directions end with the instruction: "*The Tops of Steeples rise above the Flood, with Men and Women perching on their Weather-cocks*" (1.1.469-70). The reaction of Sir Tremendous is as follows: "Begging your Pardon, Sir, I believe it can be proved, that Weather-cocks are of a modern Invention. Besides, if Stones were dissolved, as a late Philosopher hath proved, how could Steeples stand?" (1.1.471-4). Plotwell orders the stage direction to be struck out, but Clinket objects on the grounds that to do so would strike at the heart of the drama. She says: "Don't almost all the Persons of your Second Act start out of Stones that *Deucalion* and *Pyrrha* threw behind them? This Cavil is levell'd at the whole System of the Reparation of human Race" (1.1.479-80). Here classical myth is used to undercut Woodward's theory of the Flood.

Let us now look at how the virtuoso Woodward is satirized in *Three Hours after Marriage* from the point of view of action and dialogue. In 1717 the real-life Woodward was in his fifties. This is exploited in the central comic situation of *Three Hours after Marriage*, in which Fossile marries a woman much younger than himself: Townley is almost 23 while Fossile could be her father. Fossile's motivation as a character is to have a child with Townley in order to disinherit Phoebe Clinket, yet this seems more a dramatic pretext to expose Fossile to the vicissitudes of jealousy and the danger of cuckoldry by means of the comic action which ensues. The play has hardly begun when Fossile intercepts a romantic note from Plotwell to Townley and from then on the motor of the action is Fossile's jealousy for which Townley consistently makes him feel remorse. "To a Jealous Man a Whisper is Evidence, and a Dream Demonstration," says Townley (1.272-3). What she expects from her new life as Fossile's wife is a comfortable life and ample opportunity to indulge her amorous instincts with other men. So Fossile has good reason to be jealous, especially as Plotwell and Underplot have laid a wager of 100 guineas over who will seduce Townley first.

Fossile's distrust of his new bride leads to much entertaining stage comedy. For example, the pharmacist Ptisan turns up on Fossile's wedding day with unwelcome news of

---

<sup>76</sup> Ipecacuanha: *Carapichea ipecacuanha*, a flowering plant native to parts of Central and South America. The word derives from the extinct indigenous Tupi word for the flower which was taken over into Brazilian Portuguese. The Duke of Shrewsbury mentions ipecacuanha in a letter to Arbuthnot from Paris dated 3 April [O.S.] 1713, as a remedy for what he describes as "the distemper of the Country" (Arbuthnot, *Correspondence* 157). Ross notes: "(H)ipecacuana – in medicine acts as an emetic and stomachic" (157).

Fossile's patients. Whenever Fossile tries to show Ptisan the door, Townley and her servant Sarsnet attempt to whisper; Fossile gets between them to hinder their conversation and Ptisan rejoins the dialogue with news of another patient. Fossile eventually has to leave in order to attend Lady Hippokekoana, and Plotwell enters the house as an actor interested in Clinket's play. At the beginning of Act Two Fossile has bribed Hugh, Townley's servant; he takes Hugh's place before his own front door in Townley's livery in order to intercept his young wife's correspondence. This puts him into direct contact with Underplot who tells the disguised Fossile that he will father a child with Townley. When Fossile leaves to attend to a patient, fearing his rivals he instructs his own footman: "Let none in but Patients; wan, sickly Fellows, no Person in the least degree of bodily Strength" (2.1.195-7). In one of many strokes of comic genius on Gay's part, Underplot enters pretending to be a sick man in a chair, while Plotwell impersonates a Polish virtuoso, Lubomirski. The latter explains his flight from Poland as the result of the furore caused by his preparation *Lapis Lydius Virginitatis*, a virginity test. We enter the realms of high farce when Fossile expresses an interest in this, because he wishes to establish whether Townley is *virgo intacta*. He does eventually carry out the test on her, but Townley turns the situation to her own advantage by making Fossile feel guilty for his conduct. After Plotwell and Underplot are sent packing Fossile has a quiet moment with Townley in which he expresses his desire to have a son. But he explains his choice of her as a wife in terms that are comic: it is because of their respective humours.<sup>77</sup> This is immediately followed by the appearance of the sailor with the child which he has to deliver to Fossile's address. The child appears to have been born illegitimately at Townley's Covent Garden address. Townley's marriage to Lieutenant Bengall is then revealed, and Fossile is left holding a child that is not biologically his own.

Gay, Arbuthnot and Pope also use the specialized language of the virtuosi to achieve a comic effect in *Three Hours after Marriage*. Fossile addresses his young wife as if she were a curiosity: "Courage, thou best of my Curiosities" (1.1.26). To reflect Fossile's status as a virtuoso, the language of collecting informs the play. Shortly after his interception of the letter from Plotwell to Townley, Fossile says: "Should this Fellow get to my Bride before I have Bedded her, in a Collection of Cuckolds, what a Rarity should I make!" (1.1.226-28). Equally when Fossile has exchanged clothes with Townley's footman Hugh in order to intercept her suitors, he reads a note protesting that the gift of a snuffbox to her has ended

---

<sup>77</sup> "But for the natural Conformity of our Constitutions. Because thou art hot and moist in the Third Degree, and I my self cold and dry in the First" (*Three Hours after Marriage* 3.1.313-5).

up in someone else's hands. Like a true virtuoso, Fossile is greatly preoccupied about his collection of rare shells. He remarks: "A fine circulation of a Snuff-Box! In time I shall have the rarest of my Shells set off with Gold Hinges, to make Presents to all the Fops about Town. My *Conchae Veneris*; and perhaps, even my *Nautilus*" (2.1.19-22). This is a good example of how the static items in Fossile's virtuoso collection take on a life of their own which irks him, once Townley enters his household.

A conspicuous example of the satirical use of dialogue can be found in the second act when Plotwell impersonates a foreign virtuoso and uses the name Doctor Cornelius Lubomirski. The choice of Christian name is reminiscent of Cornelius Scriblerus.<sup>78</sup> The audience would see that the character of Lubomirski is an imposture and this is highly comic in effect. Plotwell's aim in impersonating Lubomirski is to remove Fossile from the house on the pretext of arousing the virtuoso's interest in items which he might purchase but which are located elsewhere. Lubomirski speaks in a sort of cod English with a heavy accent and introduces himself as follows: "I would make commutation (what do you call it) I would exchange some of my tings for some of his tings" (2.1.225-7). "Commutation" is an obsolete word that means the exchange of one thing for another, a practice common among virtuosi and among those who were collectors. But Gay may also have been drawing on another meaning of the word which was the description of a change or alteration to mark the transformation of the character of Plotwell into that of Lubomirski.

Plotwell initially portrays Lubomirski as an alchemist to Fossile. As proof of this he shows him a large snuffbox which he says is made of gold which he has transmuted from lead on the roof of "de Great Church of *Cracow*" (2.1.239). Fossile shows considerable spirit in resisting Lubomirski's strategies throughout their extended dialogue and here he highlights his visitor's imperfect grasp of alchemical procedure:

PLOTWELL.	Vat of dat? me make dat Gold my own self, of de Lead of de great Church of <i>Cracow</i> .
FOSSILE.	By what Operations?
PLOTWELL.	By Calcination; Reverberation; Purification; Sublimation; Amalgamation; Precipitation; Volitilization.

---

<sup>78</sup> The character comes from Ravenscroft's *The Anatomist: or, The Sham Doctor* in which Young Gerald's servant Crispin impersonates a doctor in the Second Act, dispensing pills for any and every complaint and is taken for a German doctor. He reappears in the Third Act and assumes the character as part of a ruse to make his father Old Gerald look foolish as he tries to court his sweetheart Angelica.

FOSSILE.                    Have a care what you assert. The Volitilization of Gold is not an obvious Process. (2.1.238-44)

Plotwell stumbles here in his dissimulation of an alchemist by using an inappropriate word, which Fossile comments upon.<sup>79</sup> The humour for the audience probably lies in the unfamiliar sound of such technical vocabulary. When Plotwell sees that he is not getting very far with alchemy he switches to antiquarianism and there follows an extended dialogue which parodies the dealings of antiquarians. Here is a brief extract:

FOSSILE.                    This is all out of my Way. Do you know of any Hermaphrodites, monstrous Twins, Antidiluvian Shells, Bones, and Vegetables?

PLOTWELL.                Vat tink you of an Antidiluvian Knife, Spoon, and Fork, with the Mark of *Tubal Cain* in *Hebrew*, dug out of the Mine of *Babylon*? (2.1.274-9)

The satirical reception of the virtuoso is therefore quite thorough in this comedy. Characters take advantage of Fossile's absence to further their own romantic aspirations and the trappings of the virtuoso enter the action as well. As will become apparent in the next section, Fossile's mummy and alligator also play their part in the satire.

#### 7.4.3. *In the Cabinet of Curiosities*

In the first two acts it is largely the interplay of jealousy and romantic intrigue which serves to throw the figure of the virtuoso into comic and thereby satirical relief. For much of Act Three there is sustained satirical treatment of the virtuoso and his concerns which is realized by using a variety of means. The first is more of the imaginative stagecraft we have already encountered. At the beginning of the third act Fossile takes delivery of a mummy and an alligator for his cabinet of curiosities. The mummy in particular was familiar as an item in the collection of any comic virtuoso at the beginning of the eighteenth century.<sup>80</sup> However, the mummy and the alligator also serve to re-introduce Plotwell and Underplot into the Fossile household, serving as resourceful disguises in which they can be smuggled back into the house and therefore return to the action of the play. The humour is both verbal and visual and it all serves to satirize the virtuosi by sending up them, their interests and what

---

<sup>79</sup> Volatilization: "The conversion of a chemical substance from a liquid or solid state to a gaseous or vapor state by the application of heat, by reducing pressure, or by a combination of these processes Also known as vaporization." *McGraw-Hill Dictionary of Scientific and Technical Terms*, 4<sup>th</sup> edn. (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1989), 2037.

<sup>80</sup> See *Memoirs* 190, n. 19. Also Gay I: 449, n. 3 for editor John Fuller's note on the result of placing a crocodile and a mummy on stage at the same time.



they collect. Fossile describes his collection to Dr Possum thus: “The *Musaeum* of the Curious is a lasting Monument” (3.1.140-1), embodying irony of character at his own expense. Nautilus remarks: “Much Joy to the Learned Dr. *Fossile*. To have a *Mummy*, an *Alligator*, and a *Wife*, all in one Day, is too great Happiness for Mortal Man!” (3.1.104-6). When Plotwell is revealed to be the mummy and Underplot the alligator Townley observes ruefully: “How unlucky is this! [*Aside.*] Nay, I don’t know but I may have Twenty lovers in this Collection. You Snakes, Sharks, Monkeys, and Mantegers, speak, and put in your claim before it is too late” (3.1.60-3). Plotwell protests his affections to her saying “Madam! If I don’t love you above all your Sex, may I be banish’d the Studies of Virtuoso’s” (3.1.74-6). A part of the humour lies in turning a collection which among the virtuosi inspires such reverence into something quite different, something used as a subterfuge in an amorous contest. This is how Townley and Plotwell construe the mummy:

- TOWNLEY. He can never parry this Blow, nor grow jealous of his *Mummy*. A *Mummy* is his intimate Friend.
- PLOTWELL. And a Man cannot easily be Cuckolded by any Body else.
- TOWNLEY. Here may’st thou remain the Ornament of his Study, and the Support of his Old Age. Thou shalt divert his Company, and be a Father to his Children. (3.1.39-45)

Underplot’s disguise as an alligator gives rise to the following dialogue between the rivals for Townley’s affections:

- PLOTWELL. Look upon me, Madam. See how I am embroider’d with Hieroglyphicks.
- UNDERPLOT. Consider my beautiful Row of Teeth.
- PLOTWELL. My Balmy Breath.
- UNDERPLOT. The strong Joints of my Back.
- PLOTWELL. My erect Stature.
- UNDERPLOT. My long Tail.
- TOWNLEY. Such a Contest of Beauty! How shall I decide it? (3.1.88-95)

When Fossile returns to the house and his cabinet of curiosities, he is in the company of Dr Nautilus and Dr Possum, two other doctors who are also virtuosi. The three of them form a compact group which represents the virtuoso as a comic type. Nautilus and Possum bicker among themselves in exemplary style and all three are satirized as collectors and astronomers. Irony is used here to mock their pretensions as collectors. The three virtuosi list

a number of extraordinary things that they own individually: a feather of the bird Porphyryon, the dart of the Mantichora, the haft of an antediluvian trowel (undoubtedly a tool belonging to one of the Masons of Babel), a fragment of Seth's Pillar and most improbably "an entire Leaf of *Noah's* Journal aboard the Ark, that was hewn out of a Porphyry Pillar in *Palmyra*" (3.1.123-5). The last phrase is beautifully alliterative and dactylic. Nautilus is unequivocal on the improving quality of the items collected and valued by virtuosi, but Gay once again uses irony of character in making Nautilus appear cerebral and didactic. There is a wonderfully pedantic dispute between Nautilus and Possum over the correct term for a medication: Nautilus says "Asphaltion" and Possum says "Pice-Asphaltus". The disagreement threatens to become a running sore while characterizing both as pedants, until Fossile says:

FOSSILE.                    Be calm, Gentlemen. Both of you handle this Argument with great Learning, Judgment and Perspicuity. For the present, I beseech you to Concord, and turn your Speculations on my *Alligator*. (3.1.156-9)

Fossile is beginning to suspect that mummy and alligator are not what they seem and so Townley creates an astronomical diversion through the telescope, pretending to espy "A Star as broad as the Moon in the Day-time!" (3.1.169-70). In renewed competition Nautilus and Possum struggle to be the first to look through the telescope. Fossile allows himself to be duped and claims to see the enormous star:

NAUTILUS.                I can espy no Celestial Body but the Sun.

POSSUM.                 Brother *Nautilus*, your Eyes are somewhat dim; your Sight is not fit for *Astronomical Observations*.

FOSSILE.                Is the Focus of the Glass right? Hold, Gentlemen, I see it; about the Bigness of *Jupiter*.

NAUTILUS.               No Phenomenon offers itself to my Speculation. (3.1.178-83)

There then follows the exposure of Plotwell and Underplot by the virtuosi:

POSSUM.                First, Brother *Nautilus*, convince your self of the Composition of the *Mummy*.

NAUTILUS.              I will insure your *Alligator* from any Damage. His Skin I affirm once more to be impenetrable. [*Draws his sword.*]

POSSUM.                I will not deface any Hieroglyphick.        [*Goes to the Mummy with the Knife.*]

FOSSILE.                I never oppose a luciferous Experiment. It is the beaten Highway to Truth.

[Plotwell & Underplot *leap from their Places; the Doctors are frightened.*] (3.1.192-8)

Townley creates another diversion by persuading Phoebe Clinket to assume the responsibility for the mummy and the alligator as forming part of a masquerade that she has written, and which is being enacted for her. But Possum and Nautilus are not convinced, departing with the following lines of dialogue:

POSSUM.                   Hark ye, Brother *Fossile*! Your *Crocodile* has proved a Human Creature, I wish your Wife may not prove a *Crocodile*.

NAUTILUS.               Hark ye, Brother *Fossile*! Your *Mummy*, as you were saying, seemeth to be hot in the first Degree, and is powerful in some Diseases of Women. (3.1.236-41)

It is an interesting feature of these passages of dialogue how in one moment Possum or Nautilus might be the butt of the humour; in another, they might represent two argumentative pedants who are called to order by Fossile; in yet another, it is they who serve as the instrument with which to ridicule Fossile. The characterization is therefore fluid, if one can indeed speak of characters at all, and not rather satirical tools. Before he is thrown out, Underplot tries to no avail to turn Fossile's reputation as a virtuoso back on him: "Let it never be said that the Famous Dr. *Fossile*, so renowned for his Charity to Monsters, should violate the Laws of Hospitality, and turn a poor *Alligator* naked into the Street" (3.1.255-8).

The mention of monsters brings to mind the Bohemian sisters from the Double Mistress chapter of the *Memoirs* of Scriblerus, being the standard term for anyone whose physical appearance was markedly divergent from what was considered normal. In the epilogue to *Three Hours after Marriage* we hear "*his very Monsters are of sweet Condition*" (line 9). But Fossile only takes Underplot at his word and orders him to remove his disguise before then seeing him ejected. So we see Fossile and the virtuosi foil Plotwell and Underplot, but much satirical mileage at the expense of the virtuosi has been obtained through the humorous use of the mummy and the alligator.

There are some shared satirical targets between *Three Hours after Marriage* and the *Memoirs* of Scriblerus, since it was the meetings of the Scriblerus Club which set Gay on the course of writing this comedy. Speaking of a child she might bear him in the future, Fossile tells Townley that "the Intellects of the Infant depend upon the Suppers of the Parents. Diet must be prescrib'd" (3.1.320-2). This is the position of Cornelius Scriblerus in the *Memoirs*, who prescribes a diet of goat's milk and honey for himself and his wife "according to the prescription of Galen" (96). The Scriblerian position on the search for the longitude, derided in the *Memoirs*, appears in the exchange between Fossile and Plotwell (as Lubomirski):

PLOTWELL.               Do you deal in Longitudes, Sir?

FOSSILE. I deal not in impossibilities. I search only for the grand Elixir.  
(2: 262-5)

Calamity brought on the head of a virtuoso through an unwise marriage is certainly common to both *Three Hours after Marriage* and the Double Mistress chapter of the *Memoirs* of Scriblerus. Common authorship of the play and that chapter of the *Memoirs* has been ascribed to Gay, Arbuthnot and Pope (*Memoirs* 297-8).

*Three Hours after Marriage* can certainly take its place in the lineage of comedies dealing with the figure of the virtuoso. After *The Virtuoso* and *The Emperor of the Moon*, *Three Hours after Marriage* can have claims to be both the most imaginative and the most farcical. Fossile defends his position well and while he is not outwitted by those around him, he is made to look quite ridiculous in the process, so the work does at least bring to mind the genre of the lampoon. Not really scurrilous, it may however play with the fact that Woodward, the real-life model for Fossile, was thought to be homosexual in his sexual orientation (Uffenbach 178). So, by placing a caricature of Woodward on the London stage and having that caricature marry a prostitute, only then to enter into a series of comic tableaux which satirize the type of the virtuoso and reveal that the prostitute has two suitors, a husband and a child, may not only satirize the figure of the virtuoso in general, but also mock John Woodward in particular for his supposed sexual orientation.

## CHAPTER EIGHT. THE VOYAGE TO LAPUTA: A SCRIBLERIAN POSTSCRIPT?

Having a Desire to see those Antients (sic), who were most renowned for Wit and Learning, I set apart one Day on purpose. I proposed that Homer and Aristotle might appear at the Head of all their Commentators; but these were so numerous, that some Hundreds were forced to attend in the Court and outward Rooms of the Palace.

Jonathan Swift, *Gulliver's Travels* (2012), 294.

### 8.1. THE DIVERSITY OF INTERPRETATION OF SWIFT'S SATIRE

Before entering into any interpretation of Jonathan Swift's best-known work, a preliminary discussion is necessary to decide on how to refer to it. As one of the most widely read works of English literature, it is generally referred to as *Gulliver's Travels*. However, this was not the original title of the work. When it was first published in 1726 it bore the title *Travels into Several Remote Nations of the World. In Four Parts, viz. I. A Voyage to Lilliput. II. A Voyage to Brobdingnag. III. A Voyage to Laputa, Balnibarbi, Luggnagg, Glubbudrib and Japan. IV. A Voyage to the Country of the Houyhnhnms. By Lemuel Gulliver, first a Surgeon, and then a Captain of several Ships*. Such a title was characteristic of the travel literature of the time to which Swift was referring for his own satirical purposes. At least one objection has been raised to the general adoption of *Gulliver's Travels* as the title of the work (Brückmann 116). This objection is twofold. Firstly, to call the work *Gulliver's Travels* is to "assign some measure of control to our anti-hero" (116). The shorter title suggests that Gulliver is the master of his own destiny, or of his destinations, which plainly he is not. It also suggests that Gulliver is a consistent and stable character. This is also clearly not the case, given the different ways in which he behaves in the various parts of the work. Rather than being a character drawn with any consistent traits, he is in fact a satirical instrument. Secondly, to call the work *Gulliver's Travels* domesticates it as a novel. A further dilution of the work occurs when it is presented as children's literature, which usually entails the omission of substantial portions of the text. As far as the title of the work is concerned, as a compromise I propose to refer to the work as the

*Travels*. The word is common to Swift's original title and the widely adopted one and is sufficiently indicative of the work as a whole.

Anyone who writes about Jonathan Swift's *Travels* must contemplate the truth of the adage *quot homines, tot sententiae*.<sup>81</sup> My interest in the *Travels* is at least partial. I am solely interested in two aspects of the work. Firstly, I am interested in whether the *Travels* have any relationship with the *Memoirs* of Scriblerus. And secondly, I am interested in arriving at an assessment of what are regarded by some critics as Swift's satirical accounts of the virtuosi.

[Passage omitted]

### 8.2. THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE *MEMOIRS* OF SCRIBLERUS AND THE *TRAVELS*

In Chapter Sixteen of the *Memoirs* the narrator makes the claim that Swift's *Travels* form a part of the imaginative world of Scriblerus. The Chapter is entitled: "*Of the Secession of Martinus, and some Hint of his Travels*" (164-5). After describing the *Travels* obliquely – which has its own humour because of the work's widespread popularity – the chapter closes with the assertion that, rather than being the voyages of "a Surgeon of a Ship, or a Captain of a Merchant-man," certain characteristics – "that cordial *Love of Mankind*, that inviolable *Regard to Truth*, that Passion for his *dear Country*, and that particular attachment to the excellent Princess Queen *Anne*" – mark out the hero of the *Travels* as "the Great Scriblerus" (165). The problem with this assertion is that such characteristics cannot consistently be ascribed to Gulliver in the *Travels*.

[Passage omitted]

### 8.3. THE PRESENCE OF NATURAL PHILOSOPHY IN THE *TRAVELS*

Undoubtedly Philosophers are in the Right when they tell us, that nothing is great or little otherwise than by Comparison.

Jonathan Swift, *Gulliver's Travels* (2012), 124.

Swift drew quite widely on natural philosophy in writing the *Travels*. Two scientific instruments which may well have shaped his satirical technique in the first two parts of the *Travels* are the telescope and the microscope respectively. What the two instruments do, both

---

<sup>81</sup> "So many men, so many opinions," Desiderius Erasmus, *The Adages of Erasmus*, selected by William Barker (Toronto: U of Toronto P, 2001), I.iii.7.

scientifically and artistically speaking, is create dramatically different perspectives. The telescope provides vision at a considerable distance but also makes large things appear small. It may have been this property of the telescope which suggested the perspective between Gulliver and the Lilliputians to Swift. Equally, the microscope opened up vast perspectives which made the minutiae of insect and plant life visible. The revelation of a hitherto unappreciated world of small things also had a great impact on how the world was envisaged and it gave rise to the topos of the vile. And the tremendous impact he achieves when Gulliver appears as a creature smaller than a dwarf in the *Voyage to Brobdingnag*, the country of the giants, also derives from the properties of the microscope (Nicolson and Mohler 193-9).

It is well worth mentioning here an alternative interpretation of Gulliver's stature in the *Voyage to Brobdingnag*. Aline Mackenzie Taylor bases her reading of this voyage on the concept of curiosity. When Gulliver first lands he is evidently looking for something curious.<sup>82</sup> But he turns out to be the object of somebody else's curiosity. Taylor persuasively argues that the exhibition of Gulliver in Brobdingnag by the farmer is reminiscent of actual exhibitions of animal and human curiosities in Swift's day. Even more striking is the fascination with dwarfs in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. For example, John Wormberg was a Swiss dwarf who had been exhibited to King James II at Whitehall. Taylor suggests it was Wormberg who set the pattern of dwarfs being carried about in boxes to be exhibited at private houses (30), as Gulliver is in this voyage, throughout which Gulliver is exhibited and treated as a curiosity. The two interpretations, that of the microscope and that of the dwarf inspiring curiosity, can easily coexist.

[Passage omitted]

#### 8.4. THE ACADEMY OF LAGADO

In Part Three of the *Travels* Gulliver visits the flying island of Laputa and its dependent territory of Balnibarbi. The rulers of Laputa and Balnibarbi represent an excess of intellectual abstraction which results in the poor management of everyday affairs. The experiments at the terrestrial Academy of Lagado are of a piece with the mathematics and music that preoccupy the court on the flying island. The entire visit to Laputa and Balnibarbi represents an excursion into a land where the aberrations of reason hold sway.

[Passage omitted]

---

<sup>82</sup> "I now began to be weary, and seeing nothing to entertain my Curiosity, I returned gently down towards the Creek . . ." (122).

#### 8.4.1. Sources for the Academy Practitioners

The Academy of Lagado consists of a number of groups of what Swift variously calls “projectors” and “professors”. Although it is widely thought that the Academy is a satirical representation of the Royal Society, yet the professors in speculative learning and the political projectors who inhabit the second and third parts of the Academy bear no relation to natural philosophy. The satirical reception of the Royal Society is usually located among the first ten practitioners that we encounter in the Academy of Lagado. This interpretation was advanced by Marjorie Nicolson and Nora M. Mohler in their essay “The Scientific Background of Swift’s *Voyage to Laputa*” (*Science and Imagination* 110-54). In that essay they assert that Swift reproduced actual experiments carried out by members of the Royal Society, sometimes combining two diverse experiments to make a composite one or adding something to an existing experiment which turns it into something ridiculous. This line of interpretation has been continued subsequently by other critics such as Frederick N. Smith and is also acknowledged by those critics who have a more pluralist approach to the text at this point. Yet this certainty that the work of the members of the Royal Society was the source for Swift’s raw material does not always stand up to inspection.

[Passage omitted]

#### 8.4.2. Composite Nature of Swift’s Satire

Anyone reading Swift’s description of the Academy of Lagado cannot help but notice his use of the word “projector”. Projectors were widespread in Swift’s day. As with so many key terms that we have encountered, the word had an original definition as well as a pejorative one. To reprise, in this case the word meant one who offered a project for the consideration of others with a view to receiving financial investment in his project. The pejorative meaning for the word was that the projector was in fact a crook, a swindler or a cheat, one who promoted companies of little worth. In the case of the first practitioner at the Academy of Lagado, he is given several attributes of a projector:

The first Man I saw . . . He had been Eight Years upon a Project for extracting Sun-Beams out of Cucumbers, which were to be put into Vials hermetically sealed, and let out to warm the Air in raw inclement Summers. He told me, he did not doubt in Eight Years more, that he should be able to supply the Governors Garden with Sun-shine at a reasonable Rate; but he complained that his Stock was low, and intreated me to give him something as an Encouragement to Ingenuity, especially since this had been a very dear Season for Cucumbers. (259-60)



The project has a purpose (“to supply the Governors Garden with Sun-shine”), the project is currently poorly valued (“his Stock was low”) and he asks Gulliver for funds (“intreated me to give him something as an Encouragement to Ingenuity”). None of these features are associated with the virtuosi, who were after all men of private means. If the projector was a figure from the world of commerce, and therefore less gentlemanly than the virtuoso, Swift may have been satirizing the gentility of the virtuoso by using the noun to describe the practitioners. Or is the use of the word “projector” here to be seen as more descriptive?

Whatever the case, the virtuosi do not appear to be Swift’s only satirical target. And if he is not exclusively satirizing the virtuosi of the Royal Society, what is it that he is satirizing? It seems to me that Swift’s ten projectors form a composite satire on various aspects of the Modern, written from the viewpoint of an Ancient. We can see this wider pattern in the example of the eighth practitioner: “There was an Astronomer who had undertaken to place a Sun-Dial upon the great Weather-Cock on the Town-House, by adjusting the annual and diurnal Motions of the Earth and Sun, so as to answer and coincide with all accidental Turnings of the Wind” (*Travels* 263). The status quo ante is the weathercock. The placing of a sundial on the town hall weathercock here arouses our attention because its utility depends on the astronomer’s adjustment of “the annual and diurnal Motions of the Earth and Sun, so as to answer and coincide with all the accidental Turnings of the Wind,” which is impossible. Nicolson corroborates the existence of the practice (139-40). We have already noted the likelihood that the passage refers to Sir Isaac Newton. Swift is satirizing a new practice, that of affixing sundials to a weathervane, by suggesting that in order to make it work, it will be necessary to adjust the movements of the Earth and Sun in order to make the movements of the weathervane correspond to the random movements of the wind. Since this would be impossible, we can extrapolate Swift’s position from this example and conclude that he would have been content with the weathervane. The status quo ante is passed over in favour of the sundial. In order to make the sundial work the movements of the sun and the earth must be changed by human hand, thus demonstrating the futility of the innovation.

The self-image of a natural philosopher was rather different to that of a projector. The former would have had some notion of himself as carrying out experiments which would contribute to the eventual discovery of universal laws or at least to the discovery of techniques and methods which might benefit mankind. A projector may have been someone who genuinely formulated a plan for the benefit of all. But in his pejorative manifestation he would have been planning a scheme or the formation of a company with the possible intention of defrauding the investors by means of an unprofitable outcome. It seems to me that Swift is applying the word

“projector” ironically to natural philosophers who also had failed to deliver the results expected of them. In Swift’s view both the projector and the natural philosopher offer the guarantee of a worthless outcome to their undertakings. Both embody, for Swift, a similar abuse of the intellect or of Modern learning and so are met with distrust and contempt on his part. In this way we finally have an interpretation which reconciles the apparent contradiction in Swift’s description of the Academy of Lagado.

#### 8.4.3. *Swift’s Use of the Adynaton*

I have reviewed the potential sources for Swift’s practitioners. Now it is time to show what lies at the heart of Swift’s satirical technique in this part of the *Travels*. There is an overall resemblance between the activities of the ten practitioners I have examined in detail. There is no positive outcome to any of the things that they do. Extracting sunbeams from cucumbers, turning human excrement into the food which gave rise to it, turning ice into gunpowder, building houses by starting with the roof, distinguishing colour by feeling and smelling, using hogs to fertilize a field by burying their food there, the use of spiders’ cobwebs instead of silkworms, attaching a sundial to a weather vane, curing colic by contrary operations, sowing the land with chaff and trying to propagate a breed of naked sheep: the description of all of these activities resembles a rhetorical device from classical literature known as the *adynaton*, which resembles a proverb and expresses impossibility or futility. The *adynaton* is the stylistic device that Swift uses to satirize the activities undertaken at the Academy of Lagado.<sup>83</sup> It is this device which provides the account of the ten projectors with a formal unity and expresses Swift’s rejection of the Modern as futile.

[Passage omitted]

#### 8.5. SWIFT AND SIR ISAAC NEWTON

As is to be expected in the context of a satirical account of natural philosophy, Swift includes in the *Travels* some strong attacks on the natural philosopher and mathematician Sir Isaac Newton. Newton had published the first edition of his groundbreaking *Principia Mathematica* in 1687 and was elected to the presidency of the Royal Society in 1703, a position he held for the rest of his life. Swift includes a disparaging portrait of mathematicians in Part

---

<sup>83</sup> Etymologically the word is made up of two other ancient Greek words, *a* meaning “without” and *dynasthai* meaning “to be able.” *Silva Rhetoricae* ([www.rhetoric.byu.edu](http://www.rhetoric.byu.edu)).

Three of the *Travels* and Newton can clearly be regarded as one of the satirical butts here. He is also explicitly referred to in the list of celestial concerns shared by mathematicians, the first of which is that with the passing of time the earth will be swallowed up by the sun (236).<sup>84</sup> The suggestion has been made recently that there is even a reference in the *Travels* to the famous anecdote in which Newton was inspired to develop the idea of gravitation by watching an apple fall from a tree.

[Passage omitted]

#### 8.6. CONCLUSION

So, is the Voyage to Laputa a Scriblerian postscript? As we have seen in the discussion about the existence of any imaginative links between the *Memoirs* and the *Travels*, there is no demonstrable external link between the two and in particular there is nothing from the mouth of Swift to say that he believed he was consciously carrying on the earlier project.

[Passage omitted]

The *Travels* are reminiscent of the *Memoirs*, similar in certain respects, but not a Scriblerian postscript. Rather they are an independent work of satire and an attempt in part to calculate the worth of mankind. But both are examples of the satirical reception of the virtuoso and therefore of natural philosophy and both contain elements of satire on learning in general. And so, despite recent critical claims, the *Travels* have their place in any account of the evolution of the satirical reception of early modern science and of learning itself.

---

<sup>84</sup> Referring to the original Latin edition, Womersley states this is “a possibility noted in Newton’s *Principia Mathematica* (1687), I, vii-viii” (*Travels* 236, n. 38).



## CHAPTER NINE. ON TEXTUAL CRITICISM, RICHARD BENTLEY AND THE FIRST SATIRICAL RESPONSES TO HIS WORK

It was in the first half of the eighteenth century that one of the largest private collections of manuscripts, charters and rolls was assembled by Robert Harley and his son Edward (1689-1741). Containing over 7,000 manuscripts, 14,000 charters and 500 rolls, the Harley collection was the largest single collection among those which made up the first holdings of the British Museum, after it was founded by an Act of Parliament on 7 June 1753. Other important collections were the Cotton manuscripts, numbering more than 1,400 manuscripts and 1,500 charters, rolls and seals, and the Sloane manuscripts which numbered over 4,000. We have already encountered this phenomenon in considering the collections of the antiquarians and the virtuosi and noted that manuscripts were as eagerly collected as statues, inscriptions and coins. There was another group of people who were interested in such manuscripts from the related perspective of textual criticism. The practice of textual criticism consists in making editorial interventions in an established text with a view to establishing a stable version of that text in line with the original author's intentions. The purpose of the scrutiny of manuscripts such as those collected by Harley and others was to gain a better insight into important works of classical literature. This activity was called *collation* and consisted in comparing one manuscript with another or with the original of the work in question in order to correct and emend it.<sup>85</sup> Editors of classical texts are generally guided by two principles, the wish to produce a text for readers which is stable and reflects the most reliable manuscript evidence. The technical term for this is *recension*. Editors also strive for accuracy, since any manuscript may contain errors which occur because of the

---

<sup>85</sup> A good example of an important manuscript in the Harley collection is that of Petrarch's edition of the works of Livy. Comparatively late as it dates from the late 12<sup>th</sup> century and owned by the Italian humanist and poet Francesco Petrarca (1304-74), this manuscript later passed into the ownership of another important Italian humanist, Lorenzo Valla (c. 1406-57). Both made corrections to the text and given the importance of both men's work as philologists, anyone interested in establishing an accurate version of Livy's text would be keen to consult this manuscript.

simple fact that manuscripts were copied from one to the other. They will take it upon themselves to make editorial changes to the text in the interest of eliminating those errors. The technical term for this is *emendation* (Metzger 156-9). An idea of what the intervention in a faulty classical text meant in practice for the interested reader can be gleaned from a passage in the fifth number of *The Censor*, probably written by Lewis Theobald and published on 20 April 1715:

When upon tumbling over the first Shelves, I have discovered an uncommon Beauty and Strength of Wit in an imperfect *Paragraph*, I grieve as much that I cannot recover the whole, as a brave Man would for the Amputation of a Limb, from a strong and vigorous Body that had done his Country great Services, and seem'd to promise it yet greater. If upon these Occasions any of the learned happen to have supplied that Defect, by restoring a maimed Sentence to its original Life and Spirit, I pay him the same regard as the ancient Romans did to One who had preserv'd the Life of a *Fellow-Citizen*. (1: 30-31)

The foremost practitioner of textual criticism in Britain in the first half of the eighteenth century was the classical philologist Richard Bentley. Lewis Theobald sought to emulate Bentley when he published his critical account of Alexander Pope's edition of Shakespeare, *Shakespeare Restored* (1726). Pope's satirical reception of textual criticism is to be found in *The Dunciad Variorum* (1728) where Theobald predominates and in *The Dunciad in Four Books* (1743) in which Bentley is more present. Bentley had worked as a classicist all his life and became more vulnerable to attack after publishing his annotated edition of Milton's *Paradise Lost* in 1732, which was regarded as eccentric by most of his contemporaries. However, before examining these works in Chapter Nine, I shall give an account of the history of textual criticism and then look at the satirical reception of Bentley's polemical edition of the Latin poetry of Horace, which appeared in 1712, although the title page gave 1711 as the year of publication (Haugen 124). This reception included the Scriblerian *Virgilius Restauratus*, written in Latin and later incorporated into Pope's *The Dunciad Variorum* as an appendix.

#### 9.1. A BRIEF HISTORY OF TEXTUAL CRITICISM

Although teachers of grammar had emended classical texts since Alexandrian times, there had never been anything amounting to a profession or an established method for examining classical sources. However, from 1450 onwards humanists began to argue in favour of creating paid university posts for scholars skilled in textual emendation. This coincided with a great revival in classical learning through the flourishing of Renaissance

humanism in Italy between 1450 and 1600. And it was because poetry came to the fore in the study of the ancient languages at this time that the need arose for corrected texts of poetic works with an accompanying critical interpretation. A key figure in the development of classical philology was the Italian Angelo Poliziano (1454-94), who was much revered by Erasmus. Before the appearance of Poliziano's *Miscellanea* in 1489, classical scholars effectively had no conventions or genres in which to communicate their findings. The essays contained in this volume established a model for that communication. Poliziano broke with the tradition of writing commentaries by basing his work on the *Noctes Atticae* of Gellius, a work which was miscellaneous in character. Divided into chapters, a list of all the chapter headings appeared at the beginning of the work, each chapter having a summary title. He also insisted on the quality and quantity of his sources. It was also at this time that rulers such as Poliziano's patron Lorenzo de' Medici (1449-92) began to establish libraries which provided stable collections of manuscripts on which humanist scholars could work. Previously access to manuscripts had been more haphazard. Before the invention of printing, however, the relationship between manuscripts was made more complex through the absence of a widely available and stable version of any given text. In these circumstances both the collation of manuscripts and the diffusion of the results were problematic. The invention of printing facilitated such diffusion and hence an improvement in the quality of a text when it was made available to other readers.

Poliziano turned philology into a much more dynamic discipline by means of his innovative approach to textual problems. His approach to manuscripts was the starting point for how modern philologists approached the task of recension, the selection of the most convincing evidence for determining a classical text. Poliziano's approach to manuscripts was to look for the oldest ones. Aware that they would still contain errors, he still prized them above modern ones as they were for him nearer to what the author had originally written. More modern manuscripts were more removed from the originals in time and their correctness often depended on an intervention in the text. Poliziano preferred the errors in the older manuscripts for containing a better trace of the original text. To explain, Poliziano was faced with two groups of texts. These were on the one hand older manuscripts and on the other more recent printed editions. He preferred to bypass the modern editions with their patina of new textual emendations and go back to the older manuscripts. While these would have their own errors, he thought it likely that these would be closer to the author's original intentions. The consequence of this approach was the reduction in evidence cited in critical commentary, since it allowed him to eliminate multiple references which refer back to

a precedent and to simplify things by going back to the original source. Another hugely important development was Poliziano's insistence on the interdependence of Latin and ancient Greek literature. He had to re-establish this in Renaissance Italy as ancient Greek had not been within the terms of reference of the educated inhabitants of the Italian peninsula for centuries. Erasmus had to fight this battle once again in his own work. This general principle was accepted in Bentley's day, as is evident from the way the later scholar refers back to ancient Greek precedents in the notes to his edition of Horace. Finally, Poliziano blamed the scribes for the faulty transmission of texts, something we shall also encounter in Bentley's work. Poliziano had also berated them for the textual emendations they made in copies of older manuscripts, providing in his view another stage of removal from the original text. He also reproached the scribes for removing the errors preserved from the older manuscripts in new editions: "Dishonest scribes have expunged these completely from the new texts" [Grafton's translation] (qtd in Grafton, *Scaliger* 1: 27).<sup>86</sup> This was because he thought those errors to be closer to the original text.

Another important predecessor of Bentley was Joseph Justus Scaliger. Scaliger produced significant editions of Latin poets such as Catullus, Tibullus and Propertius. After a period of working in France he aligned himself with the Italian school of philologists. According to Gian Vincenzo Pinelli (1535-1601), who was the mentor of Galileo, it was Scaliger's wish to become *Aristarco di tutti* [The Aristarchus of Everybody, my trans.] (Grafton 1: 3). The name of Bentley was also to become associated with Aristarchus, the ancient Greek critic who was the model of critical probity. Aristarchus of Samothrace (c.216-144 BC) became head of the Alexandrian Library in c. 153 BC, was the first scholar to write numerous commentaries and was something of a textual critic himself (*Oxford Classical Dictionary* 159). And this is not the only similarity between the two men, since Scaliger resembles Bentley in his view of his own abilities too. His publications were sometimes attended with polemic; he had a high opinion of his ability to restore a deficient text and was contemptuous of those whose claims to the office of critic he found wanting. In 1578 an edition of Hippocrates' book *On Wounds to the Head* was published. It consisted of the Greek text, a Latin translation and Scaliger's comments. In the latter Scaliger identifies various forms of interference with the text at the hands of scribes. He speaks highly of his own powers of divination. He mocks those with a medical training who have previously edited this work without noticing the

---

<sup>86</sup> ". . . vestigia . . . quae de novis codicibus ab improbis librariis prorsus obliterantur" (Grafton, *Joseph Scaliger* 1: 237, n. 61).



textual accretions. He asserts that anyone who gainsays him must be as “thick as a post” (1: 181). It is particularly striking that Scaliger regarded himself as better placed to correct a medical text than those with a medical training (1: 184). As far as the responsibilities of the textual critic are concerned, Scaliger insisted on establishing the history of the text he was working on and had stern things to say about those who contributed to the instability of a text. In all of these characteristics he resembled Bentley, with one notable exception. He remained within the world of classical scholarship, rather than entering the wider literary world outside of the university, as Bentley was to do with his critique of the *Letters of Phalaris* and his edition of Horace.

## 9.2. RICHARD BENTLEY’S REPUTATION

Now, it must here be understood that ink is the great missive weapon in all battles of the learned, which, conveyed through a sort of engine called a quill, infinite numbers of these are darted at the enemy by the valiant on each side, with equal skill and violence, as if it were an engagement of porcupines.

Jonathan Swift, *The Battle of the Books in: A Tale of a Tub and Other Works* (2008), 107.

Bentley’s reputation as the rising star of classical philology in the late 1600s was established with the publication in 1691 of a letter in Latin to John Mill, the principal of St Edmund’s Hall, Oxford (1644/5-1707). This was printed as an appendix to the Oxford edition of the *Chronicle* of John Malalas (c. 491-578), who was originally from Antioch and wrote in Greek. The letter included Bentley’s emendations to the text of that chronicle as well as emendations to other texts along with some important insights on metre. All of this was received with astonishment by the foremost philologists in Europe and as a result much was expected of Bentley in his future career. Among his later innovations was the restoration of the Greek letter *digamma* to Homeric poetry, something which solved a long-standing metrical puzzle and confirmed Bentley’s brilliance of insight, particularly where metre was concerned. His restorations to the fragments of Callimachus, published in Graevius’s Utrecht edition of 1697, were greatly prized. His editions of the poet Horace (1711), the comic playwright Terence (1726) and the astrologer Manilius (1739) were important works of Latin scholarship. His edition of Horace introduced textual criticism to England. His edition of Terence (c. 195-159? BC) proposed an innovative way of locating the metrical stress, something which had long vexed editors. Finally, Bentley presented the *Astronomica*, a guide to astrology by the Roman poet Manilius probably written in the 1st century AD, as being full of substantial interpolations (Haugen 124-5, 172 and 211).

While these publications made Bentley famous in academic circles, his work and personality were received differently in the literary circles of the day. To understand this, it is necessary to go back briefly to the 1690s and to the Battle of the Ancients and the Moderns. This dispute began over a remark made by Sir William Temple in "An Essay upon the Ancient and Modern Learning". Temple was generally arguing in favour of Ancient literature but had the misfortune to single out two works of debatable antiquity:

It may perhaps be further affirmed, in favour of the ancients, that the oldest books we have are still in their kind the best. The two most ancient that I know of in prose, among those we call profane authors, are Aesop's Fables and Phalaris's Epistles, both living near the same time, which was that of Cyrus and Pythagoras. As the first has been agreed by all ages since for the greatest master in his kind, and all others of that sort have been but imitations of his original, so I think the Epistles of Phalaris to have more race, more spirit, more force of wit and genius, than any others I have ever seen, either ancient or modern. (Temple 64)

This brought forth a response from William Wotton (1666-1727) in his *Reflections upon Ancient and Modern Learning* (1694). This first edition of Wotton's work consisted of 29 chapters. Wotton presents in a reasonably factual way the achievements of the Ancients and the Moderns across a very wide range of disciplines. These range from moral and political knowledge, poetry, grammar to architecture, subjects in which Wotton says the Ancients are generally regarded as superior, while the Moderns have made important contributions to mathematics, logic and metaphysics, geometry and arithmetic, scientific instruments and medicine. Bentley's *Dissertation upon the Epistles of Phalaris, Themistocles, Socrates, Euripides &c. and Aesop's Fables* was published with the second edition of Wotton's work in 1697; although Bentley states that he will not be drawn into the controversy over the Ancients and the Moderns, the work actually placed him on Wotton's side in the quarrel.<sup>87</sup> Written in English, this was Richard Bentley's first deliberate foray into the wider world of letters beyond the world of the university. Bentley argues rigorously with careful scholarly procedure that the *Epistles of Phalaris* belonged to a different age, were forgeries and therefore not worthy of serious consideration. He reaches this conclusion on the basis of the type of Greek in which they were written and also as a result of considering a number of other factors, such as the market for manuscripts at the time they were written. For example, the Kings of Pergamon and Alexandria were offering generous amounts of money

---

<sup>87</sup> There were three editions of Wotton's work: *Reflections upon Ancient and Modern Learning*, 1<sup>st</sup> edn. (London 1694); 2<sup>nd</sup> edn. with *Dissertation upon the Epistles of Phalaris* by Bentley (London, 1697); 3<sup>rd</sup> edn. (London, 1705). The third edition contained his comments on *A Tale of a Tub*.

to make acquisitions for their libraries and Bentley suggests that this was a financial environment which encouraged forgeries (8). While not strictly speaking being an example of textual criticism Bentley exercises his critical judgements along linguistic and historical lines.

This dissertation then became the subject of *Dr. Bentley's Dissertations on the Epistles of Phalaris, and the Fables of Aesop, examin'd*, published in 1698. Attributed to Charles Boyle (1674-1731), it became widely known as *Boyle against Bentley*. In this work Bentley's first dissertation was criticized and he was accused of pedantry. Many of Bentley's arguments in his first dissertation were based on the notion of anachronism. All such accusations against the *Letters of Phalaris* were based on concrete evidence and made use of dates. However, *Boyle against Bentley* concentrated with some success on the Greek dialect in which the *Letters* were written. Bentley decried "yet our Sophist is inexcusable, in making a Tyrant of Agrigentum, a City of *Doric* Language and Original, write Epistles in such a Dialect as if he had gone to school in Athens" (*First Dissertation* 43). Bentley protests that the Epistles are written in Attic and indeed in a version of Attic in use one thousand years after Phalaris lived. In *Boyle against Bentley* it is argued that the language of the *Letters* was the result of Doric copyists working at a time when their dialect was predominant.

Bentley published the second edition of the *Dissertation upon the Epistles of Phalaris* in 1699 and added a number of points to those in the original dissertation. Firstly, he reckons that Phintias of Agrigentum built the city of Phintia 270 years after Phalaris's death (91ff.). In the *Letters* Phalaris is portrayed as borrowing money from Phintia almost three hundred years before it had been built. Secondly, Bentley seized on the use of Greek words in the *Letters* which had changed their meaning. Before Plato the word "pronoia" did not mean "God's providence". And Pythagoras (b. mid-6<sup>th</sup> century-c. 495 BC) was the first to call the Universe "kosmos". So the use of these two words with these meanings in the *Letters* was further proof that they were forged (523-7). Bentley refutes the account of Phalaris's liberality in the *Letters*. Phalaris (d. c. 554 BC) is said to have given the physician Polyclitus, who cured him of a dangerous distemper, some goblets of refined gold among other things. Bentley argues that there was hardly any gold in Greece in Phalaris's time (530-1). And finally Bentley quotes the second century AD Syrian Christian writer Tatian as saying that "Atossa the Persian Empress was the First that wrote Epistles" (535-6). Bentley calculates that Atossa was younger than Phalaris by one or two generations, given that she was the sister of the Persian king Cambyses II (c. 559-522 BC); was afterwards married to Darius (c. 550-486 BC) and was still alive when her son Xerxes (519-465 BC) returned from his Greek expedition (480

BC). The second dissertation was his definitive refutation of *Boyle against Bentley*, although the general perception at the time was that Bentley had been defeated.<sup>88</sup>

What Bentley was practising was the beginning of the modern philological approach to classical texts, but this was received as pedantry. The charge of pedantry was never far away where Bentley was concerned, and he understood that it was as a pedant that many perceived him. Since the word “pedant” brought certain connotations with it at the end of the seventeenth century, I shall now trace the origin of the word and the development of its use in literature in order to explore those connotations.

### 9.3. PEDANTRY

A pedant is someone who regards learning of an academic nature as very important while also lacking in judgement of a practical kind. The pedant is also concerned with accuracy in unimportant issues and stands strictly by literal interpretations. Neither the origin nor the etymology of the English word “pedant” is immediately transparent, since the word comes into English in the sixteenth century from its Italian and French cognates. [Clause omitted], which signifies an itinerant teacher of grammar in the framework of the medieval trivium. Such teachers qualified by obtaining the *magister artium*. In the late sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century the word “pedant” was used neutrally in English to describe a teacher, but also became associated with certain pejorative notions such as an overemphasis on bookish learning or the ostentatious display of knowledge at an inappropriate moment. The class of itinerant grammarians was the subject of satire and reproach from important humanist scholars. Such satire was based on the perception that pedants were in fact poorly educated, something which led them to compensate for their lack of education by making themselves appear more important than they really were. First published in Latin in 1511, a defining account of pedantic behaviour is to be found in Erasmus’s *Praise of Folly*, where he writes about pedantic traits in the rhetoricians and grammarians of his day (14, 78-80). It is

---

<sup>88</sup> This phenomenon is perhaps best appreciated by examining the following joke collected in volume of jests printed in around 1740 (J.O. Halliwell-Phillipps and A.J. Storey, eds., *Cambridge Jokes from the Seventeenth to the Twentieth Century* [Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2009] 47):

Dr. Bentley and Boyle.

Dr. Bentley being in a very numerous company at Cambridge, after the election for parliament men a few years ago, was so elated on their having chosen two courtiers to represent the university, that he said “Now, God be praised, we’ve got rid of an old scab,” meaning the candidates who were thrown out. To which a gentleman present replied; “Ah! Doctor, it is too true; but you will never get rid of a *Boyle* that you had some time ago, which will make you uneasy as long as you live.”

striking in both cases how pedantry is defined by the use of words which are peculiar to the knowledge of the speaker and alien to the audience. Rhetoricians are reproached for using “a few silly little Greek words . . . however out of place these are” (14). The effect of using this kind of recondite knowledge is to create satisfaction in the few who understand it and to extract admiration from those who do not. Erasmus is suggesting here that the pedant dishonestly places himself in a position of power by using an eclectic vocabulary. Erasmus’s portrait of the grammarian has similar traits. He stresses a lack of personal cleanliness and poor working conditions among these teachers of grammar to boys, as well as a strong and misplaced belief in their own learning, which he sees as defective. Again, the use of obscure knowledge to obtain respect is satirized:

Whenever one of them digs out of some mouldy manuscript the name of Anchises’ mother or some trivial word the ordinary man doesn’t know, such as neatherd, tergiversator, cutpurse, or if anyone unearths a scrap of old stone with a fragmentary inscription, O Jupiter, what a triumph! (79)

A.H.T. Levi, who provides the notes for this edition, locates a reference to Juvenal’s seventh satire in this passage: “In his seventh satire Juvenal mentions the ‘name of Anchises’ nurse’ as an instance of the unknowable things grammarians quarrel about” (79-80), suggesting that the resources of the pedant also include what cannot be known, as well as things which are unknown to many. It is evident that the grammarians who are Erasmus’s targets are teachers of a low status both materially and intellectually. In such a context, the use of obscure knowledge to obtain power appears rather craven given the circumstances in which it arises. As a result of the widespread importance of *Praise of Folly* these representations of the pedant entered the realm of received ideas.

In English literature, an early use of the word with a pejorative meaning is in Thomas Nashe’s pamphlet *Have with You to Saffron Walden* (1596). Nashe and Gabriel Harvey (c.1545-1630) had an ongoing feud, partly due to a difference of opinion over which metrical measure was appropriate for the writing of English poetry. Harvey advocated the use of the metre of the Latin hexameter instead of the iambic pentameter, which is better suited to English. Nashe wrote as follows, dismissing Harvey as a pedant: “O, tis a precious apothegmatical Pedant, who will finde matter inough to dilate a whole daye of the first invention of Fy, fa, fam” (43). For the second half of the seventeenth century and the early part of the eighteenth, Samuel Butler’s Puritan knight Hudibras represented pedantry. To create him, Butler drew on received ideas and took them further. This is certainly a character who lives through the prism of his intellect, something which the reader of Butler’s poem is

made to find wanting, although he is higher up the social scale than Erasmus's grammar teachers, as we have already seen in Chapter Three. In the initial exposition of his intellectual capacities (1.1.15-234), we encounter the range of Hudibras's learning and a little of its application. Educated to speak Greek and Latin, Hudibras speaks the ancient tongues to those who are unfamiliar with them: "But much of either would afford / To many that had not one word" (51-8). This recalls the use of learning in Erasmus's account to dazzle those without that learning. Butler's account is a detailed one. The composite language that Hudibras speaks is "A Babylonish dialect / Which learned pedants much affect" (93-4). In logic Hudibras was also "a great critic" (65) and could master both sides of an argument easily (65-70). One of the best-known passages in *Hudibras* concerns rhetoric:

For rhetoric, he could not ope  
His mouth but out there flew a trope,  
And when he happened to break off  
I'th' middle of his speech, or cough,  
He'd hard words ready to show why,  
And tell what rules he did it by . . . (1.81-6).

These lines show Hudibras being satirized for being rhetorical all the time, even when it is inappropriate, and for having pedantic arguments at the ready to justify himself when he stops. He is overly intellectual, resolving "by sines and tangents straight / If bread or butter wanted weight" (1.123-4). We also have the sense of a precocious intellect able to argue any case either way. Hudibras is described as knowing where paradise is located and as able to prove its location as above or below the moon "as he was disposed" (171-4). Yet when placed in everyday situations, Hudibras makes a fool of himself, displaying a lack of practical knowledge. Published after the Restoration, the satirical portrait of this Puritan knight became talismanic for pedantry. In the more theoretical *Characters*, Samuel Butler wrote that what a virtuoso does through things, a pedant does through words. His character Hudibras certainly represents the pedantic.<sup>89</sup>

A representation of the pedant was to be seen on the stage in London at the turn of the century in Susanna Centlivre's comedy *The Stolen Heiress, or, The Salamanca Doctor Outplotted*. The play appeared in print in 1703 and was adapted from Thomas May's *The Heire*, which had been published in 1622. The figure of the pedant is to be found in the subplot. Don Sancho, described in the *dramatis personae* as "A Pedant bred at Salamanca" is to marry Lavinia, the daughter of Larich, brother to the Sicilian Lord Gravello (n.d.). Larich

---

<sup>89</sup> "He [the virtuoso] differs from a Pedant, as Things do from Words; for he uses the same Affectation in his Operations and Experiments, as the other does in Language" (Butler, *Characters* 122).

regards it as a good match because Sancho is “the Son and Heir of my old Friend Don Sancho of Syracuse” (11) and because Larich approves of scholars. However, Lavinia is in love with Francisco, who dupes Sancho and so wins Lavinia’s hand. Sancho is almost immediately presented with reference to the character of Don Quixote. Here is Rosco’s description of Sancho’s arrival in the city of Palermo:

Don Sancho come to Town in his Salamanca habit, his dress, and grave Phiz has alarm’d the Mobb, that there’s such a Crowd about the Inn door, I’le maintain’t his Landlord gives him free Quarter for a Twelve-month, if he’l let him expose him to advantage, ha, ha, ha, he makes as odd a Figure, Sir, as the famous Don Quixot, when he went in search of his Dulcinea. (n. pag.)

Francisco dupes Sancho by borrowing his clothes and courting Lavinia as if he were Sancho. It is in this way that Sancho is outplotted. Here the educated pedant is made to look foolish by someone with an apparently worldlier outlook.

By 1711 Joseph Addison wanted to broaden the range of the word. In *The Spectator* Number 105 (30 June 1711), he wrote: “A man who has been brought up among Books, and is able to talk of nothing else, is . . . what we call a Pedant. But, methinks, we should enlarge the Title, and give it every one that does not know how to think out of his Profession and particular way of Life” (Bond 1965, 1: 437). He was writing at a time of increased professional specialization which lent itself to a way of speaking which was both monologic and self-centred. Another type of pedant was the character Tom Folio, who appears in *The Tatler* Number 158 (11 to 13 April 1710). His trade is to procure books for his clients and to furnish their libraries with them. The parallel with pedantic learning is that he is aware of the external appearance of books, but not of what is inside them, while a pedant would be aware of learned aspects of a work without understanding its human value. Tom Folio regards the name of the author, his subject, the editor’s name, and the year of printing along with the quality of the paper, the work of the corrector and the beauty of the typesetting as “sound Learning and substantial Criticism” (Bond 1987, 2: 384). Mr Bickerstaff, the character that narrates the article, remarks at one point that he has had “a Visit from this learned Idiot, (for that is the Light in which I consider every Pedant)” (2: 385). Bickerstaff is characterizing Tom Folio as well informed, but well informed in such a way as to be foolish and indeed pedantic. Lord Chesterfield (1694-1773) gives eloquent expression to the eighteenth-century idea of a pedant when, writing to his illegitimate son Philip Stanhope in 1748, long after the Battle of the Ancients and the Moderns was over, he sketches the pedant in the following words: “He looks upon the best classical books as books for schoolboys, and consequently below him;

but pores over fragments of obscure authors, treasures up the obsolete words which he meets with there, and uses them upon all occasions to show his reading at the expense of his judgment" (94). Chesterfield then rejects the ways of the pedant, concluding: "All these, and such-like affected peculiarities, are the characteristics of learned coxcombs and pedants, and are carefully avoided by all men of sense . . ." (95). Chesterfield's understanding of pedantry displays some of the features noted by Erasmus, namely the interest in obscure authors, obsolete words and the social display of reading in an unsuccessful attempt to make an impression. This shows that these ideas were current throughout the period.

Chesterfield's review of the pedant emphasizes his knowledge of obscure texts and obsolete words. This was the approximate perception of Richard Bentley. He was also quite ostentatious where his learning was concerned, as was evident with *A Dissertation upon the Epistles of Phalaris* and his edition of Horace, where his footnotes display a detailed knowledge of other editions. In a way both were examples of a social display of his reading. As we have seen above, the word "pedant" first became attached to Bentley in the late 1690s during the Battle of the Ancients and the Moderns. Published in 1698, the work generally referred to as *Boyle against Bentley* was a critique of Bentley's *Dissertation on the Epistles of Phalaris*. It is here that the preconceptions about the pedant which I have been discussing become attached to its author. Bentley is accused of pedantry for several reasons. These include the notion that it is a pedantic affectation to use "an Hard Word, where there is an Easie one; or . . . a Greek or Latin Word, where there is an English one" (*Boyle against Bentley* 93-4). The phrase "hard word" (sometimes in the plural) comes from Samuel Butler's *Hudibras* (1.1.85) and is sometimes found in subsequent accounts of pedantry by other writers. He is also accused of overrating "the Price of Knowledge" (94), as well as making "as great ado about the true Rendring of a Phrase, or Accenting of a Word; as if an Article of Faith, or the Fortune of a Kingdom depended upon it" (94-5). We also encounter an accusation very familiar from Erasmus: "The Subject is fruitful; but I will confine my self to one Particular more of the Pedant's Character; and that is, a Love of Quoting Books, or Passages not extant, or never seen by him; in order to amaze and confound his poor Reader, and make himself Terrible in the way of Learning" (98). These familiar preconceptions are also modified and extended by the perception of Bentley as a disrespectful upstart in contrast to Sir William Temple's high social standing.<sup>90</sup> This perception is reflected in a

---

<sup>90</sup> Bentley was born the son of a yeoman farmer in Yorkshire. Temple had been a fellow-commoner at Emmanuel College Cambridge, while Bentley had been a subsizar at St John's College Cambridge,



concern for good manners and civility: “The First and surest Mark of a Pedant is, to write without observing the received Rules of Civility, and Common Decency: and without distinguishing the Characters of Those he writes to, or against: For Pedantry in the Pen, is what Clownishness is in Conversation; it is written Ill-breeding” (93). Later we read: “An Itch of contradicting Great Men, or Establish’d Opinions upon very slight Grounds, is another Instance of Pedantry” (97). It was in this way that the case was made vigorously for Bentley being a pedant.

So far in this thesis I have examined the satirical reception of the figure of the antiquarian and the virtuoso in the literature of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The word “virtuoso” connotes a variety of activities, ranging from those practised by the antiquarian and the collector to those which typify the natural philosopher. Both imply learning in the sense of bookish learning or learning acquired at a university. So the two represent different manifestations of the same phenomenon. The pedantic handling of words also implies bookish learning, as well as the ostentatious use of words at the wrong moment. When either noun is used pejoratively there is always the notion that the virtuoso and the pedant behave in a way that is excessive or indulgent. In the case of the pedant, he or she concentrates on the literal meaning of a word or statement, rather than allowing any scope for a figurative meaning.

#### 9.4. BENTLEY IN *THE BATTLE OF THE BOOKS*

It is appropriate at this stage to introduce *The Battle of the Books* by Jonathan Swift as one of the first examples of the satirical treatment of Richard Bentley. The work was published in 1704 together with *A Tale of a Tub*, although it was written in the late 1690s at the time of the Battle of the Ancients and Moderns. Swift’s *The Battle of the Books* offers not only an early and highly adverse satirical portrait of Bentley, but also considerable insight into how a Modern such as Bentley was perceived by Swift. It is interesting to reflect on whether Swift’s work of 1704 provides a template for the later satirical reception of Bentley or is solely expressive of its origins in the Phalaris controversy. Bentley is mentioned explicitly in the preface to the work and is quite prominent in the main body of the text, where Swift

---

reflecting their different social origins. A fellow-commoner had the privilege of dining at the fellows’ table, while subsizars at St John’s College Cambridge were maintained at the college by fellows other than the Master and other seniors, as well as fellow-commoners. Not only had Temple’s father been a lawyer and Master of the Rolls in Ireland, Temple himself had concluded a successful career as a diplomat before the Phalaris controversy took place.

sets up the battle between the books before writing directly about him. The battle takes place between the books in the King's Library, which in the late seventeenth century was housed in St James's Palace and is now in the British Library. By way of a general introduction to what Bentley represents, Swift has Momus, who represents the Moderns, visit "a malignant deity called Criticism" (*Tale* 115). Momus himself stands for carping criticism (221 n. 115), while the goddess is described in entirely negative terms. Momus finds her "extended in her den, upon the spoils of numberless volumes half devoured" (115). She is surrounded by her family, Ignorance, who is both her father and her husband "blind with age" (115); her mother Pride; her sister Opinion "hoodwinked, and headstrong, yet giddy and perpetually turning" (115), qualities which imply that opinion is not based on constant criteria but rather on changing priorities. Her children are listed as "Noise and Impudence, Dulness and Vanity, Positiveness, Pedantry, and Ill-Manners" (115), a portrait shaped by the perception of Bentley in the 1690s as clamorous, ill-mannered and pedantic. It is likely that this passage contributed to Pope's portrait of the Goddess of Dulness in *The Dunciad*. The characterization of the goddess of criticism continues with her head, ears and voice resembling those of an ass and "her eyes turned inward as if she looked only upon herself" (115). This idea of the critic as self-referential recurs in the story of the bee and the spider which we will encounter shortly.

Having appointed William Wotton as head of the army of Moderns, Swift turns to his characterization of Bentley: "in person the most deformed of all the Moderns . . . His armour was patched up of a thousand incoherent pieces" (120). The motley composition of Bentley's armour reflects the perception at the time that rather than having an encyclopaedic knowledge of classical literature he accessed his sources by way of reference works and by consulting indices. Bentley is of use to his generals "for his talent of railing" and is grieved to see the enemy prevail, and dissatisfied with everybody's conduct but his own" (121). Swift enlists no less a figure than Scaliger, one of Bentley's predecessors in classical philology to shout him down: "'Miscreant prater!' said he, 'eloquent only in thine own eyes, thou raillest without wit, or truth, or discretion . . . All arts of civilizing others render thee rude and untractable; courts have taught thee ill manners, and polite conversation has finished thee a pedant'" (121). In the ensuing battle both Bentley and Wotton are run through by Boyle with a lance and so their involvement in the battle ends. This reflects the general perception at the time that Boyle had triumphed in the Battle of the Ancients and Moderns with *Boyle against Bentley*, when in fact Bentley replied definitively with a second revised dissertation. Swift's characterization of Bentley is of course highly partisan. As a close associate of Temple,

he was always going to take his side in the Battle of the Ancients and Moderns. It is Bentley's rebuttal of Temple's position which shapes Swift's satirical portrait of Bentley as an ill-mannered railer. But what is most striking about the satirical reception of Bentley here is how bold and outspoken it is. He is described as "the most deformed of all the Moderns" (120) and Swift describes him as looking for "his beloved Wotton" and "his darling Wotton" (122). By the time Bentley publishes his edition of Horace he will have been Master of Trinity College for some years and achieved a professional status well beyond that of the late 1600s, when he was the keeper of the King's Library. As we shall see the satirical reception of Bentley's edition of Horace focuses much more on aspects of the text.

The encounter between the spider and the bee in *The Battle of the Books* provides us with the tools to understand Swift's concept of learning and his satirical degradation of the opposing Modern stance. The figure of the bee represents the Ancients and their approach to knowledge while the spider represents the Moderns. The former excelled in literature, while the latter were strong in mathematics and natural philosophy. We can usefully approach the figure of the bee historically. The image of the bee collecting nectar to make honey in order to produce wisdom was widespread in the Middle Ages (Carruthers 45). The image also appears in the works of later writers familiar with classical literature including Erasmus in his *De Copia* and Swift in *The Battle of the Books* (Carruthers 45). Compare Erasmus:

. . . the student, diligent as a little bee, will flit about through all the gardens of authors and will attack all the little flowerlets from whence he collects some honey which he carries into his own hive, and, since there is so much fertility of material in these that they are not all able to be plucked off, he will select the most excellent and adapt it to the structure of his own work (qtd in Yeo 103).

And Swift in *The Battle of the Books*:

I am obliged to Heaven alone for my flights and my music; and Providence would never have bestowed me two such gifts, without designing them for the noblest ends. I visit indeed all the flowers and blossoms of the field and the garden; but whatever I collect from thence enriches myself without the least injury to their beauty, their smell, or their taste. (112)

I am not suggesting any certain familiarity on Swift's part with this particular passage in the works of Erasmus. However, the similarities are striking and show that both writers came from the same tradition in which knowledge is understood as the result of the careful harvesting of materials and their subsequent fruition. However, towards the end of the passage quoted above, Swift is adapting the image to his own ends, which are to contrast the

bee's happy progress through the garden with the destructive and repellent spider which does not share the bee's happy and benign co-existence with its environment. For Swift the spider produces a substance from its own body and so is self-referential, in the same way that the eyes of the goddess Criticism are turned inwards, as if she were only looking at herself (115). Spiders and their webs in classical literature have had various symbolic meanings, ranging from decay and the catching of the unwary to fineness or delicacy (Ferber 199). Swift is taking the spider and its web into new territory here. His initial description sets the tone: "For, upon the highest corner of a large window, there dwelt a certain spider, swollen up to the first magnitude by the destruction of infinite numbers of flies . . . like human bones before the cave of some giant" (110). There is a note of disdain in the metaphor "swollen up to the first magnitude" as it is an astronomical term and therefore party to the Moderns. We are also back in the new world revealed by the microscope in the 1660s: the infinite number of flies represent all of those things previously unobserved before its invention. The image of the human bones compounds the disgust. For Swift all of Bentley's learning pours out of him like an excess of spider's web. It is easy from a critical point of view to make the comparison between Bentley's footnotes and so many spider's cobwebs where his future work on classical literature is concerned.

#### 9.5. BENTLEY, HORACE AND HUBRIS

There, thy good Scholiasts with unweary'd pains  
Make Horace flat, and humble Maro's strains

Alexander Pope, *The Dunciad Variorum* 1: 159-60 (1993), 82.

Let us now turn to Bentley's edition of Horace, which had the Latin title of *Q. Horatius Flaccus, ex Recensione & cum Notis atque Emendationibus Richardi Bentleyi* (Cambridge, 1711). It was understood by many at the time to be an act of editorial hubris and provoked a strong reaction from his opponents although it was also admired. It is beyond the scope of this thesis to analyze in depth Bentley's contribution to classical scholarship, but it is necessary to outline and characterize the relevant part of that contribution in order to be able to interpret the satirical responses to it. Bentley projects strongly and clearly in his preface that his main editorial criterion is conjecture.<sup>91</sup> It is from this single assertion that the

---

<sup>91</sup> "Therefore in these Horatian notes I will produce more emendations from conjecture than from the help of Manuscripts, and, unless I am totally wrong, the greater part of them more certain" (Haugen

perception of his activities as a textual critic really derives, since he is so clearly deviating from the traditional practice of comparing manuscripts. In terms of the balance of Bentley's editorial practice, if we were to believe what Bentley writes here, we would think that he valued reasoned conjecture over the examination of the relevant manuscripts every time he changed a text and that his readership was constitutionally unable to detect any fault with the text to begin with (Haugen 9). However, drawing on the detailed analysis made by Harold Jolliffe of the changes made by Bentley, a different picture emerges. Jolliffe counts a total of 689 changes. The manuscript support for these is far greater than we have been led to expect (7). Only 133 of the changes are pure conjecture on Bentley's part, still a significant number (6). Another measure of the value of Bentley's editorial work here is the degree to which his changes were accepted by subsequent editors. Here the German classical scholar August Meineke (1790-1870) accepts a mere 22, while a later English editor Edward Wickham (1834-1910) only adopts one (6). Bentley often justifies his emendations with reference to the corrupting influence of the scribes (*librarii*) who made copies of manuscripts of Horace's work as a part of its cultural transmission. He regarded this transmission as faulty and believed this gave him the right to intervene and reveal what he regarded as the original poet's actual intentions. He was quite prepared for his readers to disagree with him and to argue vigorously in favour of his choices in his notes where he says he will persist "until at last I drag them by the neck into agreement with me" (Haugen 133).<sup>92</sup> Such vehemence of argument and phraseology is not uncommon in Bentley's work.

Whatever the claims of Bentley's editorial procedures are, the debate as we shall see all too often revolves around the nature of poetry and especially classical poetry. One account of Bentley's procedures foregrounds the notion that "clear syntax, strict logic, and normal usage" were his main textual criteria (Jebb 126). Yet none of these three principles necessarily apply comfortably or profitably to poetry. The syntactical inversions which, for example, are in practical terms necessary and advantageous to write in the strict form of the Latin ode do not make poetry a place where clear syntax can be expected. One brilliant example of this is the ode by Horace which is addressed to a wine jar (*Odes* 3.21). The opening lines have the character of a prayer to a deity, but it is only in the fourth line of the first verse that we discover that the object of veneration is in fact a "pious wine jar" (*pia*

---

134); "Plura igitur in Horatianis his curis ex conjectura exhibemus, quam ex Codicum subsidio; & nisi me omnia fallunt, plerumque certiora . . ." (Bentley's Edition of Horace, n. pag.).

<sup>92</sup> The original Latin has "inque meam tandem sententiam vel obtorto eos collo traherem" (Bentley's Edition of Horace, n. pag.).

*testa*). Neither is rigorous logic appropriate when dealing with lyric poetry, and normal usage is its very enemy. In poetry we do not expect predictable or everyday language, we expect inspiration and that each poet will write by drawing on all the poetical devices at his disposal. Bentley's editorial criteria may sit well with prose, where he gained his considerable reputation, but not with poetry. So what results from this bold approach to the work of one of the most widely respected and admired Latin poets? In fact, many features of classical poetry appear to have been beyond Bentley's understanding. For Bentley, figures of speech were "textual ulcers" for which deluded critics invent various technical terms (qtd in Jolliffe 41). Metaphor, metonymy, the oxymoron, hyperbole, irony and the transfer of epithets, all were susceptible to conjectural emendation on Bentley's part since his logical approach was incompatible with such poetic devices. To these can be added allegory (Fraenkel 154). Here are some specific instances of emendations he proposes which arise out of his own editorial guidelines or his character. Bentley's comments consistently show him to prefer the literal to the figurative, as well as the mundane to the divine.

[Passage omitted]

#### 9.6. THE SATIRICAL RESPONSES TO BENTLEY'S EDITION OF HORACE

I have not seen the smallest excuse for it in any single instance, and with this opinion I can only look upon the numerous conjectural readings of Bentley (nearly all of which I have referred to in my notes) as so many instances of false taste and perverted ingenuity.

Arthur Maclean, *Quinti Horatii Flacci Opera Omnia* (1853), vi-vii.

There was an immediate satirical reaction to Bentley's edition of Horace, written variously in English and Latin. The authors were largely anonymous and none of these initial responses were written by any of the Scriblerians. A comprehensive listing of all printed matter relating to Bentley can be found in Bartholomew's bibliographic work, which was published in 1908. Monk comments on the principal responses in Latin and English in his biography (1: 316-24). I shall comment on some of these. A translation of the dedication appeared in 1712 as *Dr. Bentley's Dedication of Horace, Translated. To Which Is Added, A Poem in Latin and English, Inscribed to the Right Honourable the Lord Halifax, Written by the Reverend Dr. Bentley*. A pamphlet entitled *Five Extraordinary Letters Suppos'd to Be Writ to Dr. B----y, upon his Edition of Horace, and Some Other Matters of Great Importance* was

published in 1712. A part work also began to appear in 1712 consisting of translations of the poetry, translations of Bentley's notes, as well as "Notes upon Notes," which were an intermittently mocking commentary on Bentley's original notes. Monk states that seventeen numbers were published in 1712 and seven in 1713, "probably one appeared every fortnight, containing 36 pages, at the price of sixpence" (1: 319, n. 31). The 24 parts were collected together and published in two volumes in 1713 as *The Odes, Epodes, and Carmen Seculare of Horace, in Latin and English; with a Translation of Dr. Ben-ley's Notes. To which Are Added Notes upon Notes*. The work has been attributed to William Oldisworth (1680-1734) (Foxon 534). Of these three works, it is only the *Five Extraordinary Letters* which really strike out on their own, making use of allegory and parody.

With regard to the *Dedication*, the purpose of making a translation of the dedication of Bentley's edition of Horace available to a wider reading public was made clear in a prefatory note from the editor to the reader. While not satirical in character, the aim was to show Bentley's "style, and his manner of expressing himself, both in Prose and Verse . . . when he is obliged to chuse a Patron" (n. pag.). That style is relatively fawning and ingratiating, something to which Bentley's detractors wished to draw attention as the dedication had originally been intended for the Whig Lord Halifax. This reflected the fact that Bentley was a staunch Whig and had used his position at Trinity College to convert the University into a Whig bastion (Jarvis 23). The publication of Bentley's edition of Horace was delayed and so by the time it was published Queen Anne's ministry was a Tory one. The eventual dedication to Robert Harley was therefore hypocritical and the tone of Bentley's adulation for the Tory minister nauseous. This contrasted with the impatience towards other commentators and the copyists who complicate the editor's work – both characteristics of Bentley's notes. In this respect Monk believed that "the fault was rather that of the age than of the scholar" (1: 308).

[Passage omitted]

Let us now turn to what was eventually published as *The Odes, Epodes and Carmen Secular of Horace, In Latin and English; With a Translation of Dr. Ben-ley's Notes. To which are added notes upon notes. In 24 parts complete*. The work has its detractors who criticize it through the figure of William Oldisworth (1680-1734), to whom it was attributed. If Monk is correct in his estimation that Oldisworth's part-work translation of Bentley's Horace appeared fortnightly, then the translator was regularly producing 36 pages of copy every 14

days (1: 319), which implies a reduction in quality. According to Courtney's entry in the *Dictionary of National Biography*, Oldisworth has been described as a hack writer, the height of his fame being his editorship of *The Examiner* (*DNB* 14: 1008-9). This was an office that had also been held by Swift, but the latter had a very low opinion of Oldisworth.<sup>93</sup> However, the translations of Horace's poetry by Oldisworth in this volume have received praise.<sup>94</sup> The translation of Bentley's notes purports to offer ample evidence of the petulance of the editor and to convey his lack of respect for his fellow editors and his contempt for the scribes. Not surprisingly, Bentley's great champion Monk describes them as "a mere travesty" of the language and tone in which they were originally written. In Monk's words: "The version of Bentley's notes professes to be made in literal English, but is in truth a mere travesty; adopting such vulgar phraseology as would give a ludicrous character to any book that ever was written" (1: 318). The "Notes upon Notes" also foreground Bentley's tendencies to malign scholar and scribe and berate his pedantry. The tone of the translation may reflect the editorial aims of the project more than Bentley's original Latin, as expressed in the Preface. This begs the reader to encourage what follows for four reasons, the third and fourth of which are:

Thirdly, To convince him [the Reader] how ridiculous it is to presume to correct Horace without Authority, upon the pretended Strength of superior Judgment in Poetry. And,

Lastly, How easily such a Presumption may be turned upon the Authors, and sufficiently expose them their own way.

There is clear evidence that the work is a travesty. In the previous section I discussed Bentley's editorial preference for "steady eyes" over "dry eyes" (*Odes* 1.3.18). The note on this point is translated in part as follows: ". . . if you deny one of these Points I must tell you that you don't know what sort of a Blade Horace was, and if you deny both, we know what sort of a Blade you are" (31). Bentley's Latin original reads: "quorum alterum modo si negas; qui Horatius sit, omnino nescis: sin utrumque; vereor ne, qui tu sis, optime sciamus" (Bentley 8). It is the introduction of the word "Blade" into the translation which takes it into the register of a travesty. In the case of Bentley's comments on Apollo and the cloud (*Odes* 1.2.31-2) he writes "Hoc tam inepte incommodeque, ut nihil supra" (4). The translation is an appropriate reflection of its meaning: "Nothing can be more stupid and foolish than this"

---

<sup>93</sup> "He is an ingenious fellow, but the most confounded vain coxcomb in the world; so that I dare not let him see me, nor am acquainted with him" (qtd in Courtney, *DNB* 14: 1008).

<sup>94</sup> Courtney cites *Notes and Queries*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ser., viii, 229, where they are described as "uniformly good, and frequently very elegant" by A.H.K.C.L.



(21). Monk describes the “Notes upon Notes” as “miserably vapid, and their unvaried sneer tiresome and nauseous” (1: 319) but they are not without their moments, as when the length of the ears of Bentley and the classicist Heinsius (1580-1655) are compared: “But I am persuaded, according to the Dr.’s Advice, Horace will stand in awe of neither Heinsius’s Ears nor Dr. B’s, till he is first satisfied, which of the two are the longest” (1: 162). Given the stylistic register of this comment and the translation of some of Bentley’s notes contained in *The Odes, Epodes, and Carmen Secular of Horace, in Latin and English*, we can see that the translator produced something which was at least in part intended to mock Bentley rather than to represent his original thoughts as they were expressed in Latin.

#### 9.7. VIRGILIUS RESTAURATUS

The *Virgilius Restauratus* is referred to in critical accounts of the Scriblerians, but those accounts rarely go beyond stating what it is and where it is to be found.<sup>95</sup> It is generally attributed to Arbuthnot, although there is no real evidence for his authorship and Rogers suggests that Pope may have made a significant contribution (314). There are some aspects of the text which suggest it was slightly dashed off or that due care was not taken in preparing the text for publication (Mondschein 182-3). It is set out in “specimen” format, — as an extract and short example from a larger work — with suspect words typeset in italics and footnoted with the editor’s suggested emendation. This makes it another example of the use of genre and format in Scriblerian satire, in the same way that *Annus Mirabilis* was published as an astrological pamphlet. However, little attempt has been made to elucidate the considerable humour of the piece and to relate it to Bentley’s editorial practice, which I now propose to do.

*Virgilius Restauratus* begins with a brief introduction which locates the work firmly in the territory of textual criticism:

We shall, dear reader, recover the entire *Aeneid*, at present gushing with almost countless defects, to its original sense. Spurious readings occur in nearly every single verse in all the bound-books that I ever saw, either

---

<sup>95</sup> For a notable exception see Dee Mondschein, “*Virgilius Restauratus*: A Translation,” *The Scriblerian and the Kit-Cats* 33 (2000): 182-8. I shall quote from this translation and footnote the Latin original except when discussing one or two words. The Latin text is to be found in Alexander Pope, *Dunciad* 3: 335-8.

published or unpublished, extant to this day as a standing reproach to critics. Meanwhile, direct your eyes and enjoy these few things. (183)<sup>96</sup>

Immediately evident is the exaggerated idea that the text of the *Aeneid* is almost completely corrupt, with doubtful readings in nearly every line of the poem. This is compounded by the phrase “published or unpublished”. Such exaggerations parody Bentley’s editorial pronouncements. The “standing reproach to critics” is very reminiscent of the way in which Bentley creates a supposedly virtuous relationship between himself and the text, corralling all earlier perceived textual corruption and placing it into the hands of previous commentators. The injunction to the reader to “direct your eyes and enjoy these few things” parodies Bentley’s various injunctions to the reader in his edition of Horace.

There are some fine parodies of Bentley’s low tolerance of figurative language in the way Scriblerus edits the first three lines of the *Aeneid*. Here Virgil sets out the subject of the poem, that is, arms and the man, or more specifically warfare and Aeneas, who has been sent by fate from Troy to the Lavinian shore, which is now a part of Italy.<sup>97</sup> Fate is an important agency in Virgil’s epic, here Aeneas is “exiled by fate”.<sup>98</sup> The words in italics are those for which Scriblerus intends to provide alternative readings, with the addition of *Lavina*, meaning “Lavinian”. Firstly, here is Mondschein’s translation of Virgil’s original text:

I sing arms and the man, who, exiled by fate from the coast of Troy,  
first came to Italy and the Lavinian shore: that man, much tossed both  
on land and on sea by the forces of heaven —<sup>99</sup>

Here is the translation of Scriblerus’s modified text:

I sing arms and the man, who, exiled *by blowing wind* from the *altars* of  
Troy,  
first came to Italy and the *Latium* shore: that man, much *buffeted* both  
on land and on sea by the forces of heaven —

The most salient editorial change is from “fate” to “wind” making the blowing of the wind the force that drives Aeneas and his men from Troy rather than fate.<sup>100</sup> Scriblerus prefers

---

<sup>96</sup> Aeneidem totam, Amice Lector, innumerabilibus poene mendis scaturientem, ad pristinum sensum revocabimus. In singulis ferè versibus spuriae occurruntlectiones, in omnibus quos unquamvidi codicibus aut vulgatis aut ineditis, ad opprobrium usque Criticorm, in hunc diem existentes. Interea adverte oculos, et his paucis fruere (*Dunciad* 3: 335).

<sup>97</sup> With the exception of the first line, all line references to Book I of the *Aeneid* are four lines ahead of the actual text. This is probably explained by the four so-called “ille ego” lines which are no longer regarded as written by Virgil (Mondschein 182).

<sup>98</sup> “fato profugus” (*Aeneid* 1.2).

<sup>99</sup> Arma Virumque cano, Trojae qui primus ab oris  
Italiam, *fato* profugus, Lavinaque venit  
Litora: multum ille et terries *jactatus* et alto. (*Aeneid* 1.1-3)

“altars” to “coast,” suggesting that these are the altars of Jove, who loved Carthage and hated Troy.<sup>101</sup> Scriblerus provides the reading “*vexatus*,” meaning “buffeted,” since “tossed” (*jactatus*) would not normally be used of someone on land – another example of the figurative suffering at the hand of the literal. In the hands of Scriblerus, Aeneas emerges merely as a sailor blown off course by a strong wind, instead of a noble hero seeking to fulfil his destiny who is blown off course thanks to the interference of a hostile deity. Scriblerus rejects the “Lavinian” shore on the grounds that when Aeneas arrived it would have been called Latium, missing the importance of the word’s presence in the first seven lines of the poem. In those lines reference is made to Rome’s three historical phases of growth, Lavinium, Alba Longa (Ascanius) and Rome itself.

An instance of the scaling down of the divine occurs in the second editorial intervention by Scriblerus, where the divinity of Jove (“Numen Junonis”) becomes the name of Jove (“Nomen Junonis”). There is also a bristling parody of Bentley’s editorial manner in the observations: “Far better than divinity as used before. And without a doubt, as Virgil wrote it.” And in the third editorial intervention we see a further parody of Bentley’s lack of sympathy with figurative language. The third example reads as follows in the translation of Virgil’s original:

The winds surge, as though they had formed a marching column,  
Through the gate which was given –<sup>102</sup>

Scriblerus revises these lines as follows:

The winds surge, as though a dam having been burst,  
Through the gate which was given

Scriblerus rejects “marching column” in favour of “burst dam,” parodying Bentley’s dislike for figurative language.<sup>103</sup>

Bentley was at great pains in his editorial preamble to stress how his editorial choices were arrived at and one of the routes is usage. Let us recall his objection to “Cytherean Venus” in Horace’s *Odes* (1.4.5) on the grounds that it is a combination of words not found elsewhere. This kind of editorial scruple is reflected in Scriblerus’s “carrying the *brave Orontes*” for Virgil’s “carrying the faithful Orontes” on the basis that “faithful” is always said

---

<sup>100</sup> From “fato” to “flatu”.

<sup>101</sup> From “aris” for “oris”.

<sup>102</sup> Venti velut *agmine facto*

Qua data porta ruunt –.

<sup>103</sup> “Aggere facto” for “agmine facto”.

of Achates and never of Orontes.<sup>104</sup> Another characteristic of Bentley's editorial style when commentating is the imperious quality of his notes. This is parodied well in the tenth example chosen by Scriblerus which relates to the Trojans arriving off the coast of Africa:

— On the shore he sees in front of him  
 Three wandering stags: and these the whole herd follow  
 From behind — <sup>105</sup>

Scriblerus emends this as follows:

On the shore he sees three wandering *ravens*: and these *the whole flock* follow from behind — *Stags*, a vulgar reading, a most flagrant incongruity: Who does not know that these animals are not found in Africa? On the other hand, who does not recognise in this place the motion and manner of ravens' walking? (184)

The presence of stags in the narrative of the *Aeneid* is explained by the change in the terrain of North Africa between Virgil's time and now. North Africa was famously described as Rome's breadbasket at a time when corn did not grow in Italy. "*Stags*, a vulgar reading, a most flagrant incongruity" could so easily have been written by Bentley as could the imperious "Who does not know that these animals are not found in Africa?"

The culmination of the editorial art of Scriblerus is his excursus on the Trojan Horse. This is contained in the footnote to the last passage quoted from the *Aeneid*. In this passage the Trojan horse is introduced as it is being built by the Greeks under the aegis of the goddess Athena. Scriblerus remarks: "Let us approach it now as *the Trojan horse* (as the crowd call it); which if you, Reader, shall call it *the Greek Mare*, then you err least: for it is only females who bear in the womb (187).<sup>106</sup> Scriblerus then cites *Aeneid* 2.237-8, where the Trojan horse is described as being "pregnant with arms," insisting that the word "pregnant" can only refer to a mare; equally he remarks that it would be improper for a male horse to be built under Athena's purview. And so he insists that "the right reading of *mare*" be substituted throughout, with the exception of where it suits the metre better, which he qualifies by saying that Virgil is referring there to the species rather than the sex (187). The cumulative effect of the argument is quite absurd, turning the Trojan Horse into the Greek

---

<sup>104</sup> "Fortemque vehebat Orontem" for "Fidumque vehebat Orontem".

<sup>105</sup> ----- Tres littore cervos  
 Prospicit errantes: hos *tota armenta* sequuntur  
 A tergo -----

<sup>106</sup> *Equum jam Trojanum*, (ut vulgus loquitur) adeamus; quem si *Equam Graecam* vocabis Lector, minimè pecces: Solae enim femellae utero gestant (*Dunciad* 3: 338).

mare, but this does indeed parody the way Bentley piles up reference after reference in his notes to Horace's poetry.

The *Virgilius Restauratus* subsequently became an appendix to *The Dunciad Variorum* and points the way forward to the more substantial parody of Bentley in *The Dunciad in Four Books*. Pope incorporated much of its content into the footnotes of *The Dunciad Variorum* in English, where there are references to its forthcoming publication, thus adding to the profile of Scriblerus as a critic. The *Virgilius Restauratus* is typically Scriblerian for its sham scholarship, which consists of a set of mock emendations to Virgil's *Aeneid* which parody the editorial style of Richard Bentley. And it is the most sophisticated of the satirical responses to Bentley's edition of Horace, parodying many of its editorial strategies and mimicking the pedantic reduction of the poetic reach of the original Latin poetry.



## CHAPTER TEN. THE SATIRICAL RECEPTION OF TEXTUAL CRITICISM IN POPE'S *DUNCIADS*

In the last chapter we saw how textual criticism was clearly put to use by Richard Bentley with an adverse outcome. It is as well to re-focus on the discipline of textual criticism here with a recent definition which reads as follows:

A branch of literary scholarship that attempts to establish the most accurate version of a written work by comparing all existing manuscript and/or printed versions so as to reconstruct from them the author's intention, eliminating copyists' and printers' errors and any corrupt interpolations. (Baldick 332)

Verbal or textual criticism can also consist in an editorial intervention which changes the words in a text according to the editor's own criteria, as we have seen in the case of Bentley's conjectural emendations. In Pope's day the overall practice was known as "verbal criticism" and is widely described as "textual criticism" in the later secondary literature on the subject. It was seen by Pope as another misguided modern critical practice and as such it was fair game for satirical treatment. He provides an early verdict on it in *An Essay on Criticism* (1711). The purpose of this extended poem is on the one hand to foreground the Ancients as being in the right and on the other to disparage modern critical tendencies as misguided and inimical to the rightful appreciation of poetry. Included among the latter was verbal or textual criticism. And while it is evident that Pope was ill-disposed towards textual criticism on philosophical grounds, he also came to have personal reasons to despise both the discipline and its practitioners. This is reflected in his choice of Lewis Theobald as the hero of the first version of *The Dunciad*. Pope's choice was made in reaction to the publication in 1726 of Theobald's *Shakespeare Restored*. Theobald's book was, as its title suggests, highly critical of Pope's edition of Shakespeare. *The Dunciad* was originally published in 1728 in its original form consisting of three books with all proper names blacked out. Pope then added the parodic critical apparatus, which consisted of introductory editorial matter, a commentary and various appendices related to the content of the poem. This version was published in 1729 as *The Dunciad Variorum*. The author of the editorial apparatus and the

principle commentator or scholiast is Martinus Scriblerus, the character invented by the Scriblerus Club many years earlier and chosen by Pope to realize his satirical reception of the textual critic. In 1742 Pope added to his *Dunciad* a fourth book by publishing *The New Dunciad*. This poem was also provided with a mock critical apparatus described on the title page as the "Illustrations of Scriblerus". And then, incensed by the publication of *A Letter from Mr. Cibber, To Mr. Pope* in 1742, Pope resolved to make Colley Cibber the new hero of the poem.<sup>107</sup> Pope's decision resulted in some rewriting of the poem and the bringing together of *The Dunciad Variorum* and *The New Dunciad* into one longer version which became known as *The Dunciad in Four Books*, published in 1743.<sup>108</sup> The move from *The Dunciad* of 1728 and *The Dunciad Variorum* of 1729 with Lewis Theobald as the hero to the edition in four books of 1743 where Colley Cibber replaced Theobald has exercised the minds of critics greatly. For Ian Jack there was "a fundamental uncertainty about the subject of the poem, a fatal indefiniteness of purpose" where the 1743 version was concerned (134). For Jack: "From Cibber himself onwards, critics have noted Pope's failure to adapt the satirical portrait of Theobald in Book 1 to Cibber's very different, and quite un-antiquarian, character" (125 n. 2). By contrast, for those who argue in favour of the poem being a cultural critique of its day, the fact that Cibber was Poet Laureate in the Whig cultural hegemony of the day is persuasive. Although Scriblerus was still very much present in the critical apparatus, Richard

---

<sup>107</sup> Well known as an actor, writer and theatre manager, he became Poet Laureate in December 1730, at least in part because of his adherence to the Hanoverian succession and the Whig cause. Cibber excelled as an actor of roles requiring foppish behaviour including his own *Sir Novelty Fashion* (*Love's Last Shift*, 1696) and Lord Foppington (John Vanbrugh's *The Relapse*, 1697). Late in his career his rather mannered style of acting gave way to the more natural style of David Garrick who triumphed on the London stage in 1741. Cibber had worked as a stage manager from 1709 onwards. He was widely performed as a dramatist although his work is now largely forgotten. The antagonism between Pope and Cibber began with the performance of *Three Hours after Midnight* in 1717. The latter had accepted the play for performance and took the role of Plotwell, which he realized during the brief run of the comedy was in fact a caricature of himself. Pope chose Cibber as the new hero of *The Dunciad in Four Books* for all these reasons.

<sup>108</sup> Pope would have taken pleasure in the variety of scholarly editions that have been made of his poetry. I refer to four different editions of *The Dunciad*, using a simple numerical code. The first is the 1929 facsimile edition: Alexander Pope, *The Dunciad, variorum; with the Prolegomena of Scriblerus. Reproduced in Facsimile from the First Issue of the Original Edition in 1729* (Princeton, NJ, 1929) [*Dunciad 1*]. For many years the Twickenham Edition of Pope's works has been the standard edition. James Sutherland's edition of *The Dunciad* belongs to that edition: Alexander Pope, *The Dunciad. The Poems of Alexander Pope*, vol. 5, ed. James Sutherland (London: Methuen, 1993) [*Dunciad 2*]. Valerie Rumbold's more recent editions have reinterpreted *The Dunciad* in its various manifestations: Alexander Pope, *The Dunciad (1728) and the Dunciad Variorum (1729)*, *The Poems of Alexander Pope*, vol. 3 (Harlow: Pearson Longman, 2007) [*Dunciad 3*]; and Alexander Pope, *The Dunciad in Four Books*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edn. (Harlow: Pearson Longman, 2009) [*Dunciad 4*].



Bentley was now also foregrounded there, compensating for any loss of focus on textual criticism resulting from the change of hero. Pope had felt more able to satirize Bentley following the publication of his revised version of Milton's *Paradise Lost* in 1732. Bentley had perhaps seemed too formidable an enemy in the 1710s after the publication of his edition of Horace. While it is true that the *Virgilius Restauratus* was a response to this, the editorial folly of revising Milton's famous poem in Bentley's old age had made the foremost textual critic look both vulnerable and therefore much more tractable as a satirical target.

#### 10.1. THE VERBAL CRITICK IN *AN ESSAY ON CRITICISM*

Before embarking on an account of Pope's satirical reception of verbal criticism, it is appropriate to examine his treatment of the subject in *An Essay on Criticism* (1711). His attitude towards the discipline is encapsulated in the following two couplets:

As Men of Breeding, sometimes Men of Wit,  
T'avoid *great Errors*, must the *less* commit,  
Neglect the Rules each *Verbal Critick* lays,  
For not to know some Trifles, is a Praise. (261-2)

Pope's aversion to modern critical trends finds its origin in his neo-classical perspective on writing and appreciating poetry. And the neo-classical outlook finds its own origins in the harmony discernible in the best classical literature and appreciated by moderns such as Pope and Swift. Harmony in art reflects the harmony of the cosmos. The order, regularity and harmony of the cosmos reflect the Divine Mind of its creator (219). Mankind is able to appreciate this because his soul is made in the image of the creator of Nature (219). Nature and the mind of God reflect each other and nature is thereby "the visible creation of the Order and Reason behind all things" (220). In such a scheme of things man as poet is able to reflect the order and perfection of nature in his work. Pope famously gives expression to this belief in the following lines:

First follow NATURE, and your Judgment frame  
By her just Standard, which is still the same:  
*Unerring Nature*, still divinely bright,  
One clear, unchang'd, and *Universal* Light,  
Life, Force, and Beauty, must to all impart  
At once the Source, and End, and Test of Art. (68-73)

Pope is advancing here the idea of perfection in art. And in placing the mind of man on an equal footing with the mind of the divine creator, he also appears to assent to the idea of the perfectibility of man. The poem in its ideal form will reflect the perfection of nature and the divine maker. [Passage omitted]

## 10.2. THE LIFE AND WORK OF POPE

OLDWIT. I was such a Rakehell, I wou'd needs be a Wit. My Friends soon perceiv'd I could not be a Divine; so they sent me to the Inns of Court; and there, I'faith; I pepper'd the Court with Libels and Lampoons: my Wit was so bitter, I 'scaped the Pillory very narrowly, between you and I. But then, for good Language and strong Lines, none out-did me.

Thomas Shadwell. *Bury Fair*, Act 1, Scene 1. 1689

It is as well to give an outline of Pope's life and works, since the one informs the other, as well as shaping his interaction with other writers of the day, which was often hostile. Politics and religion were the main extra-literary sources of contention for Pope's detractors. Alexander Pope senior (1643-1733) was by profession a linen merchant and probably converted to Roman Catholicism while an apprentice in Flanders. The restrictions on Roman Catholics during Pope's own lifetime were substantial. William III and Queen Mary had come to the throne in 1689 as Protestant victors over their Roman Catholic predecessor James II. For this reason, legislation was soon introduced against Roman Catholic recusants, people who refused to attend the services of the Church of England. They could be instructed to move ten miles from the cities of London and Westminster. Pope's family first moved to Hammersmith. Worse still, under a new law passed in 1700 recusants could no longer inherit or purchase land. The same legislation prevented Catholics from running schools or assuming responsibility for the education of children. Pope's education, which was private, was therefore unlawful. And Catholics were also not allowed to attend universities, which were Anglican institutions (Rogers 256). Another determining factor for the course of Pope's life was his early contraction of Pott's disease, or tuberculosis of the spinal column. This resulted in both backward and sideways curvature of the spine. In 1700 his family moved to Binfield in Windsor Forest, one of those places at a safe enough remove from London for Roman Catholics. Inspired by his surroundings he wrote pastoral poetry, which resulted in his first publication, the *Pastorals* of 1709. His second major poem was *An Essay on Criticism* (1711). This work was praised in *The Spectator* by Joseph Addison, the writer and Whig, who initially brought Pope into Whig cultural circles. However, Pope later wrote of the importance of peace in *Windsor-Forest* (1714), reflecting Tory foreign policy which sought to negotiate a peace with France. This was at the invitation of the Tory Lord Lansdowne. It was this poem which drew Pope to Swift's attention and was the impulse for their great literary friendship. Addison, by contrast, became estranged and, although the story is a complicated one, he appears to have been involved in a rival translation of the *Iliad*, aimed at undermining Pope's

own. Pope never wrote an epic but did write the mock-epic *The Rape of the Lock*, which was published in 1712 and in a revised version in 1714. Pope worked on his translation of Homer's *Iliad* from 1714 to 1720, following this with a version of the *Odyssey* which was completed in 1726. These projects secured Pope's personal fortune through the combination of publisher's fees and subscriptions. This allowed Pope to lease land at Cross Deep in Twickenham in 1719, where he eventually built a villa in the Palladian style by the River Thames.

Pope had faced political danger following the death of Queen Anne and the collapse of the Tory ministry in August 1714. A further problem was his association with Francis Atterbury, the Bishop of Rochester, who was arraigned for the so-called Atterbury Plot. Both the Earl of Oxford and Atterbury were sent to the Tower on suspicion of treason. Pope emerged from this period in political safety, having avoided any need to go into exile as others had done before him. His edition of Shakespeare was completed in 1725 and this was meant to consolidate his reputation after the Homer translations, but instead opened up a new chapter of hostilities. Pope's editing of Shakespeare had been deficient, and he was attacked for this by Lewis Theobald in *Shakespeare Restored* (1726), a work of textual criticism. Pope's response was the first edition of *The Dunciad* in 1728, followed by *The Dunciad Variorum* in 1729. Both poems sought to make a mock-epic out of all the polemical writings against Pope by his opponents, whom he styled "dunces". Later works of importance were *An Essay on Man* (1734-5), his *Imitations of Horace* (1733-8) and an edition of his own correspondence in 1737. The four epistles which make up the *Epistles to Several Persons* were originally published between 1731 and 1735. (It was Warburton who later gave them the name *Moral Essays*.) They are written in the style of the Roman poet Horace's epistles to friends on moral and philosophical topics although Pope's epistles also include brilliantly expressed invective. These are highly regarded examples of the epistle form in English literature. Hostilities with Colley Cibber, the Poet Laureate, in the 1740s led to the hasty revision of *The Dunciad Variorum* and *The New Dunciad* (1742) into *The Dunciad in Four Books* (1743). Although Pope remained very productive, the state of his health had long been noted by both his friends and enemies. The disease from which he suffered can also affect the heart and lungs and this is what appears to have happened in the last year of Pope's life (Rogers 81). He died at home on the night of 30 May 1744, just after his 56<sup>th</sup> birthday, and was buried in the parish church in Twickenham (Erskine-Hill 2004).

Several different editions of Pope's *Works* had been published in his lifetime, the first in 1717 and the last in 1743. To understand the publications which appeared after his death,

we must turn to the figure of William Warburton (1698-1779). Warburton, Pope's last collaborator, is a figure who divides critics and biographers. As B.W. Young writes in his article on Warburton in the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, he first came to Pope's assistance when a Swiss divine called Jean Pierre de Crousaz accused the poet of being a follower of Leibniz in his *Essay of Man* (online edition, par. 6 of 16). Warburton was keen to be more than a regional cleric and so when the opportunity arose to work with Pope, he took it. He contributed notes to the edition of *The Dunciad in Four Books*. Some critics have argued that it was a mistake to enlarge *The Dunciad Variorum* as Colley Cibber was not a direct replacement for Lewis Theobald as the hero of the poem. The collaboration with Warburton took *The Dunciad* into another phase of its life which for those critics was arguably past its logical resting place. Jack, for example, argues that the subject of the first three books is dullness in literature and that the main characteristic of these books is retaliation, while the fourth book has a different character, ranging more widely and displaying an earnest moral purpose (125-6). Warburton also began work on the deathbed edition of Pope's works which after four volumes came to an end with the poet's actual death on 30 May 1744. As his literary executor, Warburton prepared a nine-volume edition of Pope's *Works*, published in 1751, which was entitled *The Works of Alexander Pope Esq. In Nine Volumes Complete With his last Corrections, Additions, And Improvements; As They Were Delivered to the Editor a Little before his Death: Together with The Commentaries and Notes of Mr. Warburton*. Important subsequent editions in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries were prepared and published by Joseph Warton in 1797 and by W.J. Courthope and W. Elwin (10 vols.) in 1871-86.

It is a commonplace of literary scholarship that the poets of the first half of the eighteenth century were at war with each other. The respective armies divided up along political lines and, in a sense, it was a Whig army which opposed Alexander Pope. As has already been stated in Chapter Five, the foremost conservative literary club of the day was that of the Scriblerians and the principal protagonists were Jonathan Swift, John Arbuthnot (1667-1735) and Pope himself. The Scriblerians were aligned with the Tory regime of Robert Harley, First Earl of Oxford and Mortimer, while the members of the Kit-Cat Club were all Whigs. This was a club which was literary in character and was founded by the publisher Jacob Tonson the elder. Members included the dramatists William Congreve (1670-1729) and Sir John Vanbrugh (1664-1726), the philosopher John Locke, the writers Joseph Addison and Sir Richard Steele. Addison was a focus for Whig cultural circles from the early 1700s onwards. In 1705 Addison's poem *The Campaign, A Poem, to His Grace the Duke of*

*Marlborough* won him considerable favour among the Whigs, and so he and his followers gained preference under Whig rule. Pope had also been associated with Addison and his group at the coffee house Button's, and so had known many of the poets and writers who later opposed him. Addison had courted Pope as a poet, probably seeking to gain his allegiance for the Whig cause. However, like Swift, once Pope crossed the political floor he became a butt for Whig invective. Salient in anti-Pope Whig invective was the perception that Pope's fame for his translation of *The Iliad* was unwarranted.

With so many enemies it was perhaps only a matter of time before Pope began to think of having them populate a long poem. While the main focus in this chapter is on textual criticism, it is necessary to review Pope's purpose in writing *The Dunciad*, which was to have done with that Whig army of enemies, whose attacks had begun after the publication of *An Essay on Criticism* (1711). Pope and his allies Swift, Arbuthnot and Gay were Tories. Conspicuous among Pope's critics were John Dennis (1658-1734), Leonard Welsted (*hap.* 1688-1747) and Thomas Cooke (1703-56). Cooke had dramatized the antagonism between his Whig colleagues and Pope in his poem in two cantos *The Battle of the Poets*, first published in 1725 and then republished after the appearance of *The Dunciad* as *The Battel (sic) of the Poets in Tales, Epistles, Odes, Fables, &c.* (1729). Most of the poets are Whigs but Cooke also mentions Swift, a notable Tory. Ambrose Philips (1674-1749) is the winner of Cooke's poetic battle. Cooke gives strong expression to what he regarded as Pope's unjustified reputation in the preface to *The Battel of the Poets* in the 1729 reprint.<sup>109</sup> Dennis was a greater target for Pope, having been the subject of unfavourable lines in *An Essay on Criticism* (585-7), as noted by Jonathan Pritchard in his article in the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (online edition, para. 11 of 14). He responded with the first of a number of publications which not only attacked Pope's work but also his physical appearance.<sup>110</sup> Welsted wrote a satire on *Three Hours after Marriage* called *Palaemon to Caelia, or, The Triumvirate* (1717), as James Sambrook mentions in his article in the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (online edition, par. 7 of 9). He also responded negatively to *An Essay on Criticism* in the dissertation which accompanied the text of his *Epistles, Odes, &c.* (1724).

---

<sup>109</sup> "I was induced to the writing this by a Reflection on the Conduct of a Person [Pope] who, with but a small Share of Learning and moderate natural Endowments, has, by concurring and uncommon Accidents, acquired as great a Reputation as the most learned with an exalted Genius could ever hope" (Cooke, *Tales, Epistles, Odes, Fables, &c.*, 107).

<sup>110</sup> *Reflections Critical and Satyrical, upon a Late Rhapsody, Call'd, An Essay on Criticism* (1711); *A True Character of Mr Pope and his Writings* (1716); *Remarks on Mr Pope's Translation of Homer* (1717); *Remarks on Mr Pope's Rape of the Lock* (1728).

Welsted was prominent in Cooke's *The Battel of the Poets*. Pope responded by mocking Welsted in the *Peri Bathous* and *The Dunciad*. Welsted then responded with *One Epistle to Mr. A. Pope* (1730), *Of Dulness and Scandal* (1732), which was written with James Moore Smythe, and *Of False Fame* (1732). These were Pope's dunces, or at least the principal ones, who feature as characters in Pope's *Dunciad* poems and who are subject to the rule of the Goddess of Dulness, according to Pope's poetic scheme.

### 10.3. LEWIS THEOBALD

To understand the antagonism which Pope experienced towards Theobald, it is necessary to appreciate the dichotomy of the gentleman and the scholar, or the gentleman and the pedant, as it was understood in Pope's day. The scholar and the pedant here are interchangeable.

[Passage omitted]

When Pope accepted the commission to edit the plays of Shakespeare, he can scarcely have thought at the time that in doing so he would be presented with a hero for his poem *The Dunciad*, the composition of which was already underway. Pope's edition of Shakespeare was published between 1723 and 1725. He did relegate some passages to the foot of the page which are fully incorporated in modern editions. What soon became apparent was that it was also full of textual errors and that Pope had been ill-suited to the task. This came to light with the publication of *Shakespeare Restored* in 1726 by Lewis Theobald (1688-1744). The full and rather damning title of the work was *Shakespeare Restored, or, A Specimen of the Many Errors As Well Committed, As Unamended, by Mr Pope in his Late Edition of this Poet*. The work consists of 132 pages devoted to editorial issues in *Hamlet* and an appendix of 62 pages dealing with examples from other plays. In his introduction Theobald acknowledges the widespread textual problems with Shakespeare's plays, comparing them to Hamlet's opinion of the world, that it is "an unweeded Garden grown to Seed" (ii). It has long been his wish that "some fine *Genius*" would retrieve "the original Purity of [Shakespeare's] text . . . rooting out that vast Crop of *Errors*, which has almost choak'd up his *Beauties*" (i). In Theobald's view the duty of the editor is to set right the poor state of any text by the judicious use of textual emendation.

Theobald's qualifications for this role lie in his education as well as his training as an attorney. And this in turn led him in the direction of the scholar or the pedant, as defined by

Shaftesbury. Theobald had not only become conversant with Latin and Greek but also with the scholarship which made literature in those ancient languages available to the contemporary reader. This led him to an appreciation of the classical scholarship of Richard Bentley, with which he sought to align himself. Towards the end of the appendix to *Shakespeare Restored* Theobald writes of Bentley with great reverence, mentioning his work on the fragments of the writings of Menander and Philemon as well as stating he is incapable of doing justice "to that Great Man's Character" (193). Through his reverence for Bentley he styles himself as a textual critic. In addition to this, Theobald's legal apprenticeship was served at a time when clerks had to be able to read and write secretary script. This was the script in which Theobald believed Shakespeare had written his plays and the future editor thereby gained an insight into the range of possible errors that could be made by copyists.

On the face of it, Theobald seemed an unlikely candidate to examine and correct Pope's work as an editor, given that he was relatively unknown, and Pope was famous for his Homer translations. Pope was also financially successful whereas Theobald was intermittently impecunious. Pope styled himself as a gentleman reader in Shaftesbury's sense and assumed that his taste and understanding were superior to writers engaged in earning a living through hack work or in the case of Theobald, working on pantomimes. As Peter Seary writes in his article on Theobald in the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Theobald first became associated with John Rich's theatre in Lincoln's Inn Fields in around 1715. There he became the librettist for a several operatic pantomimes on classical themes, which were financially successful for Rich's theatre (online edition, paras. 7 and 8 of 17). I have mentioned Theobald's knowledge of Greek and Latin and of contemporary scholarship such as Bentley's. However, while Pope had successfully translated *The Iliad*, Theobald's own translations from the classics did not find a public. His versions of Sophocles's *Electra* (1714), *Oedipus King of Thebes* (1715) and *The First Book of The Odyssey* (1716) had remained unpublished, while his translation of *The Clouds* by Aristophanes (1715), while printed, also went unnoticed. Theobald had started a journal called *The Censor* in 1715, but this sank without trace in the wake of *The Spectator*, which had been an outstanding publishing success. Theobald had even praised Pope in his poem *The Mausoleum*, published in 1714, as well as in *The Grove, or, a Collection of Original Poems, Translations* (1721) in his poem "To Mr Pope on his Translation of Homer":

So much, dear *Pope*, thy *English Illiad* Charms,  
Where Pity melts us, or where Passion warms,  
That after - Ages shall with Wonder seek,  
Who 'twas translated *Homer* into *Greek*. (265)

None of this, however, stopped Theobald from criticizing Pope's edition of Shakespeare. When it comes to *Shakespeare Restored*, Theobald's criticism begins mildly enough and he even limits the number of textual instances in one case lest he be considered "too hypercritical in my Observation" (42). He concentrates on Hamlet but has an appendix with examples from other plays by Shakespeare in Pope's edition. He shows his own critical acumen as an editor by offering conjectural readings where appropriate (60). He decries Pope's punctuation, in one instance in particularly strong terms, saying that "the Sense of it is but barely intelligible" (68). Theobald's criticism becomes highly damaging when he suggests that Pope never saw some of the pages of his edition of Shakespeare to revise them. In all Theobald recorded 97 examples of unsatisfactory editing on Pope's part in *Hamlet*, and 107 from the rest of Pope's edition of Shakespeare. Concentrating on the examples from *Hamlet*, the largest number come from various readings (32), followed by false pointing (21), conjectural emendation (14), emendation (12), omission supplied (11), false printing (9), correction (7), occasional correction (2), occasional explication (1) and text vindicated (1). The double counting is attributable to some textual cruces having more than one editorial feature.

The following cross-section of examples is intended to characterize Theobald's approach. An early example of a various reading, or what would now be called an alternative reading, occurs near the end of a long speech by Claudius, King of Denmark, brother of the late King Hamlet. I will quote from a recent edition of the play in *The Arden Shakespeare*, putting the contested word or phrase in italics and comment on the two different readings offered by Pope and Theobald:

CLAUDIUS.                      Giving to you no further personal power  
   *To business* with the King more than the scope  
   Of these delated articles allow. (1.2.36-8)

Pope prefers "of treaty" to Theobald's choice "to business," the latter arguing that "of treaty" is a modern reading and that it overlooks Shakespeare's propensity to make verbs out of nouns and adjectives. Theobald made several conjectural emendations in *Shakespeare Restored*, many of which have been adopted by modern editors. He prefers "canon" to Pope's "cannon" in the following passage on the basis that it is divine law which prohibits suicide rather than any military weapon:

HAMLET.                         O that this too too sallied flesh would melt,  
   Thaw and resolve itself into a dew,  
   Or that the Everlasting had not fixed  
   His canon 'gainst self-slaughter. (1.2.129-132)





In Pope's edition there was no comma after "fear", which Theobald judged made "greatness" the object of that verb, regarding it as an ablative absolute for Shakespeare. Finally, there is a rare category in Theobald's *Shakespeare Restored* which is "text vindicated". This is where Pope suggests an editorial change which Theobald rejects. In the famous soliloquy in which Hamlet contemplates the possibility of suicide, Pope provides a note to the line suggesting an alternative for "sea" in the line spoken by Hamlet – "Or to take arms against a sea of troubles" (3.1.58) – which reads: "Perhaps siege, which continues the metaphor of slings, arrows, taking arms; and represents the being encompass'd on all sides with troubles" (6: 400, n.). Theobald rejects this and modern editions conserve the line as it appears above. Because of Theobald's findings in *Shakespeare Restored* Pope's edition of Shakespeare was humbled. He had no alternative but to adopt many of Theobald's corrections in his second edition.

Suffering a troubled reception in its own time, Theobald's 1733 edition of Shakespeare eventually became well received. Critics still take issue with individual examples of Theobald's revisions, but overall his achievement is accepted today as a sound one.<sup>111</sup> Theobald's reproaches towards Pope's edition of Shakespeare represented a professional challenge to Pope's integrity as an editor. Theobald was working as a textual critic and his admiration of Richard Bentley would have compounded Pope's animosity towards him. As a result, Pope's satirical instincts were aroused and *The Dunciad* and *The Dunciad Variorum* took the form that they did because of a dual motivation on Pope's part firstly to defend his reputation as an editor by discrediting Theobald and secondly to attack textual criticism as a worthless discipline. If the deployment of Martinus Scriblerus in *The Dunciad Variorum* allowed Pope to carry on the attack on Theobald and textual criticism which he had begun in *The Dunciad*, we need first to review what Pope wrote about his adversary in the poem of *The Dunciad*.

Pope provides many portraits of men he regarded as bad writers in *The Dunciad*, writers whom he styled as dunces. While regarding Theobald as a bad writer, he now also

---

<sup>111</sup> "Despite Pope's hostility and Johnson's disparagement, Theobald's own edition of Shakespeare has received almost unanimous approval from subsequent, and especially from twentieth-century, historians of the subject. T.R. Lounsbury's lengthy defence of Theobald in *The First Editors of Shakespeare* (1906) was followed by R.F. Jones's *Lewis Theobald* (1919), which first made clear the extent of Theobald's indebtedness to the textual-critical techniques of classical philology; later, more general surveys of the field, such as those of McKerrow and Brian Vickers, have singled out Theobald's criticism for praise; most recently, Peter Seary's full-length book has made an extensive and thoroughly documented case for Theobald's attention to Shakespearean bibliography . . ." (Jarvis 89).

had enough motivation to make Theobald the leading Dunce. Pope created a composite version of Theobald to denigrate him and his reputation. He gave that composite version the name Tibbald, which is the phonetic spelling of the surname (i.e. Theobald pronounced Tibbald). The passage which follows here is a comprehensive attempt at character assassination:

In each she [the Goddess Dulness] marks her image full exprest,  
But chief, in Tibbald's monster-breeding breast;  
Sees Gods with Daemons in strange league ingage;  
And earth, and heav'n, and hell her battles wage.  
She ey'd the Bard, where supperless he sate,  
And pin'd, unconscious of his rising fate;  
Studious he sate, with all his books around,  
Sinking from thought to thought, a vast profound!  
Plung'd for his sense, but found no bottom there;  
Then writ, and flounder'd on, in mere despair.  
He roll'd his eyes that witness'd huge dismay,  
Where yet unpawn'd, much learned lumber lay,  
Volumes, whose size the space exactly fill'd;  
Or which fond authors were so good to gild;  
Or where, by sculpture made for ever known,  
The page admires new beauties, not its own. (*Dunciad* 3: 1.105-20)

There are a number of features in the characterization which are worthy of comment. In the lines preceding these the Goddess of Dulness has been surveying poets and critics such as Eusden, Blackmore, Philips and Dennis, all enemies of Pope and her creatures. In Pope's representation the Goddess Dulness marks "her image full exprest" in each of them but above all "in Tibbald's monster-breeding breast" (1.106). The last phrase is a reference to Theobald's career as librettist for a number of operatic pantomimes which were performed in John Rich's theatre in Lincoln's Inn Fields, as described in Peter Seary's article on Theobald in the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (online edition, par. 7 of 16). Ever conscious of literary hierarchy, Pope wishes to draw attention to Theobald's involvement in what he considered a lower form of art, or what Theobald calls in the dedication of *Shakespeare Restored* "Entertainments of a different Species" (n. pag.). Theobald sits "supperless" (1.109), indicating that he does not earn enough from his writing in order to feed himself in the evenings. The suggestion of impecuniousness is picked up a few lines later when Pope writes "Where yet unpawn'd, much learned lumber lay" (1.116). "Lumber" here suggests something heavy, brought home like a treasure. In the line "Sinking from thought to thought, a vast profound!" (1.112) Pope evokes his *Peri Bathous, the Art of Sinking in Poetry*. The emphasis is on downward motion, as opposed to the upward motion associated with the sublime. This sense of the abysmal is continued in the next line: "Plung'd for his sense, but found no

bottom there" (1.113). Theobald flounders on in despair with his work and rolls "his eyes that witness'd huge dismay" (1.115) in his study. The line echoes Milton's description of Satan: "round he throws his baleful eyes / That witnessed huge affliction and dismay" (*Paradise Lost*, 1.56-7). The description of Theobald's library immediately after this passage focuses on the superficial aspects of book collecting, detailing books which are the right size for his shelves, are gilded or illustrated. The other part of Theobald's library is described as follows:

But high above, more solid Learning shone,  
The Classics of an Age that heard of none;  
There Caxton slept, with Wynkin at his side . . . (*Dunciad* 3: 1.127-9)

Pope is dismissing here Theobald's interest in antiquarian printed matter, characterizing the printers William Caxton and Wynkyn de Worde as fusty and irrelevant figures from the Middle Ages.

The overall effect of this portrait of Theobald is to denigrate his critical and creative output. In a slightly later passage his variety of textual criticism and his approach to editing Shakespeare are satirized. The passage is written in Tibbald's own voice, an aspect of Pope's technique of characterization in verse:

Ah! Still o'er Britain stretch that peaceful wand,  
Which lulls th' Helvetian and Batavian land.  
Where rebel to thy throne if Science rise,  
She does but shew her coward face and dies:  
There, thy good Scholiasts with unweary'd pains  
Make Horace flat, and humble Maro's strains;  
Here studious I unlucky moderns save,  
Nor sleeps one error in its father's grave,  
Old puns restore, lost blunders nicely seek,  
And crucify poor Shakespear once a week.  
For thee I dim these eyes, and stuff this head,  
With all such reading as was never read;  
For thee supplying, in the worst of days,  
Notes to dull books, and prologues to dull plays;  
For thee explain a thing till all men doubt it,  
And write about it, Goddess, and about it;  
So spins the silkworm small its slender store,  
And labours, 'till it clouds itself all o'er. (*Dunciad* 3: 1.155-72)

The first couplet describes for Pope the soporific state into which Switzerland and the Dutch city states have fallen given the predominance there of textual criticism. Theobald's wish is to introduce it in Britain. The couplet "There, thy good Scholiasts with unweary'd pains / Make Horace flat, and humble Maro's strains" expresses Pope's belief that such textual criticism is not an enlightened undertaking with a beneficial result, but rather a way of making great literature mediocre. "Nor sleeps one error . . ." refers to the textual archaeology carried out

by Theobald in determining what Shakespeare's predecessors and contemporaries wrote in similar contexts. The notion of error here is shaped by Pope's perception that such writers were deviating from what was normal usage in his day. The neo-classical intolerance of puns also determines the notion of restoring old puns in line 163. Theobald contributed articles on Shakespeare to *Mist's Journal*. However, Pope probably overestimated the frequency. He expressed his venom for Theobald's writing on the subject in the choice of the verb "crucify" in the phrase "crucify poor Shakespear" (1.164). Lines 165-70 further characterize Theobald in line with the notion of dullness. He dims his eyes, he crams into his head reading that is so obscure it has never been read before. He writes notes and prologues to books and plays which are of course also dull. His lengthy style of exegesis has the effect of making his readers doubt what he writes. This passage ends with the image of the silkworm, an insect of modest proportions which can nevertheless generate a considerable amount of thread. Pope portrays it as labouring and clouding itself over in the exertion.

The exchange between Pope and Theobald conforms very much to the pattern observed previously of the New Learning. In this case it is textual criticism which is initially given a satirical reception, yet goes on to be subsequently accepted. Pope was writing as a gentleman in Shaftesbury's sense to demean a pedant. The satirical reception was also driven by Pope's wish to sustain his reputation and discredit a threatening rival. The resulting damage to Theobald's reputation was considerable.

#### 10.4. RICHARD BENTLEY

Theobald had expressed his admiration for Bentley in *Shakespeare Restored*, drawing inspiration for his own textual criticism from that of the older man. There were a number of reasons why Alexander Pope felt able to incorporate a satirical portrait of Richard Bentley into *The Dunciad in Four Books*. It was Pope's growing interest in writing imitations of the poetry of Horace in the 1730s which brought him into closer contact with Bentley's scholarship, and there is some evidence that his response to it was not positive. We see instances of his view of Bentley as a pedant in his correspondence in the 1730s.<sup>112</sup> And Pope

---

<sup>112</sup> Writing to the Earl of Oxford on 7 November 1731, Pope asks the Earl about his library in the wake of the fire at the Cottonian Library, the responsibility for which was laid at Bentley's door: "How stands the Library, which since the Loss of the Cottonian is the greatest Care of the Republick of Learning? Has not B—y done Great things for literature, in publishing his own papers, and burning those? That public Calamity has happened under this Tyrant, while he was *fidling* upon Milton and Manilius" (Pope, *Correspondence* 3: 241). A further letter to Oxford dated 22 January 1731/2 contains the ironic

published anonymously in 1734 *Sober Advice from Horace Imitated from his Second Sermon* with a mock commentary. This is a version of Horace's second satire (1.2) in which Pope replaces the topical names of Horace's day with those of contemporaries, who included Lord Hervey and Lady Mary Wortley Montagu. The Latin original which faces Pope's English text is taken from Bentley's edition of Horace. The third element in the work is a satirical set of footnotes in the hectoring style of Bentley. However, the main reason for his satirical representation of Bentley was the negative reception of Bentley's 1732 edition of John Milton's religious epic poem *Paradise Lost*.<sup>113</sup> Bentley's revision was published barely sixty five years after the first edition of the work, although a world of sensibility and outlook separates the two men.<sup>114</sup> Bentley did not consult important editions of the work and did not acknowledge the existence of the original manuscript of Book One of *Paradise Lost*, which he had both consulted and annotated. Bentley's editorial procedures for this project differed from those he used in most of his classical scholarship in that he did not emend by conjecture with recourse to manuscripts, as he had done in the case of his edition of Horace's poetry. Instead of the interfering scribes who muddled the transmission of Horace's poetry between generations, Bentley hypothesized an editor who had taken Milton's manuscript and filled it with mistakes, wrong transcriptions and spurious passages. In his article on Bentley in the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Hugh de Quehen counts 700 changes from the vulgate (online edition, par. 27 of 57). Although Bentley's approach was rejected in his day, later critics have some sympathy for his work. Bentley shared with Addison a concern for Milton's puns, but Bentley was by and large more forgiving, since punning was a part of the repertoire of the classical poets.<sup>115</sup> [Passage omitted]

---

sentence: "As also to wish Your Lordship, Dr. Middleton, and Dr. Colbatch, Joy of Bentley's Milton" (3: 267).

<sup>113</sup> Pope's friend David Mallet published his poem *Of Verbal Criticism: An Epistle to Mr. Pope. Occasioned by Theobald's Shakespear, and Bentley's Milton* in April 1733.

<sup>114</sup> Milton (1608-74) had been very much associated with the Puritan experiment and the Interregnum. Indeed two weeks after the execution of Charles I in January 1649, Milton's pamphlet *Tenure of Kings and Magistrates* was published, arguing in favour of regicide where there was due justification. Because of his association with the Interregnum, although *Paradise Lost* was ready for publication in 1663 in the first version in ten books, this was too soon after the Restoration, and the poem was not published until 1667. A second edition of *Paradise Lost* in twelve books was published in July 1674.

<sup>115</sup> William Empson's essay on Bentley and Milton was published in 1935 and provides an entry into the debate about Milton's style. He asserted that Bentley raised a number of important questions about the way Milton used language which went unanswered at the time but which were still worth addressing. Empson detected the unsatisfactory presence of muddles in Milton's poem which were worthy of interrogation where they were not redeemed by Milton's poetic complexity, summarizing that Milton "left a grim posterity of shoddy thinking in blank verse" (156). Empson's arguments form part of a wider spectrum of criticism of what is referred to as Milton's Grand Style. In its harshest form

10.5. *The Dunciad in Four Books*

To pass a Censure upon all kinds of Writings, to shew their several Excellencies and Defects, and especially to assign each of them to their proper Authors, was the chief Province and the greatest Commendation of the Ancient Critics.

Richard Bentley, *A Dissertation upon the Epistles of Phalaris* (1697), 5.

The above quotation from the first edition of Bentley's *A Dissertation upon the Epistles of Phalaris* reminds us not only of Bentley's own habit of passing censure on other critics but also of the reason why Pope's animosity towards him had become topical again in the 1730s and 1740s. This was the publication in 1732 of Bentley's edition of Milton's *Paradise Lost*, in which the ageing classicist had sought to apportion those lines which truly originated with Milton and those which had been placed into the text by an unscrupulous editor. Bentley's presence in *The Dunciad in Four Books* represents a delayed expression of Pope's hostility towards the classical scholar. He surely would have shared this animosity with Swift, whose satirical account of the Phalaris controversy in *The Battle of the Books* was one of the first satires to defend the position of the Ancients. There was also a political motive on Pope's part, since Bentley had consistently supported the Whig regime as head of Trinity College, Cambridge. Bentley appears in *The Dunciad in Four Books* in three different forms: firstly, in the text of the poem under his own name; secondly, in caricature form as Ricardus Aristarchus, the author of the introductory essay "Ricardus Aristarchus of the Hero of the Poem" (*Dunciad* 4: 75-86); and, thirdly, in the notes to the text of the poem attributed to him throughout the work.

Let us first examine Pope's portrayal of Bentley in heroic couplets in the *The Dunciad in Four Books*. It is quite a lengthy passage, from which I shall now quote selectively. Bentley was at the end of his career when Pope's poem was published, and Pope begins with one of those attributed character traits which served to diminish the reputation of his adversaries:

Where Bentley late tempestuous wont to sport  
In troubled waters, but now sleeps in Port. (4.201-2)

---

F.R. Leavis complains that this Grand Style is responsible for "the extreme and consistent remoteness of Milton's medium from any English that was ever spoken" (qtd in Ricks 3). Milton's detractors believe that "Milton's poetry doesn't *mean* very much, that the verbal music thrives at the expense of – instead of in harmony with – any precise relevance" (Ricks 7). This stylistic distance from its material Ricks ascribes to the decorum with which Milton wrote because of his subject matter. He also judged it to be misleading to make Bentley central to any argument as he was "incorrigibly eccentric" (Ricks 10). This is a broad and interesting subject, but we need only focus here on the antagonism created by Bentley's edition of *Paradise Lost*, while acknowledging the later debate to which Bentley of course contributed.

This refers to the strident way Bentley would attack his academic adversaries. Scriblerus in a footnote interprets the reference to port as meaning "now retired into harbour, after the tempests that had long agitated his society," while Scipio Maffei is cited in the same footnote as recalling the invitation from Bentley to drink port copiously (4.202 n.). A few lines further on Bentley addresses the Goddess of Dulness directly:

Mistress! Dismiss that rabble from your throne:  
 Avaunt ----- is Aristarchus yet unknown?  
 Thy mighty Scholiast, whose unwear'y'd pains  
 Made Horace dull, and humbled Milton's strains.  
 Turn what they will to Verse, their toil is vain,  
 Critics like me shall make it Prose again.  
 Roman and Greek Grammarians! Know your Better:  
 Author of something yet more great than Letter;  
 While tow'ring o'er your Alphabet, like Saul,  
 Stands our Digamma, and o'er-tops them all. (4.209-18)

Pope's version of Bentley arrogantly tells the Goddess to dismiss her subjects from around her throne and then ironically presents his own achievements. There is a quite conscious echo of Theobald's monologue in the first book of *The Dunciad Variorum* in lines 211-2. Pope implies that Bentley turns verse into prose despite his fine ear for classical metre (4.213-4). And the passage finishes with the mention of the *digamma*, the letter which Bentley had identified as missing from ancient Greek in its written form.

There then follows a passage which is critical of Bentley for his interest in writers who for Pope fall outside of the legitimate interests of the connoisseur of classical literature:

For me, what Virgil, Pliny may deny,  
 Manilius or Solinus shall supply:  
 For Attic Phrase in Plato let them seek,  
 I poach in Suidas for unlicens'd Greek.  
 In ancient Sense if any needs will deal,  
 Be sure I give them Fragments, not a Meal;  
 What Gellius or Stobaeus hash'd before,  
 Or chew'd by blind old Scholiasts o'er and o'er. (4.225-32)

Pope contrasts what he regards as great writers (Virgil, Pliny, Plato) with second-rate writers of less literary merit (Manilius, Solinus, Suidas, Gellius and Stobaeus).<sup>116</sup> The implication on Pope's part is that Bentley and his fellow verbal critics would have much greater critical

---

<sup>116</sup> Marcus Manilius, who flourished in the early First Century AD, is thought to have been the author of a work in five books on astrology entitled *Astronomica*; Julius Solinus (fl., c. AD 200) summarized books on geography and natural history; Suidas was wrongly thought to be the author of a Greek literary encyclopedia now called the *Suda*, which was written in the early 5th century AD; Aulus Gellius (c. AD 130-180?) & Stobaeus were compilers who flourished in the early fifth century AD and whose writings conserve passages from works which would otherwise be lost.



latitude with the lesser authors, whose works are inherently (or at least from Pope's perspective) of less interest.

Verbal criticism is one form of academic activity which for Pope brings myopia and partial sight:

The critic Eye, that microscope of Wit,  
Sees hairs and pores, examines bit by bit . . . (4.233-5)

This highly critical account of Bentley appears relatively late on in Book Four of *The Dunciad in Four Books*. The title page of the work speaks of "the Hypercritics of Aristarchus, and his Dissertation on the Hero of the Poem" (21). These are one and the same: Warburton's essay entitled *Ricardus Aristarchus of the Hero of the Poem* appears as the last item in the Prolegomena before the poem itself. Its main purpose is to justify the change in the central character from Lewis Theobald to Colley Cibber. The essay displays many of the characteristics commonly attributed to Bentley by his detractors. Perceived as ill-mannered, particularly towards other scholars, he describes Scriblerus illustratively in the following way when speaking of his choice of hero: "But when he cometh to speak of the *Person* of the *Hero* fitted for such a poem, in truth he miserably halts and hallucinates" (75-6). It also dismisses the position of Le Bossu (cited in *The Dunciad Variorum*) on the "epic hero as a 'phantom'" as a "putid conceit" (76).<sup>117</sup> Scriblerus used the latter argument to justify the choice of Lewis Theobald as the central character for *The Dunciad* and *The Dunciad Variorum* in 1728 and 1729 (165-6). It suits Ricardus Aristarchus to sweep it aside before introducing Cibber and Pope in mythological guise, Cibber as the Cyclops and Pope as Odysseus: "Why truly, and it is worth his observation, the unequal Contention of an old, dull, debauched, buffoon Cyclops, with the heaven-directed Favourite of Minerva; who after having quietly born all the monster's obscene and impious ribaldry, endeth the farce in punishing him with the mark of an indelible brand in his forehead" (77). Minerva is the Roman goddess of wisdom and Odysseus her favourite. The stylization of Cibber as the Cyclops and Pope as Odysseus clearly makes the latter victorious. In characterizing the former as "old, dull, debauched, buffoon" (77), Aristarchus's choice of words is strong and unequivocal, and the choice of the phrase "obscene and impious ribaldry" (77) here surely suggests he is recalling the salacious revelations in Cibber's letter of 1742 to Pope about a visit the two men made to a brothel when younger. This letter was the trigger to make Cibber the hero of a revised

---

<sup>117</sup> "Putid" was regarded as being beyond the pale of polite discourse (Jarvis 22-3). As Valerie Rumbold explains, Le Bossu's idea is that the epic hero is a 'phantom' whose name and identity are contingent on the poet's predetermined moral and fable (*Dunciad* 3: 76, n. 1).

*Dunciad*, along with Cibber's central position in the Whig cultural panorama of the day (Jack 123-4).

Valerie Rumbold denotes the Bentley of the footnotes to *The Dunciad in Four Books* as 'Bentley', to distinguish Pope and Warburton's parodic Bentley from the actual one. The presence of this parodic character of 'Bentley' among the footnotes is not as great as one might expect. He is missing entirely from the second book and falls silent when he becomes the subject of the poem in the fourth book (4.210). In the characterization of Bentley which we encounter in these footnotes, he criticizes those who do not share his position vehemently. Charged with projecting Cibber as the hero in a prefatory note, he dismisses as "blunderers" the people who found the original *Dunciad*, which was printed in a foreign country, filling up the blanks as they pleased and thus obscuring the real identity of the hero of the poem (*Dunciad* 4: 95-6). 'Bentley' introduces his own understanding of the word "Dulness" in a footnote (1.15 n.). He expresses wonder that Scriblerus had not clarified the meaning of the word at the beginning of the poem, and has the following advice for the reader: "This remark ought to be carried along with the reader throughout the work; and without this caution he will be apt to mistake the importance of many of the Characters as well as the Design of the Poet" (1.15 n.). This sort of portentous and directive statement is typical of the real Bentley. He provides a new reading of the word "supperless" which is retained from the portrait of Theobald in *The Dunciad Variorum*, interpreting it in line with his characterization of the new hero of the poem as having no appetite "after so great a loss of Money at Dice, or of Reputation by his Play" (1.115 n.). Of the phrase "Cibberian forehead" he notes that all the manuscripts read: "but I make no scruple to pronounce them all wrong" (1.218 n.), an imperious editorial response which his detractors might expect from the editor of Horace's poetry. Finally, there is one editorial intervention by 'Bentley' which is particularly worthy of comment. It will be recalled that in his edition of *Paradise Lost* he suggested that many lines were spurious. The editorial convention at the time for indicating that textual matter was spurious was to place a line or lines "between hooks". He does this with the line "Tho' Christ-church long kept prudishly away" (*Dunciad* 4: 4.194). The scene has all the colleges thronging Dulness, but out of deference to the role of Christ Church in opposing Bentley in the Phalaris controversy, Pope has the College hold back, which of course 'Bentley' contends. So the cumulative portrait of Bentley in *The Dunciad in Four Books* is, on the one hand, that of a textual critic, irascible, disrespectful of his fellow scholars, but, on the other, useful as a critical presence to insist on the rightful identity of Colley Cibber as the new hero of the poem.

10.6. *THE DUNCIAD VARIORUM* AS A PARODY OF TEXTUAL CRITICISM

The first edition of *The Dunciad* is given by Griffith as being published on 18 May 1728, while the first edition of *The Dunciad Variorum* appeared on 10 April 1729. A paragraph in a letter from Pope to Swift, written on 28 June 1728, anticipates the overall shape of *The Dunciad Variorum*:

The Dunciad is going to be printed in all pomp, with the inscription, which makes me proudest. It will be attended with *Proeme, Prologomena, Testimonia Scriptorum, Index Authorum*, and *Notes Variorum*. As to the latter, I desire you to read over the Text, and make a few in any way you like best, whether dry raillery, upon the stile and way of commenting of trivial Critics; or humorous, upon the authors in the poem; or historical, of persons, places, times; or explanatory, or collecting the parallel passages of the Ancients (*Correspondence* 2: 503).

Not everything appears to have made it into *The Dunciad Variorum*. The *proeme* appears to have been absorbed into the Prolegomena or given way to *A Letter to the Publisher*. By the inscription Pope presumably means the quotation from Horace on the original title page of the 1729 edition of *The Dunciad Variorum*. This is reproduced as Plate 3 in *Dunciad* 3: 120. "Deferor in vicum / vedentem thus et odores" ("I am carried into the street where they sell frankincense and perfumes" [Valerie Rumbold's trans.], Horace *Epistles* 2.1.269).<sup>118</sup> As for the notes, Pope gives four possibilities to Swift to contribute to the Notes Variorum. The first, which reflects his satirical intent is to comment on "the stile and way of commenting of trivial Critics" in the way that Pope does in *The Remarks on Book the First* at the beginning of *The Dunciad Variorum* where he attributes to Theobald the view that the title of *The Dunciad* ought to be spelled *The Duncceiad*. This is a parody of Theobald's spelling of Shakespeare's name ("Shakespeare") as opposed to his own way of spelling it ("Shakespear"); the second offers the possibility of making a humorous comment on any of the authors who appear there as dunces, such as Theobald, Welsted or Dennis; the third option is historical, more neutral, explaining the historical background to a passage, such as the significance of the Fleet Ditch; as is the fourth option, that of making explanatory comments or noting parallel passages from classical writers. The invitation to friends to contribute notes to the forthcoming variorum edition makes it polyvocal.<sup>119</sup>

---

<sup>118</sup> Valerie Rumbold relates this to 1.199-202 where we find the threat that Tibbald's works will be used to wrap ginger (*Dunciad* 3: 116).

<sup>119</sup> James McLaverty looks at *The Dunciad Variorum* through the lens of Bakhtin's theory of the novel. McLaverty begins by saying *The Dunciad Variorum* has "self-evident claims to be a great polyphonic text" (82). This leads him to suggest that an important issue for criticism of *The Dunciad* is the nature

Pope's use of the *variorum* genre in *The Dunciad Variorum* is, on the one hand, a general formal parody of it or of textual criticism and, on the other, a brilliant vehicle for the satire of attitudes implied in textual criticism. Pope's model was the sort of *variorum* edition of classical writers which had appeared between the sixteenth century and his own day. One definition of a *variorum* edition is as follows: "Originally an edition of an author's works (or of a single work) containing explanatory notes by various commentators and editors" (Baldick 349). Grafton illuminates the case well.<sup>120</sup> Rumbold calls it "one that compiles extracts from the critical edition" (*Dunciad* 4: 119 n). This can be illustrated with an exemplary model of such an edition. We have already encountered Cornelius Schrevelius (or Cornelis Schrevel) (1615-1661) in this thesis, best known for his *Lexicon manual Graeco-Latinum et Latino-Graecum* which was first published in Leiden in 1654. He also prepared several *variorum* editions of Latin and Greek authors, including Homer, Hesiod, Cicero, Martial, Juvenal and Persius, Justinus, and Lucan, as well as of lesser known authors such as Claudian (b. c. 370 AD). Indeed, many *variorum* editions in the seventeenth century were prepared by Dutch scholars. An examination of two editions of Schrevelius's *variorum* Juvenal and Persius reveals some of the regular features of such editions.<sup>121</sup> The 1648 edition consists of the text of the satires of Juvenal and Persius as well as the following: *Epistola dedicataria*; *Benigno Lectori S.P.D.*; *D. Junii Juvenalis Vita*; *Testimonia Veterum Scriptorum De Juvenale*; *Catalogus*

---

of Pope's engagement with the other voices in the work. He points out that the history of the planning and publication of the poem from its beginnings in 1719-20 by way of its appearance in print in 1728 to the quarto edition of 1743 coincides with "the development of the canonical English novel" (84). *Robinson Crusoe* appeared in 1719, *Pamela* in 1740 and *Joseph Andrews* in 1742. The degree to which the work is truly polyphonic is questioned by McLaverty. He regards the dunces as being "in the *Variorum* but they cannot get at the poem. The organization and typography of the book afford Pope a triumph, but at the cost of a fuller engagement with his opponents" (86-7).

<sup>120</sup> "The particular sort of footnote Pope chose as his favourite satirical medium had been fashionable just before his day. Between the fifteenth and the seventeenth centuries, classical scholars bent on correcting every error, explicating every literary device, and identifying every thing or custom that cropped up in a classical text had mounted every major piece of Greek or Latin prose in a baroque setting of exegesis and debate. . . . By the late fifteenth century the poems of Virgil were already ringed with a band of text wider than the original, printed in illegibly small type, in which commentators ancient and modern, literal and allegorical debated the meaning and application of his texts. Propertius, Martial, Ovid, and Livy soon had their multiple commentaries and handy, large-sized editions to read them in as well. These sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century editions 'with the commentaries of various critics' – 'cum notis variorum' – became the model, between 1650 and 1730, for a raft of editions of lesser authors, from Petronius to Phaedrus, in all of which the voices of the arguing commentators threatened to drown the thin classic monotone of the original text. This model of literary scholarship Pope employed not to imitate but to demolish his opponents" (*The Footnote* 114-5).

<sup>121</sup> D. Junii Juvenalis, et Auli Persii Flacci, *Satyræ: Accurante Cornelio Schrevelio cum Veteris Scholiastæ et Variorum Commentariis* (Leiden, 1648; enl., Amsterdam, 1684).

Eorum Auctorum ex Quibus Notae Variorum Sunt Desumpta [My trans.: Dedicatory Letter; A Letter to the Kind Reader; Life of Juvenal; Testimony of Older Writers on Juvenal; Catalogue of Those Authors from whose Works the Notes Variorum are Taken]. The main text had to be clearly distinguished typographically from the textual apparatus and in this edition is set in italics. The commentary is set in Roman type with some textual matter in italics, with the text arranged in two columns and divided internally between comments from the old scholiasts and variorum notes. In the Amsterdam edition of 1684, the principle differences are the addition of a dissertation on Juvenal by Nicolas Rigault (1577-1654) and a variation in some of the typesetting. In this new edition the main text is set in larger elegant Roman type and the words queried in the notes are set in italics, whereas they were previously set in Roman. These are the generic components, some of which Pope uses in *The Dunciad Variorum*. Pope wanted ironically to present his *Dunciad* as a mock-epic and simulate the veneration for his text that a variorum edition implied. It was a stroke of genius which gave the work parodic classical status and provided a further means to satirize the pretensions of the textual critic.

[Passage omitted]

Let us now turn to the notion of the paratext as a sphere of influence before examining Pope's paratexts for his *Dunciads*.

#### 10.7. PARATEXTS

Hitherto I have not had any recourse to literary theory in this thesis beyond the use of standard critical terms such as "satire," "parody" and the various examples of "genre" encountered so far. However, it seems appropriate to draw on the vocabulary of the "paratext" as elaborated in the work of Gérard Genette (1930-2018) to describe and analyze the pretend critical apparatus in Alexander Pope's *The Dunciad Variorum*. For Genette, the literary work is usually accompanied "by a certain number of verbal or other productions, such as an author's name, a title, a preface, illustrations" (1). We do not know, says Genette, whether such productions are to be regarded as a part of the text, but "in any case they surround it and extend it, precisely in order to *present* it, in the usual sense of this verb but also in the strongest sense: to *make present*, to ensure the text's presence in the world, its 'reception' and consumption in the form (nowadays, at least) of a book" (1). It would be going too far to describe the paratext of *The Dunciad Variorum* as "a fringe of the printed text which in reality controls one's whole reading of the text" (Philippe Lejeune, qtd in

Genette 2), but what Genette has to say about the paratext as an area of transaction is very relevant. He writes “this fringe, always the conveyor of a commentary that is authorial or more or less legitimated by the author, constitutes a zone between text and off-text, a zone not only of transition but also of *transaction* . . . a privileged place . . . of an influence on the public . . . at the service of a better reception for the text and a more pertinent reading of it (more pertinent, of course, in the eyes of the author and his allies)” (2). In the case of *The Dunciad Variorum* not all readers will accept that influence. One example among many is Thomas Lounsbury, an early twentieth-century supporter of Theobald as an editor of Shakespeare. For Lounsbury, “Pope’s prose commentary is mainly a ‘fertile breeding-ground of baseless insinuation and deliberate misstatement,’ which it is the duty of every right-thinking critic to repudiate” (qtd in Williams 62). This clash of perspectives – Pope & Scriblerus versus Theobald & Lounsbury – shows that Pope has created a paratext which serves his own position, or to put it another way, is adversarial. It not only exists to convey information, it also exists to convey information prejudicial to Pope’s enemies and critical of their positions. One would expect the commentary of a variorum edition to provide alternative readings of textually unsound words and lines of poetry along with a supporting scholarly apparatus that introduced the poet and the poem. And here we are near to the second major characteristic of Pope’s paratext: it is playful, it is a general parody of such paratexts and it pretends to be something it is not, to lure in the unsuspecting reader. Although the term “Scriblerian” has been under serious attack recently by Ashley Marshall (2008), I believe it still justifiable to use the term to describe a number of examples, including the *Dunciad Variorum* itself, of what I shall henceforth refer to as the Scriblerian paratext.

[Passage deleted]

Before entering into that discussion, I shall describe some predecessors to Pope’s work in *The Dunciad Variorum*.

#### 10.7.1. Precursors

One definition of the Scriblerian paratext might be that it is a paratext which assumes a form coterminous with a genre, only to reveal itself as a “sham” which serves the overall satirical and parodic aims of the work to which it belongs or to which it is related. The most complex example of a Scriblerian paratext is *The Dunciad Variorum*, where Pope makes use of the textual apparatus of the variorum edition to accommodate his poem, published

initially with no commentary and many names blacked out. I now propose to examine some earlier examples of writing by both Pope and Swift which anticipate the elaborate variorum paratext of *The Dunciad Variorum*.

Not much English poetry had been published with footnotes before Pope's translation of *The Iliad* and *The Dunciad Variorum*. Where footnotes are concerned, there had been an earlier example of a seventeenth-century poet annotating his own text. This was Samuel Butler, who also satirized learning and annotated the revised edition of *Hudibras, the First and Second Parts*, published in 1674. But these notes were explanatory in character rather than solely playful. The true antecedent of the variorum apparatus to *The Dunciad* is the creation of footnotes by Swift which draw on the work of William Wotton in the fifth edition of *A Tale of a Tub*, published in 1710. Here we encounter a recognizable example of the Scriblerian paratext for the first time. Swift's use of quotations from Wotton's work in the 1710 edition of *A Tale of a Tub* sets a handsome precedent for Pope's use of writing which criticizes him. He draws in part on *Observations on Tale of a Tub*, published in 1705 and uses the passages he borrows to make Wotton an authority on *A Tale* rather than an important opponent. Wotton's outrage was in large part religious in character: "In one Word, God and Religion, Truth and Moral Honesty, Learning and Industry are made a May-Game, and the most serious Things in the World are described as so many several Scenes in a Tale of a Tub" (Swift, *Tale II*, 218). *A Tale of a Tub* is allegorical in character, and Wotton's glosses are quite useful. Swift writes in the text "a Man who had Three Sons by one Wife" and a note on "Sons" and written by Wotton is provided: "By these three Sons, Peter, Martyn and Jack; Popery, the Church of England, and our Protestant Dissenters are designed" (47). In this way Swift ironizes Wotton's exegesis. Two earlier examples written by Pope are more interesting and relevant for our purposes. They are both epitexts, an epitext being something written in relation to and yet physically distant from the text to which it refers. Number 40 of the periodical *The Guardian* (27 April 1713), where Pope published an essay on pastoral poetry, and the pamphlet *The Key to the Lock* (1715), show an early precocity in dissembling a position in order to further or protect the poet's position.

In the case of *The Guardian*, Pope showed an unusual ability and propensity to write about his own work under an assumed identity, in order to advance its cause critically and at the expense of his rivals. As I discussed in Chapter Six, the term "bite" is interchangeable with "sham". There I defined a "sham" as "an invention presented as a truth which turns out to be an imposture or a lie at the expense of those who fall for the ruse". The background to this early "bite" by Pope is as follows. *The Guardian* was a periodical at first edited by Richard

Steele and later by Joseph Addison and first published on 12 March 1713. As with the other periodicals of the day, a part of the editorial plan was the inclusion of a fictitious group of people as guiding spirits for the editorial content, in this case the Lizard family. One of the daughters, Cornelia, is a great admirer of pastoral poetry, so this was a genre of poetry that the editor acknowledged as being of interest to his readers from the beginning. And to understand Pope's bite it is necessary to recall Tonson's *Miscellany* for 1709, the sixth in a series first published in 1684.<sup>122</sup> Two poets of the day had contributed respective sets of pastoral poems to this miscellany, namely Ambrose Philips and Alexander Pope. The latter had contributed other matter to the miscellany but had invested his hopes of poetic success in his pastoral poems, the first set of poems he offered for publication. There were marked differences in the style of the pastorals offered by both poets. Philips's poems opened the anthology and Pope's closed it. The work of Philips was modelled on that of Edmund Spenser (1552-99), whose *The Shepheardes Calender* was first published in 1579. Spenser represents the modern tendency in pastoral. For example, he uses contemporary names such as Colin Clout to refer to himself and Hobbinol to refer to Gabriel Harvey (1552/3-1631), his teacher at Cambridge. Pope by contrast modelled his own pastoral poems on the *Eclogues* of Virgil and so pursued a classicizing style, using Latinate names such as Daphnis, Alexis and Thyrsis. Samuel Johnson contrasted the aspirations of the two poets further: "Philips endeavoured to be natural, Pope laboured to be elegant" (4: 113). There had been a series of essays in *The Guardian* about pastoral poetry. When a contemporary practitioner of the form had been mentioned, Ambrose Philips was always preferred to Pope.<sup>123</sup>

Concerned that he was hardly mentioned in the course of Tickell's five essays and more importantly that Philips was consistently praised to the virtual exclusion of Pope, the latter took it upon himself to write a sham continuation of the sequence. He adopts the same style, reproduces some of Tickell's arguments to establish a continuity of tone with the earlier essays and consistently argues that this essay will prove the superiority of Philips's

---

<sup>122</sup> *Poetical Miscellanies: The Sixth Part. Containing a Collection of Original Poems, with Several New Translations. By the Most Eminent Hands* (London, 1709).

<sup>123</sup> The relevant numbers were 22, 23, 28, 30 and 32 (Stephens 8). There has been a variety of opinion over who wrote these essays. In a recent edition of the numbers of *The Guardian* they are firmly attributed to Thomas Tickell (1686-1740), a member of Addison's group at Button's coffee house. In his essays Tickell established his rules for understanding ancient pastoral poetry, described some characteristics and distinguished what can be done differently in modern pastoral poetry, as well as evaluating it and concluding in favour of the poetry of Ambrose Philips. Number 32 marked the end of the sequence, but the theme is taken up again in Number 40, Pope's justly celebrated bite on Philips and his circle.



poetry over that of Pope, when in fact it does the opposite. The opening paragraph is a studied example of how to carry out a bite:

I Designed to have troubled the Reader with no further Discourses of *Pastorals*, but being informed that I am taxed of Partiality in not mentioning an Author, whose Eclogues are published in the Same Volume with Mr. Philips's; I shall employ this Paper in Observations upon him, written in the free Spirit of Criticism, and without Apprehension of offending that Gentleman, whose Character it is, that he takes the greatest Care of his Works before they are published, and has the least Concern for them afterwards. (163)

Pope makes several ironical observations and suggestions in the essay. For example, he suggests that Virgil could have used his familiarity with the "old obsolete *Roman* language, as *Philips* hath by the antiquated *English*" to achieve something less formal. Pope draws attention approvingly to Phillips's inclusion of the wolf in his first pastoral, having argued previously against the inclusion of non-native flora in pastoral poems. Pope compliments Philips on "that beautiful Rusticity" as a way of introducing some dreadful lines of poetry into the essay:

O woful Day! O Day of Woe, quoth he,  
And woful I, who live the Day to see! (167)

And he then proceeds to praise them in such a way that underlines their banality: "That Simplicity of Diction, the Melancholy Flowing of the Numbers, the Solemnity of the Sound, and the easy Turn of the Words . . . are extremely Elegant" (168). Philips is said to have hung up a rod with which to take revenge on Pope at Button's for the damage done to his reputation by Pope's mock essay. Pope's epitext in this case advanced the cause of his own poems and damaged the reputation of his rival, prefiguring his relationship with Theobald and the literary tactics he adopted in *The Dunciad Variorum*.

The motivation for Pope to write *The Key to the Lock* was more complex.<sup>124</sup> Another epitext, it is related to Pope's mock-epic masterpiece *The Rape of the Lock* (1712, 1714). The main purpose of the work was to act as a spoiler for any unfavourable pamphlet attacks on this work. Such keys to books that had sold well were a part of the book trade in Pope's day. Indeed, Edmund Curll (c. 1683-1747) had published a key to *A Tale of a Tub*.<sup>125</sup> The political

---

<sup>124</sup> The full title is *A Key to the Lock. Or, a Treatise Proving, Beyond All Contradiction, The Dangerous Tendency of a Late Poem, Entitled, The Rape of the Lock, to Government and Religion*. By Esdras Barnivelt (London, 1715).

<sup>125</sup> *A Complete Key to The Tale of a Tub; With Some Account of the Authors, The Occasion and Design of Writing It, and Mr. Wotton's Remarks Examin'd*. (London, 1710).

climate had turned against Pope in August 1714 with the fall of the ministry of the Earl of Oxford on the death of Queen Anne. It would have been easy for Pope's enemies to make trouble for him once Bolingbroke had left for France to join the Pretender and the Earl of Oxford had been arrested for treason. The second version of *The Rape of the Lock* had been published in March 1714 and Pope eventually decided to defend himself against any possible attack by creating a hoax pamphlet which advanced the preposterous notion that *The Rape of the Lock* was an allegory for The Barrier Treaty. In his pamphlet *The Key to the Lock* Pope attempts to be so ridiculous so as to forestall all polemic and any suggestion that there is a political interpretation of *The Rape of the Lock* (Prose 73-4). The political interpretation goes back to the end of the War of the Spanish Succession. England and her allies had been in hostilities with France over the Spanish throne. One attempt had been made to bring hostilities to a close in 1709 when Lord Townsend represented England at discussions over a Barrier Treaty. There were three treaties in all, dated 1709, 1713 and 1715. The name found its origin in the proposal that the Dutch be given towns in the Spanish Netherlands which would be a barrier to French advancement. Against the spirit of these negotiations, Oxford achieved a reconciliation with the French in 1711, which resulted in the Congress of Utrecht in 1712.

Pope uses the pseudonym Esdras Barnivelt for *The Key to the Lock*. The voice of Barnivelt is a clear and prejudiced one. His principal diagnosis of the current woes of England is that the division of the nation into parties (Whig & Tory) is an unhappy one, and that many writers have published works which "obscure the Truth, and cover Designs, which may be detrimental to the Publick; in particular, it has been their Custom of late to vent their Political Spleen in Allegory and Fable" (76). Arbuthnot's characters John Bull and his Wife are mentioned explicitly as examples of this unwelcome trend (76). The interpretation of the poem is as follows. The Lock represents the Barrier Treaty, while Belinda represents Great Britain. The Baron, who cuts off the Lock (or Barrier Treaty) is the Earl of Oxford. Clarissa, who lent the scissors, is Lady Masham, the Queen's favourite. Thalestris, who provokes Belinda to resent the loss of the Lock, is the Duchess of Marlborough, while the Sylphs and Gnomes stand for the two contending parties of the Nation. And the Game at *Ombre* is a representation of the War of the Spanish Succession. Barnivelt accuses the author of *The Rape of the Lock* of having ridiculed the ministry of Oxford and the one that succeeded it; and of having abused great statesmen and generals, treaties and the Crown (88). In this case the epitext serves in advance to neutralize any criticism of *The Rape of the Lock* at what was politically a delicate time.

Pope was the subject of strong anti-Catholic polemic on a number of occasions and this gave rise to a second theme in *The Key to the Lock*.<sup>126</sup> There we read in the "consideration of the author and his character in general": "Now that the Author of this Poem is professedly a Papist, is well known; and that a Genius so capable of doing service to that cause, may have been corrupted in the Course of his Education by Jesuits or others, is justly very much to be suspected . . ." (77). The point here is that since the propagation of "Popery" is forbidden in print, readers are quite justified in looking for allegorical meanings in a text by a Roman Catholic. At the end of Pope's pamphlet there is a *tour de force* in interpretation of *The Rape of the Lock*, which finds Roman Catholicism in nearly every aspect of the poem. The clarion call is "I shall now show that the same Poem, taken in another Light, had a Tendency to Popery, which is secretly insinuated through the whole" (85). For example, the guardian angels and patron saints are seen "in the Machinery of his Sylphs,

<sup>126</sup> An example of the sort of anti-Catholic polemic which was directed against Pope was the *Homerides: Or, A Letter to Mr. Pope, Occasion'd by his Intended Translation of Homer*. The first edition was published on 7 March 1715 and it was written by Thomas Burnet (1694-1753) and George Duckett (1684-1732) under the pseudonym of Sir Iliad Doggrell. The main purpose of the pamphlet was to mock Pope's aspiration of translating the *Iliad* into English. This Burnet and Duckett do by offering for inclusion to Pope in his forthcoming translation a number of passages from Homer's first epic rendered into English in the style of Cotton's burlesque version of Virgil's *Aeneid*. Two examples of anti-Catholic polemic will suffice. Burnet and Duckett make an explicitly anti-Catholic version of the invocation of Apollo's priest for the god's wrath to fall on the Greeks (*Iliad* 1.33-8):

This said – The old Man grew afeard,  
Slunk down his Ears and stroak'd his Beard;  
And silent trotted to the Shore,  
'Gainst which the Waves do flouncing roar,  
And there his Beads began to handle,  
And curst them all by Book and Candle. (*Homerides* 10)

The relationship between Catholicism and Protestantism in the modern text parallels the Trojan and the Greek religions in the original. But there is a direct sneer at Pope in the text of the pamphlet where Burnet & Duckett say the following: "Here now, Mr. Pope, you see I have converted *Homer* at a dash into a modern *Papist*, and I leave it to your Care to bring him over to the Protestant Faith" (10). The second example takes a slightly different form. The original Greek is an invocation to the Muses asking who were the leaders and commanders of the Greeks (*Iliad* 2.484-96). The irreverent tone of the burlesque version in the pamphlet is evident from these lines:

Tell me, you Sisters six and three,  
Who the fam'd Grecian Hero's be.  
For I would not rehearse the Mob,  
Though all their Names were in my Fob. (14)

This time Burnet and Duckett invite Pope to rewrite the invocation to the Muses in a Roman Catholic form: "And to carry on the Fancy I began with, of making Homer a Papist, I would fain have you transpose this into a Christian Prayer to Saint Ursula and the Eleven Thousand Virgins that suffered Matyrdom (sic) with her. This will be something surprisingly new" (14). In the first example the authors invite Pope to bring Homer over from Roman Catholicism to Protestantism, whereas in the second they invite him to make a Catholic version of a Greek original. Both instances draw attention to Pope's Roman Catholicism in a derogatory fashion.

which being a Piece of Popish Superstition that hath been endeavoured to be exploded ever since the Reformation, he would here revive under this disguise" (85). *The Key to the Lock* parodies the way Pope's pamphleteering opponents might write about him with a view to deflecting such readings away from the original poem. At the end of *The Key to the Lock* we even encounter the suggestion that the publisher Bernard Lintot (1675-1736) be taken into custody and interrogated to see what knowledge he has that might be detrimental to the established order. Lintot paid Pope £10-15-00 on 31 April 1715 for *The Key to the Lock*, and so was obviously a party to the hoax.

*The Guardian* Number 40 and *The Key to the Lock* are respectively promotional and deflective, acting on the text to which they serve as epitexts. The paratext to *The Dunciad Variorum* works more like Pope's *Guardian* piece, increasing the status of *The Dunciad* by its formal presence and through its content which is hostile to textual criticism.

#### 10.7.2. *The Notes of Scriblerus* in The Dunciad Variorum

Two things there are, upon which the very Basis of all verbal Criticism is founded and supported: The first, that the Author could never fail to use the very best word, on every occasion. The second, that the Critick cannot chuse but know, which it is? This being granted, whenever any doth not fully content us, we take upon us to conclude, first that the author could never have us'd it. And secondly, that he must have used That very one which we conjecture in its stead.

We cannot therefore enough admire the learned *Scriblerus*, for his alteration of the Text in the two last verses of the preceding book, which in all the former editions stood thus: 'Hoarse Thunder to its bottom shook the bog, / And the loud nation croak'd, *God save K. Log!*' He has with great judgment transposed these two epithets, putting *hoarse* to the Nation, and *loud* to the Thunder: And this being evidently the true reading, he vouchsafed not so much as to mention the former; For which assertion of the just right of a Critick, he merits the acknowledgement of all sound Commentators.

Alexander Pope, *The Dunciad Variorum*, 1729 (*Dunciad* 3: 209)

The above two paragraphs form the "Remarks on Book the Second" of *The Dunciad Variorum* and preface the book in which Lewis Theobald is portrayed on his throne of dullness. The first paragraph explores in a parodic fashion the notion underlying textual criticism, that the critic knows better than the text in front of him, and that he will conjecture and come to the same original conclusion as the author of the text when he needs to. Here Pope is proceeding with the first of the options he gave Swift in his letter of 28 June 1728, the possibility of making "dry raillery, upon the stile and way of commenting of trivial Critics" (*Correspondence* 2: 503). But for Pope to include a lot drier raillery of this kind in his textual

apparatus, he was going to need more than the occasional epigraph, however well turned it may be. Pope had found his structure: the textual apparatus, the prolegomena and footnotes form a general parody of the variorum edition. Together these tools provide a framework within which Pope could attack textual criticism, but to create the kind of humorous effect displayed in the second paragraph, Pope needed a commentator. We are already familiar with the parodic character of Martinus Scriblerus from Chapter Six of this thesis. Foremost among the Scriblerian satirical accounts of the virtuosi is the figure of Martinus, whose *Memoirs* parody various aspects of the type of the virtuoso in the later seventeenth century and in the earlier eighteenth century. It was Pope's brilliant creative stroke to turn Martinus into a textual critic and make him into an instrument with which to parody the real textual critics of the day. This he did first of all by using the character of Martinus Scriblerus in the *Virgilius Restauratus* and in the *Peri Bathous*. In the second paragraph above, a change of mind on Pope's part is ascribed to Scriblerus in the form of an insightful conjectural emendation. He is arguably the most important weapon in Pope's attack on textual criticism in *The Dunciad Variorum*. As Valerie Rumbold writes in her edition of *The Dunciad Variorum* the "introduction in 1729 of the parodic scholar-critic Martinus Scriblerus and his Prolegomena enabled Pope to extend his attack on Theobald" (*Dunciad* 3: 113). It will be remembered that Martinus Scriblerus in his fictional *Memoirs* conceals from his father the *Peri Bathous* of which he is the author (*Memoirs* 118). In the divide between Cornelius and Martinus, between Ancient and Modern, a treatise critical of contemporary poetry is a Modern undertaking. Pope takes the opportunity to develop Martinus's pedigree by making him the author of the critical apparatus of *The Dunciad Variorum*. He is ideally suited to become a scholiast and a textual critic. He is also a zany pedant, knowledgeable but literal-minded.<sup>127</sup> As a satirical representation of a pedant he is in line with the stated intention of the Scriblerians. However, it should be noted that there are no critics in his ancestry, which suggests that it was a later initiative on Pope's part to take the character in this direction.

[Passage omitted]

---

<sup>127</sup> Robert Kilburn Root relates *The Dunciad Variorum* to the concerns of the Scriblerus Club and their preoccupation with pedantry (*Dunciad* 1: 26-7). And Maynard Mack remarks that Dr Johnson was forgetful when he suggested that Pope only became hostile to editors and textual critics after Theobald's *Shakespeare Restored*, stressing the continuity of Pope's stance from the mock *Account of the Works of the Unlearned* through to the *Dunciads* and the *Memoirs* of Scriblerus (486-7).

## 10.8. THE FOLLOWERS OF SCRIBLERUS

The figure of Martinus Scriblerus and the textual apparatus of *The Dunciad Variorum* did inspire a certain amount of emulation. Henry Fielding (1707-1754), for example, wrote several plays under the pseudonym of H. Scriblerus Secundus, the homage to Pope and Martinus Scriblerus being explicit in the chosen pseudonym. Fielding was the author of an important work, which made innovative use of parodic textual apparatus. Firstly, he published the heroic burlesque *Tom Thumb: A Tragedy* in 1730 and under the influence of *The Dunciad Variorum*, followed it with a revised and expanded *The Tragedy of Tragedies, or, The Life and Death of Tom Thumb the Great* (1731), to which he also gave a preface and footnotes. Through the textual apparatus it was Fielding's aim to connect the work with the plays it parodied, such as Dryden's *The Conquest of Granada* and *All for Love* (1677), a reworking of Shakespeare's *Anthony and Cleopatra*.<sup>128</sup> The textual apparatus of *The Tragedy of Tragedies* also touches on an aspect of Lewis Theobald's work, namely his publication in 1728 of a play called *Double Falshood, or, The Distrest Lovers* which today is thought to have been based on a lost play by Shakespeare and Fletcher. In the preface H. Scriblerus Secundus writes that he will pass over the date as to whether "this Piece was originally written by *Shakespear*, tho' certainly that, were it true, must add a considerable Share to its Merit . . ." (v). This was the sort of debate one might have heard about *Double Falshood*.

In an introductory essay to *The Conquest of Granada* called *Of Heroique Playes*, Dryden states that the proper subject for such plays is "Love and Valour" (10), defends the inclusion of "Spirits, or Spectres" (12) and the incorporation of battle scenes (13). In *The Tragedy of Tragedies* Tom Thumb, the English fairy tale character is the main protagonist of a play in which he returns to the court of King Arthur as the conqueror of the giants. The romantic intrigues which are a feature of heroic dramas are satirized here through the love interests of all the characters. For example, King Arthur is married to Queen Dollalolla, who is in love with Tom Thumb, and is father to Princess Huncamunca, who is also in love with Tom Thumb. The bloodier side of the heroic drama is represented in *The Tragedy of Tragedies* particularly well in two scenes. In Act Two, Scene Two, Tom Thumb is talking with the courtier Noodle when the latter is approached by a bailiff. Tom Thumb takes this as a personal insult and kills the bailiff, reflecting the summary killings in heroic dramas. But it is

---

<sup>128</sup> Other plays of this kind are *Sophonisba* (1675), *Gloriana* (1676) and *Caesar Borgia* (1679) by Nathaniel Lee (c. 1645-1692) and *Cyrus the Great, Or, The Tragedy of Love*, written by John Banks (1652/3-1706) in 1681, but not performed until 1695.

the end of the play which mocks the heroic drama most thoroughly. The trigger is the news Noodle the courtier supplies about Tom Thumb, who has been swallowed by a cow. He is murdered for his pains by Queen Dollalolla, who is in turn killed by Cleora, a maid of honour, who is in love with Noodle. Doodle, another courtier, kills Princess Huncamunca. Mustacha, a maid of honour in love with Doodle kills him and she in turn is killed by the King, who then kills himself. So a spiral of seven violent deaths in rapid succession closes *The Tragedy of Tragedies*. It will be noted that the characters' names themselves are also parodic of those in heroic dramas. Names such as Dollalolla, Huncamunca and Glumdalca are parodic of the names of some of the characters for example in Dryden's *The Conquest of Granada*: Abdalla, Abdelmelech, Almahide and Lyndaraxa. Where spirits are concerned, Tom Thumb's father Gaffar Thumb appears as a ghost in the play. On the face of it, it may seem odd that Fielding chose to parody heroic tragedies which were written in the late seventeenth century, instead of those written closer to his own day. The reason for this was that the older plays were still widely performed and as popular as more recent examples of the genre (Lewis 112). Unusually for a play, *The Tragedy of Tragedies* was published with the annotations of H. Scriblerus Secundus, which do include the observations of a Dr. B---y, before Pope had begun to turn Bentley into a character in his own fictitious critical apparatus.

Except for Fielding's work, none of the works under consideration here is written at the same level of sophistication of Pope's *Dunciads*, but the fascination with the figure of Scriblerus led to some interesting imitative offspring. There are two minor long poems which should be mentioned in connection with the influence of Scriblerus, although neither are concerned with satire on learning. William Kenrick (1729/1730-79) published *The Old Woman's Dunciad* in 1751, under the pseudonym Mary Midnight, with a textual apparatus attributed to *Margelina Scribelinda Macularia*.<sup>129</sup> As C.S. Rogers and Betty Rizzo write in their article on Kenrick in the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* this formed part of a paper war between Kenrick and Christopher Smart (1722-71) (online edition, par. 3 of 23). Karina Williamson records in her article on Smart in the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* that he was the editor and main writer for *The Midwife, or, The Old Woman's Magazine* in the early 1750s (online edition, par. 6 of 17), where he used the pseudonym Mrs Mary Midnight. He published *The Hilliad* with prolegomena and notes variorum in 1753. He

---

<sup>129</sup> *The So Much Talk'd of and Expected Old Woman's Dunciad. Or, Midwife's Master-piece. Containing the Most Choice Collection of Humdrums and Drivellers, that Was Ever Expos'd to Public View. By Mary Midnight. With Historical, Critical, and Explanatory Notes, by Margelina Scribelinda Macularia* (London, 1751).

received a response in the same year from its target Dr John Hill (1714-75) in the form of *The Smartiad* (1753), which had no textual apparatus. Both works were written during a paper war in the 1750s involving Dr John Hill, Smart and Henry Fielding (1707-54).<sup>130</sup> Smart and his colleague Arthur Murphy (1727-1805) in two letters placed at the front of *The Hilliad* tie the reason for writing the work to Pope's aim in *The Dunciad*, which was to vanquish dull writers. In another detail reminiscent of the sort of polemic Pope faced from the likes of Welsted and Dennis, Hill attacked Smart and Fielding in the only issue of the paper *The Impertinent*. Hill had started his career as the apprentice to an apothecary and eventually opened a shop in Westminster. According to a contemporary account, Hill overlooked Smart's learning while Smart only saw Hill as a quack and a fool (qtd in Smart 443). *The Hilliad* is presented very much in the manner of *The Dunciad*, with prolegomena, main text and subordinate notes written under two main pseudonyms, Martinus Macularius and Quinbus Flestrin. The former represents Hill, while the latter (the name for Gulliver in Lilliput) stands for Samuel Derrick (1724-69), a writer and friend of Hill.

Another work appeared in the early 1750s which was influenced by the figure of Scriblerus. Richard Owen Cambridge (1717-1802) wrote a continuation of the *Memoirs* of Scriblerus, a work he regarded as having been "executed very unequally" (*The Scribleriad* vi). Preferring to write in heroic couplets rather than in prose, *The Scribleriad* was published in six books in 1751 and again in 1752 with preface, notes and an index. The hero of this poem is called Scriblerus, is clearly a version of Martinus and travels widely in the poem. There is both continuity and discontinuity with the *Memoirs*. For example, Cambridge mentions Martinus's wish to see an earthquake, for which he waited three years in Naples without seeing Vesuvius erupt, as well as his wish to disembark for Jamaica, well known at the time for earthquakes (*Memoirs* 93). His wife Lindamira is mentioned in the third book, which is a retelling of the story of Dido and Aeneas featuring Martinus and an unnamed foreign queen. Minor references such as Basilius Valentinus, born on 1 April and an alchemist, appear in the last book, which is concerned with the Philosopher's Stone. In the first book of *The Scribleriad*, Martinus is searching for a petrified city and when faced with death he makes a funeral pyre of his possessions. Here he is portrayed as an antiquary since included in the pyre are fossils, shells and "The Shield, his Cradle once" (1.113). In the *Memoirs* the

---

<sup>130</sup> Christopher Smart, *The Hilliad: An Epic Poem. To which Are Prefixed, Copious Prolegomena and Notes Variorum. Particularly, Those of Quinbus Flestrin Esq; and Martinus Macularis, M.D. Acad. Reg. Scient. Burdig.. &c. Soc.* (Dublin, 1753). For a modern critical edition see Christopher Smart, *Poetical Works*, vol. 4, ed. Karina Williamson (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1987).



antiquarian interests are more associated with his father Cornelius. And in the last book Scriblerus goes in search of the Philosopher's Stone, again something not explicitly connected with him in the *Memoirs*.

[Passage omitted]

The second edition has extensive notes, but these are of an informative nature and there is no Martinus Scriblerus animating hostilities against Lewis Theobald and the Dunces as there is in *The Dunciad Variorum*. *The Scribleriad* is now largely forgotten but remains of interest to readers of the *Memoirs* of Scriberus.

#### 10.9. CONCLUSION

With its reception in Pope's *Dunciads*, textual criticism takes its place with antiquarianism and early modern science as the third example of the New Learning to be subjected to a satirical reception. If Pope's victory as a satirist was immediate, Theobald's efforts to determine what the original printer's copy of a Shakespeare play looked like became an important and enduring part of the armoury of the textual critic. So, Pope's short-term gain of defending his reputation was outweighed over time by a better editorial approach and superior editions of Shakespeare thanks to the efforts of Theobald.

In many ways the satirical reception of the New Learning in Pope's poetry is the culmination of what is now visibly a tradition or body of work. It also provided arguably the most sophisticated response to it and certainly the most sustained and accomplished. If Bacon's proposals to adopt the experimental method and his wish to replace Aristotle's syllogism with induction in logic were the first important steps in the Battle of the Ancients and the Moderns, then textual criticism was one of the later ambushes made by the Moderns. This can be discerned behind the substantial exchange between Theobald and Pope in *Shakespeare Restored* and *The Dunciad Variorum*. For those who took the side of the Ancients, the application of the techniques of textual criticism to ancient texts was an abomination. For them it was the condescension of Bentley, the prime practitioner, towards his subject matter which caused the most difficulty. In contrast, Maynard Mack, in his biography of Pope points to the importance of a "critical civility" in Pope's stance (Mack 486). This contrasts with the arrogance of Bentley and the manifestations of his pedantry in his extensive footnotes, as well as his summary dismissal of the opinions of previous scholars.

The Battle finds some of its protagonists in the figures of the gentleman and the scholar or the pedant, figures alluded to in this chapter. Pope certainly sided with the gentlemen as representing eternal classical cultural values, but there is one aspect of his success as a writer which marks him out as belonging more to the monetarization of literature which was taking place at the time than would have suited his self-image as an Ancient. Pope became very wealthy as a result of his translations of Homer. Expressed in the monetary value of sterling in 2017, he made just over £1.5 million from the translations of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. It was this income which allowed him to create the lifestyle he desired for himself in Twickenham. Theobald's attack on Pope's editing skills was not only a manifestation in print of a new cultural trend; it was also an attack on Pope's reputation, which the poet felt compelled to defend with all his rhetorical might.

There was a difference between Bentley and his disciple Theobald. The former's leaden changes to Horace found their satirical counterpart in the *Virgilius Restauratus*. And the Martinus Scriblerus of the *Virgilius Restauratus* is central to the satirical reception of Bentley, particularly in the former's reading of the figure of the Trojan Horse, which after Scriblerus's absurd intervention becomes a Greek mare. Bentley's rewritings of Horace were a kind of model for the wrong way to go about interpreting one culture to another. These were all indiscretions that remained visible only to those who knew Latin. Bentley made his approach and its strident tone available to English readers with his version of Milton's *Paradise Lost*. We have already heard how his changes often diminish the poetry of the original text and how he prefers more literal readings to figurative ones in metaphorical passages, while in descriptive ones he prefers abstract nouns to those expressing physicality. We might say he was a perverse reader. The opposite was the case for Theobald, despite Pope's protestations that he was insignificant and preoccupied with trivialities. Posterity made an honest man of Theobald, whereas Bentley found few advocates in English literary criticism. The German philologist Moritz Haupt (1808-74) was of the opinion that the prime requisite of a good emendation is that it should begin with the thought and that only afterwards should it be considered whether factors such as a defective metrical reading or the possibility that an interchange of letters have taken place. This notion of thought as the motor of textual criticism fits well with Theobald's approach to the conjectural emendation. Theobald was also in favour of collating older texts when faced with textual corruption.

His interpretations of Shakespeare have been adopted by many later editors, including nearly all those in the eighteenth century. Theobald's work also points towards later textual criticism. In the twentieth century the New Bibliographers believed that

emendation was best based on an understanding of how the corruption arose (*Oxford Companion* 127). It has been widely noted that in Shakespeare's handwriting the letters 'a' and 'u' cannot be told apart. This is visible in his revisions to the play *Sir Thomas More*. This insight resulted in John Dover Wilson changing the phrase "sallied flesh" in Hamlet's first soliloquy to "sullied flesh" (127). The role of foul papers, the dramatist's draft manuscript used in the theatre and then used in subsequent publication, is also thought to have played a role in generating printer's errors.

Despite Theobald's rescue by posterity, the formal dimension of Pope's response remains highly impressive. His formal parody of the variorum edition remains something to savour. Pope was a masterful manipulator of text with a detailed knowledge of print culture. The critical apparatus in both *The Dunciad Variorum* and *The Dunciad in Four Books* contains elements which are both playful as well as adversarial. This all finds its precedents in the bite and the sham as practised by Swift as well as in two of the epitexts written by Pope, Number 40 of *The Guardian* on pastoral poetry and the pamphlet *The Key to the Lock*. The fictitious textual critic Martinus Scriblerus is arguably the most important weapon in Pope's attack on Theobald and textual criticism. Yet the analysis of Scriblerus's footnotes to *The Dunciad Variorum* shows that they are often coterminous with the poetic text and so do not form a real paratext. However, it is for the creation of the fictitious textual critic Martinus Scriblerus that we can be most grateful. Much too rational in one moment and human in the next, Scriblerus makes us laugh at the literal-mindedness of the textual critic and admire his humanity when he sympathizes with the dunces. He is a Modern whose misadventures are intended to reaffirm the ascendancy of the Ancient position and so as a literary creation is conservative in character, like all satire on the New Learning. Finally, there is the twentieth-century notion of the copy-text, the printed text closest to the author's manuscript. All these later innovations begin with Theobald's work, which is thereby shown to be the third and final example of the New Learning.



## CONCLUSION

[Passage omitted]

This has been a remarkably diverse journey through the literature which satirizes the New Learning, defining the subject and giving many examples of it in a wide variety of genres. Now is the moment to look back over the material gathered together here to see what patterns emerge from this large body of evidence. If we say that the New Learning is a newly discovered country, it has three provinces known by the names of antiquarianism, early modern science and textual criticism. The first is rather slight, the second is the largest although somewhat diverse in its composition, and the third is of a reasonable size and well defined. The theme begins almost incidentally with antiquarianism, overlaps and continues with the figure of the virtuoso who was interested in early modern science and collecting, and concludes with textual criticism. I might have included medicine, given the considerable number of medical doctors in the Royal Society, but I did not come across many satires on the subject, except for those on Dr Woodward. The literary evidence for each is of a different character and the amount of evidence is quite different between say antiquarianism and textual criticism. This is because the antiquary is usually an occasional figure in literature up to 1699, whereas the practice of textual criticism sparked a major work of literature in the shape of Pope's *The Dunciad Variorum* (1729).

Here I shall start by describing the faces of learning – the antiquary, the virtuoso and the textual critic – in the light of all the evidence provided in our examination of these literary types. This will be accompanied by a look at the chronological development of the three literary types, as well as determining whether there is any crossing over between the three and within the virtuoso. Before turning to satire itself as a topic, I will provide a composite portrait of pedantry and the pedant, which one might argue lies behind the three manifestations. Finally, satire itself will become the subject, to see whether Pardo's ideas about satire on learning or Bakhtin's ideas about the Menippean tradition of satire can help

in interpreting the material gathered here. An important conclusion in this respect is that the eccentricity which characterizes the portrayal of the satirical targets which we have encountered in this thesis shows that the satire is conservative in nature.

The somewhat different yet interrelated provinces of antiquarianism, early modern science and textual criticism assume the faces of their practitioners in the satires which were written to vex them. The satirical reception of antiquarianism is the earlier of the three responses. It begins in 1592 with Thomas Nashe's *Pierce Penilesse his Supplication to the Devil*. Antiquaries were earnest men, exploring the physical world for evidence which would help them towards a better understanding of the past. They were usually portrayed as being obsessed with old, decaying things covered in rust and cobwebs. I have argued that this consistent satirical reception is in line with the intellectual outlook of the satirists who would have been educated to believe that knowledge came from books. Another factor would have been the great maritime expansion of the Elizabethan era which brought other lands into reach resulting in trade and the importation of new things. So in this commercial and cultural environment which was defined by obtaining what was new and unusual, to contemplate an antiquary and his interest in old things was probably a strange and discordant experience. The most striking thing about the small body of work concerned with antiquaries that I have collected here is the variety in the reception. In Thomas Lodge's *Wits Miserie* (1596) we have not yet left the medieval world of the Seven Deadly Sins in which the antiquary is coterminous with the liar. Donne adds a little to the as yet small tradition with his jibes at the antiquary Hammon for his strangeness, although he also acknowledges the importance of the antiquary to biblical scholarship. The template of the satirical reception of the antiquary is set with the publication of John Earle's collection of prose character sketches in 1628, which included his account of an antiquary. Earle writes of cobwebs and worms and rotting manuscripts, all motifs taken up by later writers on the subject. I think it important to point out that here the sardonic and pejorative tone of the piece also derives in part from the work which provided the genre, Theophrastus's *Characters* (c. 4<sup>th</sup>-3<sup>rd</sup> centuries BC; early modern Latin edition, 1592). This is something which is carried forward by later writers of character sketches. The major literary example of the period is Marmion's comedy *The Antiquary* (1641), which provides a negative portrait for the Caroline court to please Charles I after the closure of the antiquary Sir Robert Cotton's library. In this comedy Veterano, the central character, is portrayed as being obsessed with antiquities at the expense of the human relations in his life. He resolves at the end of the comedy to help his nephew financially in a way that would have been beyond him at the beginning of the play. This begins a trend of

portraying new intellectual pursuits as eccentric and inhuman. The few examples from after the Interregnum continue the criticism of antiquaries before the antiquary is absorbed as a type into the figure of the virtuoso. We see this in William King's satirical reception of an interest in coins in *A Journey to London, In the Year 1698* (1699), and the trope reaches its zenith in the third chapter of the *Memoirs of Scriblerus* (1741), in which Cornelius's shield is used in line with ancient practice in the christening of his son Martin to disastrous effect. The classical learning which brings it into play at the christening gives way as it is revealed to be an old sconce of no value. In this way, the antiquary is portrayed as pretentious and deluded (102-04).

The antiquary is the first of three types to occur chronologically. The second is the virtuoso. The members of the Royal Society were aware of the potentially disastrous consequences of their fledgling project being made to look ridiculous by the wits. And so it was. The figure of the virtuoso has its origins in collecting but the word is indissolubly linked to natural philosophy, or early modern science. The first example of its satirical reception is to be found in the lines on the microscope in Samuel Butler's *Hudibras, The Second Part* (1663). The early zenith of satirical effectiveness is achieved in Thomas Shadwell's *The Virtuoso* (1676). Shadwell had been helped by Samuel Butler, who had written much on the subject and probably circulated what he had written among the likeminded, but only very little was published in his lifetime. Butler's accounts of the virtuosi stressed what he perceived as the futility of their activities, whether it was in making old dogs young by means of blood transfusions, the interest in the louse shown by Robert Hooke in his groundbreaking *Micrographia* (1665), or in what was the most fully realized of his satires on early modern science, the telescope in *The Elephant in the Moon* (1676). Butler's satire was direct and robust and written in the first years of the scientific revolution. Shadwell was a playwright who wrote for a different medium to Butler, whose work was in prose and verse. Restoration comedy, of which *The Virtuoso* (1676) is an example, thrived on verbal wit. Shadwell creates the stage character Sir Nicholas Gimcrack and furnishes him with a number of actual experiments which are ridiculed by means of exaggeration. Shadwell concentrated on the most sensational ones, such as the already mentioned blood transfusions between dogs, and developed the idea of keeping air, so ridiculed by Charles II. These were experiments, the contents of which were accessible to the layman, and which made for excellent material with which to discredit early modern science. Other research, for example the work done on the mechanics of the tides, were much harder to expropriate for satirical purposes. Exaggeration and irony of character were Shadwell's two main weapons. We first encounter Sir Nicholas

on a table having a swimming lesson and he pointedly says that he is only interested in the theoretical aspects of swimming, since he never does anything with a practical outcome. The combination of this reductive comic device and taking the basic situation in the experiments to an absurd conclusion served Shadwell well. Like Veterano, Gimcrack is portrayed as unnaturally absorbed in his intellectual interests. The character of Gimcrack was the template of the virtuoso for the second half of the seventeenth century, so when Addison came to write Number 216 of *The Tatler*, dated 26 August 1710, he used the character of Sir Nicholas Gimcrack to illustrate the idea that the study of what he disparagingly called “the refuse of nature” should be a pastime, rather than the main concern of a man’s life (Bond 1987 3: 133). He publishes *The Will of a Virtuoso* in the same number and extends the satire to the contents of the will, which details the recipients of a box of butterflies, a drawer of shells, a female skeleton, a recipe for preserving dead caterpillars, three crocodile eggs and various other animal and vegetable items (3: 133-4).

From the 1680s onwards, there followed a number of works which maintained the attack on the virtuosi. Later works by Sir Thomas Browne, Aphra Behn and William King are more concerned with the virtuoso’s curiosity, his interest in Rosicrucianism and the writings of the virtuosi in the *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society* (1665 onwards). A work which targeted the curiosity of the virtuoso and his interest in the rare and unusual in the form of paintings, books and collectables was Sir Thomas Browne’s *Musaeum Clausum, or Bibliotheca Abscondita* (1683). Aphra Behn’s play *The Emperor of the Moon* (1687) foregrounded Rosicrucian concerns as well as the ongoing interest in observing the heavens through a telescope. Dr Baliardo, the central character, is made to look foolish in much the same way as Veterano in *The Antiquary* (1641) and Sir Nicholas Gimcrack in *The Virtuoso* (1676). The pattern recurs. The virtuoso is portrayed as unworldly, overly bound up in his preoccupations and made to look foolish when what he thinks is a visit from the emperor of the moon turns out to be a covert attempt to woo his daughter.

The origins of textual criticism are to be found in the Italian Renaissance when there was a great flourishing of humanism between 1450 and 1600. A great revival in learning saw poetry become central to the study of literature in Latin and Greek. And so there was a need for corrected texts of classical poetry with an accompanying critical interpretation. For such activity stable collections of manuscripts were required and in the late 1400s nobles such as Lorenzo de’ Medici began to establish libraries which housed manuscripts. Two important figures in the evolution of textual criticism were the Italian Angelo Poliziano (1454-94) and Joseph Scaliger (1540-1609), who was born in France. The satirical reception of the textual



critic does not begin in earnest until the 1710s, in the wake of Bentley's edition of Horace (1711). Of the three faces of the New Learning, it is the textual critic which is the most concisely defined. Textual criticism had a clear start in the work of Richard Bentley (1662-1742), who lent himself easily to satire through the nature of his combative character, as well as representing a seemingly new approach to editing classical texts through the use of the conjectural emendation. He had made his reputation in the 1690s by publishing suggestions for the emendation of classical texts. He was central to the Battle of the Ancients and Moderns, in which he made a strong case for the *Letters of Phalaris* being a forgery. Bentley's editions of Horace (1711), the comic playwright Terence (1726) and the astrologer Manilius (1739) were important works of Latin scholarship. It was his edition of Horace which introduced textual criticism to a wider audience outside of the universities in England. He made the conjectural emendation central to his editorial policy in his edition of Horace, although in fact there was less emendation of this kind than the reader had been led to expect. Making use of the same skills, Lewis Theobald's *Shakespeare Restored* (1726) angered Alexander Pope so much that it became the catalyst for that poet's *The Dunciad Variorum* (1729). And Bentley's edition of Milton's *Paradise Lost* was published in 1732 and flowed into the satirical current formed by Pope's *Dunciads*, *The Dunciad Variorum* (1729) and *The Dunciad in Four Books* (1743). These are two of the most extended and carefully constructed works under consideration in this thesis.

[Passage omitted]

What conclusions can be drawn about this heterogenous body of satirical literature written in a variety of genres? The satirical reception of the New Learning is not exclusively attached to any one genre, in the way that writing about love is often associated with the sonnet. There is a small family of texts for which Greek literature provides the models. One is the character sketch of Theophrastus, which provides a model for John Earle and Samuel Butler. Secondly, Lucian's genre of the dialogue of the dead gives the template for William King's *The Transactioneer* (1700). The mock-epic also comes from ancient Greek literature. A reading of the *Batrachomyomachia* lies behind Pope's *The Dunciad Variorum* (1729). Another family of texts is the one influenced by Roman literature. It was the discovery of the biting satire of Juvenal in the 1590s that led to the satirical tone of the works of Thomas Nashe and Everard Guilpin. Satires on Bentley's edition of Horace stemmed from his emendations to the work of the Roman poet. And the variorum edition so popular in the 1600s and often

emanating from Holland, was the model for Pope's *Dunciads*. In these circumstances it is justifiable to speak of satire as a mode (Fowler 110-111), a category that leaves room for the formal variety observable in our corpus of works. But even so it seems rather that a unifying concept is needed here. In the Introduction Pardo's concept of satire on learning was cited as the starting point for the research which resulted in this thesis. The same source can provide orientation for the analysis of the evidence which has now been collected through some of the categories it contains. The most relevant are "the overrating of learning" which results in its centrality in the life of the pedant and "the triviality of learning" which results when too much attention is given to specialized knowledge (*Satire 4*). When both combine the result is an "excess in learning" (4) and abuse of learning. The perception of this combination gives rise to the satirical response. In countless examples in this thesis, the proponent of the New Learning sees his activity as interesting and justified, whereas the satirist derides it as meaningless.

As a result of identifying the many satires on the New Learning as a coherent group, it has been my intention here to assemble a corpus of works on the subject written in English. In doing so I have amassed a substantial bibliography of works in three tiers. These are firstly the well-known works by Jonathan Swift such as *Gulliver's Travels* (1726) and Alexander Pope's *The Dunciad Variorum* (1729). In the second tier one can locate works by William King such as *The Transactioneer* (1700) and the *Useful Transactions in Philosophy, and Other Sorts of Learning* (1708). King is a writer known to specialists in eighteenth-century literature but not to the general reader. In addition to these two tiers there is a third which includes works little known even to experts in the period. An outstanding example of this is discussed in Chapter Ten. This is a parodic treatment in the style of a textual critic of a verse from the old English folk song *Tom Bostock* which can be found in Richard Johnson's *The Anti-Bentleian Aristarchus* (1717). The further to disseminate satirical writing on the New Learning, a short appendix containing four character sketches is appended to the thesis. There are examples of satire on learning in other European literatures too (Pardo, *Satire 6*).

[Passage omitted]

It might have been possible to account theoretically for the evidence presented in this thesis by drawing on the Menippean tradition. Firstly, Mikhail Bakhtin's characterization of Menippean satire holds a great attraction for the literary critic in search of a theoretical platform. In his *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics* (1984) Bakhtin (1895-1975) suggests that

Menippean satire is intellectual in content and concerns the satirical treatment of ideas. This, potentially, is the relevance of Bakhtin's ideas to the satirical reception of the New Learning. Menippean satire has been defined as follows: "A form of intellectually humorous work characterized by miscellaneous contents, displays of curious erudition and comical discussions on philosophical topics" (Baldick 202).<sup>131</sup> The name comes from the Greek philosopher Menippus (3<sup>rd</sup> century BC), whose works are lost, but who was imitated by the Roman writer Varro (1st century BC), as well as by other ancient writers. Menippus is often a character in the works of Lucian, which include dialogues and prose narratives. The mixing of prose and verse, which were normally kept apart, was also characteristic of the works of Varro, the Roman satirist who imitated Menippus (Varro 1985: 1, 2, 4 et seq.) It is for this reason among others that Menippean satire is sometimes described as dialogic or polyvocal. In other words, works in the tradition of Menippean satire contain more than one voice and the presence of two voices offers the possibility for dialogue and questioning. However, only five of Bakhtin's fourteen Menippean characteristics are relevant to the satirical reception of the New Learning.<sup>132</sup> The testing of an idea, the use of the fantastic and the adventure in the

---

<sup>131</sup> Northrop Frye's definition is more extensive: "The Menippean satire deals less with people as such than with mental attitudes. Pedants, bigots, cranks, parvenus, virtuosi, enthusiasts, rapacious and incompetent professional men of all kinds, are handled in terms of their occupational approach to life as distinct from their social behaviour. The Menippean satire thus resembles the confession in its ability to handle abstract ideas and theories, and differs from the novel in its characterization, which is stylized rather than naturalistic, and presents people as mouthpieces of the ideas they represent" (309).

<sup>132</sup> Bakhtin calls Menippean satire "the menippea" and defines fourteen characteristics. The first emphasizes the increased role of the comic element in the menippea in comparison to the Socratic dialogue. Although this may vary from writer to writer, the comic is an important feature of Menippean satire. The second characteristic is the lack of restraint on plot and the freedom of philosophical invention from considerations of history and memoir evident in the Socratic dialogue. The third centres on "the creation of extraordinary situations for the provoking and testing of a philosophical idea" (114). This in turn results in the untrammelled use of both the fantastic and adventure in the passage of the idea through the world. Bakhtin emphasizes here that the testing of an idea is foregrounded, rather than the testing of a particular human individual or type. The fourth characteristic acknowledges that the representation of an idea or truth can be located in the least reputable places of society, such as taverns, marketplaces and brothels (115). The fifth juxtaposes the bold inventiveness and the presence of the fantastic with an ability to contemplate the world in the widest sense. The sixth characteristic is the relocation of action from earth either to Olympus or the underworld. The latter was particularly important to the menippea and this resulted in the genre of the dialogue of the dead (116). The seventh embodies the principle of the observation of people or action from an unexpected viewpoint. Bakhtin suggests that Lucian's *Icaromenippus* is an ancient example of this and points to the continuation of "experimental fantasticality" in later epochs (116). The eighth characteristic is the representation of unusual states of mind, including madness. The ninth is the disruption of what is widely accepted and customary, in the form of unusual behaviour or speeches or scandalous scenes (117). The role of such disruptive forces is to destroy the perceived wholeness of the world evident in the epic and to free mankind from the factors that shape life. The

passage of the idea through the world, these features from the third of Bakhtin's Menippean characteristics appear promising. Here one can speak fruitfully of William King's satirical method in the *Useful Transactions in Philosophy, and Other Sorts of Learning* (1708), where King offers the passage of the ideas of natural philosophy through his world. In writing about the experiments of Antoni van Leeuwenhoek (1632-1723) in *The Tongue*, King uses characters from the lower classes to satirize the gentility of the natural philosophers. In *The Eunuch's Child*, the satirical target is the work of Francis Hauksbee (*bap.* 1660, *d.* 1713), who was a pioneer in the research of electricity. Some of Hauksbee's experiments in which phenomena pass through glass are used to support the notion that a eunuch has fathered a child, but this is undermined by vivid testimony from a young woman to the effect that no eunuch can do such a thing. In *Millers Are Not Thieves*, King develops a scenario around the idea which was proverbial at the time that millers were thieves. It is argued that the action of the atoms in flour that seize on the miller, rather than his removal of flour, is the cause his customers are cheated. In each case, King tries to use something from the accumulated experience of mankind to undermine the credibility of natural philosophy.

The principle of the observation of people or action from an unexpected viewpoint is present in the seventh characteristic. Here the first two parts of *Gulliver's Travels* (1726) are obvious examples of what Bakhtin calls "experimental fantasticality" (116). The character of Gulliver visits Lilliput in Part One, where he is a giant. This change of perspective is suggested by the recent invention of the telescope, allowing the viewer to see for long distances. He visits Brobdingnag in Part Two, where he is very small, and the change of perspective here is suggested by the microscope, not only for the ability to detect and inspect smaller forms of life, but also to magnify the imperfections of mankind. The resulting change of perspective in both parts is also used by Swift for satirical purposes. The polyvocal nature of Menippean satire is also pertinent (thirteenth characteristic). Here we can cite Pope's *The Dunciad Variorum* (1729) and *The Dunciad in Four Books* (1743). The third and fifth characteristics mention the fantastic, which is an important part of Menippean satire. One of Lucian's translators defines it as it occurs in his work as follows:

---

tenth characteristic is one of marked contrasts, such as a powerful man who becomes a slave. The eleventh is the notion of social utopia. The twelfth characteristic is a widespread use of the inserted genre, whether it is the letter, the speech or verse. This relates to the polyvocal nature of Menippean satire, the thirteenth characteristic. And finally, the fourteenth characteristic is the concern with contemporary, topical issues.

A large number of works are in dialogue form. These might be divided between the realistic and the fantastic . . . The second category, the fantastic, can be subdivided into pieces with an Underworld setting, those with an Olympian setting, those in which gods and humans interact or gods come to the human world, those in which the conversations are with long-dead figures from the past or an animal and one where a fantastic cure is affected. (Lucian, *Chattering Courtesans* xiv-xv.)

There are some fascinating examples of this in Lucian's work. The dialogues of the dead are those with the most relevance to the material presented in this thesis, with the caveat that when William King made use of the genre in *The Transactioneer* (1700), Sir Hans Sloane, his satirical target, was very much alive. It is the rhetorical form of the dialogue of the dead that King uses. Examples of the fantastic in Lucian's work are his *Charon, or The Inspectors* in which the ferryman comes up from the Underworld to find out what it is that men miss so much after they die. *The Dream, or The Cock* is a dialogue between Micythus the cobbler and his cock, who is the reincarnation of Pythagoras. Unfortunately, it is only King's *The Transactioneer* (1700) that is modelled on this genre.

The topicality of the satire discussed in this thesis in its day suggests Bakhtin's fourteenth characteristic. The satirists who attacked the early modern scientists were writing about something that was very contemporary and were in some cases writing about it as it happened. Bakhtin emphasizes that the Menippea is concerned "with current and topical issues" (118). Bakhtin calls this "the 'journalistic' genre of antiquity, acutely echoing the ideological issues of the day" (118). When Samuel Butler attacks the virtuosi in the 1660s, he dismisses them as a fad. His lines on the microscope in *Hudibras* were written when this new scientific instrument was first being demonstrated. When he returns to the subject of natural philosophy the following decade in "An Heroical Epistle of Hudibras to Sidrophel" he practically shrieks at Sidrophel, his representation of the natural philosopher, because he is carrying on with what Butler has already decided is a pointless activity. We sense here the absolute contemporaneity of Butler's writing as he attacks something which is happening in front of him. We have the same sense of the contemporary in the satires of William King. *The Transactioneer* (1700) contains instances of curiosity written about in the *Philosophical Transactions* of 1698 and 1699. King's sources are even more immediate in the first two numbers of the *Useful Transactions* of 1708/09, where he draws on letters from the Dutchman Antoni van Leeuwenhoek which had only recently been published in the *Philosophical Transactions*. Moving to the subject of textual criticism we have what on publication was one of the most immediate long poems in English literature, Pope's *The Dunciad Variorum* (1729). But the immediacy and topicality in Pope's own day would have

been most striking. However, having said all of that, Menippean satire is no different from other satire in targeting what is contemporary, since this is a characteristic of satire in general. Finally, Menippean satire is not concerned with the social behaviour of its subjects, something we have seen taken into account in the works under discussion in this thesis, especially in the cases of Marmion's *The Antiquary* (1641) and Shadwell's *The Virtuoso* (1676).

Bakhtin has in fact been strongly criticized by some critics. For Griffin, Bakhtin misses the role of erudition so clearly presented as a part of this kind of satire in Frye's account in *The Anatomy of Criticism* (1957) (*Satire* 33). And Weinbrot goes further, dismissing Bakhtin's competence in the field completely (Weinbrot 39).<sup>133</sup> It is apparent that Bakhtin's descriptions of Menippean satire are unable to cover the entire range of examples presented in this thesis. Another potential source of elucidation is Howard D. Weinbrot's book *Menippean Satire Reconsidered: From Antiquity to the Eighteenth Century* (2005). His definition includes a satirical target which is a questionable orthodoxy. Weinbrot offers this definition:

Menippean satire, then, is a form that uses at least two other genres, languages, cultures, or changes of voice to oppose a dangerous, false, or specious and threatening orthodoxy. . . . The form also may use or combine any of four cognate devices. Menippean satire by addition enlarges a main text with new generally smaller texts that further characterize a dangerous world. Menippean satire by genre sets a work against its own approximate genre, like an art of poetry, and either comments on it or uses it as a backdrop to suggest its own subject's danger to the world. Menippean satire by annotation uses the sub- or side text further to darken the already dark text. (6-7)

The fourth device is Menippean satire by incursion, which is not relevant here. Weinbrot describes Menippean satire in the three other forms with relevant examples. He chooses *A Tale of a Tub* and *The Battle of the Books* (both 1704) to illustrate Menippean satire by addition; Pope's *An Essay on Criticism* (1711) to illustrate such satire by genre and *The Dunciad in Four Books* (1743) to illustrate this kind of satire by annotation. These are all works mentioned to a lesser or greater extent in this thesis. Yet on closer inspection, Weinbrot's categories seem somewhat ad hoc. For example, where he calls *The Dunciad in Four Books* (1743) an example of Menippean satire by annotation, two points can be raised against this. He does not appear to be aware of the formal origin of the work, namely the

---

<sup>133</sup> "I hope to have shown that much of Bakhtin's theory of the Menippea is alien to actual events in literary history so far as we can reclaim them" (39).

variorum edition. Also, the notes serve on occasion to lighten and inform the experience of reading the poem, which is, as he describes it, both moral and dark in tone. However, it is an interesting notion of his that Menippean satire serves “to resist a dangerously threatening false orthodoxy” (110). All of the satires presented in this thesis target newly emerging orthodoxies. And we must note that the new orthodoxies which become satirical butts so often turn out to be right in the long run. It would be hard to make many of the literary examples of the satirical reception of the New Learning fit Weinbrot’s model. So it is Pardo’s account of satire on learning which better accounts for the evidence presented in this thesis.

It remains to be said that satire on the New Learning is uniformly conservative in character. The Society of Antiquaries of London, founded in 1707, continues to thrive. The Royal Society has become an organization of worldwide importance. Modern editorial practices reflect the work of Lewis Theobald rather than those of Alexander Pope. The satirical opponents of antiquarianism, early modern science and textual criticism are preserved here in a pantheon of satirical reaction which subsequent generations have proved wrong. There is a simple moral to this story, which is that it is unwise to dismiss something new, just in case you subsequently make yourself look foolish, although even today we can still enjoy the best writing of the satirists under consideration here for their felicity of expression.





## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### PRIMARY SOURCES

*An Account of the Occasion and End of the War, with Remarks on the Present Treaty of Peace begun between Britain and France.* London, 1711. Web. 5 January 2019.

*An Account of the Sickness and Death of Dr. W---dw---d; as also upon what appeared upon opening his Body. In a Letter to a Friend in the Country. By Dr. Technicum.* London, 1719. Print.

*A Catalogue of Books, The Library of the Late Rev. Dr. Swift, Dean of St. Patrick's, Dublin. To be Sold by Auction.* Dublin, 1745. Print.

*Annus Mirabilis, or Strange and Wonderful Predictions and Observations Gathered out of Mr J. Partridge's Almanack 1688. With some Remarks also, out of his Almanack 1687.* London, 1689. Print.

Anon. "An Account of Micrographia, or the Physiological Descriptions of Minute Bodies, Made by Magnifying Glasses." *Philosophical Transactions (1665-1678)* 1 (1665-1666): 27-32. Print.

Arbuthnot, John. *Annus Mirabilis: or, The Wonderful Effects of the Approaching Conjunction of the Planets Jupiter, Mars, and Saturn.* By Abraham Gunter, Philomath. London, 1722. Web. 4 March 2014.

Arbuthnot, John. *Annus Mirabilis: or, The Wonderful Effects of the Approaching Conjunction of the Planets Jupiter, Mars, and Saturn.* By Abraham Gunter, Philomath. Dublin: 1722-23. Web. 4 March 2014.

Arbuthnot, John. *Correspondence of Dr. John Arbuthnot.* Ed. Angus Ross. Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 2006. Print.

Arbuthnot, John. *An Examination of Dr. Woodward's Account of the Deluge, &c. With a Comparison between Steno's Philosophy and the Doctor's, in the Case of Marine Bodies dug out of the Earth.* London, 1697. Print.

Arbuthnot, John [attributed].<sup>134</sup> *The Miscellaneous Works of the Late Dr. Arbuthnot.* 2<sup>nd</sup> edn. Glasgow, 1751. Print.

---

<sup>134</sup> I use square brackets for information I adduce and round ones for information widely available.

*Aristophanes with the English Translation of Benjamin Bickley Rogers.* 3 vols. London: Heinemann, 1924. Print.

Aristophanes. *Clouds. Wasps. Peace.* Ed. & trans. Jeffrey Henderson. Loeb Classical Library 488. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1998. Print.

Astell, Mary. *An Essay in Defense of the Female Sex in which are Inserted the Characters of a Pedant, a Squire, a Beau, a Vertuoso, a Poetaster, a City-Critick, &c: in a Letter to a Lady.* London, 1696. Web. 4 January 2019.

Aubrey, John. *Aubrey's Brief Lives.* Ed. Oliver Lawson Dick. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1972. Print.

Bacon, Francis. *The Advancement of Learning.* Ed. Michael Kiernan. The Oxford Francis Bacon, vol. 4. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000. Print.

Bacon, Francis. *The Instauration Magna Part II: Novum Organum and Associated Texts.* Ed. Graham Rees with Maria Wakely. The Oxford Francis Bacon, vol. 9. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2004. Print.

Bacon, Francis. *The Major Works.* Ed. Brian Vickers. The World's Classics. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2008. Print.

Behn, Aphra. *The Rover and Other Plays.* Ed. Jane Spencer. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1995. Print.

Bentley, Richard [attributed]. *Critical Remarks upon Gulliver's Travels; Particularly his Voyage to the Houyhnhms Country. Part 1.* 3<sup>rd</sup> edn. Dublin, 1735. Print.

Bentley, Richard. *A Dissertation upon the Epistles of Phalaris, Themistocles, Socrates, Euripides &c. and Aesop's Fables,* London, 1697. See Wotton, William. *Reflections upon Ancient and Modern Learning,* 2<sup>nd</sup> edn. London, 1697. Print.

Bentley, Richard. *Dr. Bentley's Dedication of Horace, Translated. To Which Is Added, A Poem in Latin and English, Inscribed to the Right Honourable the Lord Halifax, Written by the Reverend Dr. Bentley.* London, n.d. Print.

Bentley, Richard, ed. *Milton's Paradise Lost. A New Edition.* London, 1732. Print.

Bentley, Richard. *Q. Horatius Flaccus, ex Recensione & cum Notis atque Emendationibus Richardi Bentleii.* Cambridge, 1711. [Bentley's Edition of Horace.] Print.

Bond, Donald F., ed. *The Spectator,* 5 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965. Print.

Bond, Donald F., ed. *The Tatler,* 3 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987. Print.

Boyle, Charles. *Dr. Bentley's Dissertations on the Epistles of Phalaris, and the Fables of Aesop, examin'd.* London, 1698. [Boyle against Bentley.] Print.

Boyle, Robert. *Occasional Reflections upon Several Subjects.* London, 1665. Print.

Boyle, Robert. *Some Motives and Incentives to the Love of God. Pathetically discours'd of, in A Letter to a Friend.* London, 1659. Print.

Brown, Thomas. *The Adventures of Lindamira, A Lady of Quality.* Ed. Benjamin Bryce. Minneapolis, MN: U of Minnesota P, 1949.

---

BIBLIOGRAPHY

---

- Brown, Thomas. *The Lover's Secretary: Or, The Adventures of Lindamira, A Lady of Quality. Written to her Friend in the Country. In XXIV Letters.* Revis'd and Corrected by Mr. Tho. Brown. 2<sup>nd</sup> edn. London, 1713. Print.
- Browne, Sir Thomas. *The Miscellaneous Writings of Sir Thomas Browne. Including Miscellany Tracts and Repertorium.* Ed. Geoffrey Keynes. London: Faber and Faber, 1946. Print.
- Browne, Sir Thomas. *Thomas Browne.* Ed. Kevin Killeen. 21<sup>st</sup>-century Oxford Authors. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2014. Print.
- Burton, Robert. *The Anatomy of Melancholy.* Volume 1. Ed. Faulkner, Thomas C., Nicolas K. Kiessling, Rhonda L. Blair. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989. Print.
- Burton, Robert. *The Anatomy of Melancholy.* Volume 2. Ed. Kiessling, Nicolas K., Thomas C. Faulkner, Rhonda L. Blair. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990. Print.
- Butler, Samuel. *Characters.* Ed. Charles W. Daves. Cleveland: P of Case Western Reserve U, 1970. Print.
- Butler, Samuel. *The Genuine Remains in Verse and Prose of Mr. Samuel Butler.* 2 vols. London, 1759. Print.
- Butler, Samuel. *Hudibras.* Ed. Zachary Grey. Dublin, 1744. Print.
- Butler, Samuel. *Hudibras.* Ed. John Wilders. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967. Print.
- Butler, Samuel. *Hudibras Parts 1 & 2 and Other Writings.* Ed. John Wilders & Hugh de Quehen. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1973. Print.
- Butler, Samuel. *Prose Observations.* Ed. Hugh de Quehen. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979. Print.
- Butler, Samuel. *Satires and Miscellaneous Poetry and Prose.* Ed. René Lamar. London: Cambridge UP, 1928. Print.
- Butler, Samuel. *Three Poems.* Ed. Alexander C. Spence. Augustan Reprint Society. Publication No. 88. Los Angeles: U of California at Los Angeles, 1961. Print.
- Cambridge, Richard Owen. *The Scribleriad: An Heroic Poem. In Six Books.* London, 1752. Print.
- Camden, William. *Britain, or a Chorographical Description of the Most Flourishing Kingdoms, England, Scotland, and Ireland, and the Ilands Adioyning, out of the Depths of Antiquitie.* Trans. Philemon Holland. London, 1610. Print.
- Casaubon, Meric. *A Letter of Meric Casaubon D.D: &c. to Peter du Moulin D.D: and Prebendarie of the Same Church: Concerning Natural Experimental Philosophie, and Some Books Lately Set out about It.* Cambridge, 1669. Print.
- The Censor.* 3 vols. London, 1717. Print.
- Centlivre, Susanna. *The Stolen Heiress, or, The Salamanca Doctor Outplotted.* London, 1703. Print.

Cervantes Saavedra, Miguel de. *The History of the Most Ingenious Knight Don Quixote de la Mancha*. 2<sup>nd</sup> edn. 2 vols. Trans. Thomas Shelton; rev. & trans. Captain John Stevens. London, 1706. Print.

Chaloner, Thomas. *The Strange Finding Out of Moses his Tombe*. Introduction C.H. Wilkinson. Luttrell Society reprints 18. Oxford: Blackwell, 1958. Print.

Chesterfield, Philip Dormer Stanhope, 4<sup>th</sup> Earl of. *Letters*. Ed. David Roberts. The World's Classics. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1992. Print.

Cibber, Colley. *A Letter from Mr. Cibber, To Mr. Pope, Inquiring into the Motives that Might Induce Him in His Satyrical Works, to Be so Frequently Fond of Mr. Cibber's Name*. London, 1742. Print.

Cleveland, John. *The Character of a London-Diurnall with Several Select Poems*. London, 1647. Web. 4 January 2019.

Cooke, Thomas. *Tales, Epistles, Odes, Fables*. London, 1729. Print.

Digby, Sir Kenelm. *Two Treatises: in the One of which, the Nature of Bodies; in the Other, the Nature of Mans Soule, Is Looked into: in Way of Discovery of the Immortality of Reasonable Soules*. London, 1658. Print.

Doggrell, Sir Iliad (Burnet, Thomas & George Duckett.) *Homerides: Or, A Letter to Mr. Pope, Occasion'd by his Intended Translation of Homer*. London, 1715. Web. 27 October 2018.

Donne, John. *Essays in Divinity*. Ed. Evelyn Simpson. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1952. Print.

Donne, John. *The Major Works*. Ed. John Carey. Oxford World's Classics. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2000. Print.

Donne, John. *The Satires, Epigrams and Verse Letters*. Ed. W. Milgate. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967. Print.

Dryden, John. *The Works of John Dryden*. Ed. E.N. Hooker, H.T. Swedenberg, V.A. Dearing and A. Roper. 20 vols. Berkeley: U of California P, 1956-2000. Print.

D'Urfey, Thomas. *Madam Fickle: Or The Witty False One*. London, 1677. Web. 16 March 2018.

Earle, John. *Micro-cosmographie. Or, A Peece of the World Discovered; In Essays and Characters*. London, 1628. Web. 7 April 2018.

Elys, Edmund. *Three Letters to the Author of a Book, Entituled The Lord's Day un\*\*\* . . . The Pride and Folly of an Ignorant Scribler Made Manifest*. London, 1694. Web. 5 January 2019.

*Eniaytos terastios Mirabilis Annus, or, The Year of Prodigies and Wonders, Being a Faithful and Impartial Collection of Severall Signs That Have Been Seen in the Heavens, in the Earth, and in the Waters, together with Many Remarkable Accidents, and Judgements Befalling Divers Persons, According as They Have Been Testified by Very Credible Hands, all which Have Happened within the Space of One Year Last Past, and Are now Made Publick for a Seasonable Warning to the People of these Three Kingdoms Speedily to Repent and Turn to the Lord, whose Hand is Lifted up amongst Us*. London, 1661. Print.

- Erasmus, Desiderius. *The Adages of Erasmus*. Selected by William Barker. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 2001. Print.
- Erasmus, Desiderius. *Praise of Folly*. Trans. Betty Radice. London: Penguin, 1993. Print.
- Five Extraordinary Letters Suppos'd to Be Writ to Dr. B----y, upon his Edition of Horace, and some Other Matters of Great Importance*. London, 1712. Print.
- Gadbury, John. *The Scurrilous Scribler Dissected or, A Word in William Lily's Ear*. London, 1693. Web. 5 January 2019.
- Gay, John. *Dramatic Works*. Ed. John Fuller. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983. Print.
- Godwin, Francis. *The Man in the Moone or A Discourse of a Voyage Thither*. London, 1638. Print.
- Guilpin, Everard. *Skialetheia or A Shadowe of Truth, in Certaine Epigrams and Satyres*. Ed. D. Allen Carroll. Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 1974. Print.
- Heath, Robert. *Clarastella; Together with Poems Occasional, Elegies, Epigrams, Satyrs*. Gainesville, Florida: Scholars' Facsimiles & Reprints, 1970. Print.
- Hevelius, Johannes. *Selenographia sive Lunae Descriptio*. Danzig, 1647. Print.
- Hill, Sir John. *The Smartiad, a Satire. Occasioned by an Epic Poem, Intituled The Hilliad*. London, 1753. Web. 31 October 2014.
- The History of the Works of the Learned, or, An Impartial Account of Books Lately Printed in all Parts of Europe (with a Particular Relation of the State of Learning in Each Country)*. London: 1699-1712. Print.
- Hooke, Robert. *Micrographia: or Some Physiological Descriptions of Minute Bodies Made by Magnifying Glasses with Observations and Inquiries Hereupon*. London, 1665. Print.
- Horace. *Odes and Epodes*. Ed. and trans. Niall Rudd. Loeb Classical Library 33. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 2004. Print.
- Horace. *The Odes, Epodes and Carmen Secular of Horace, In Latin and English; With a Translation of Dr. Bentley's Notes. To which Are Added Notes upon Notes. In 24 parts complete*. 2 vols. London, 1713. Print.
- Horace. *Quinti Horatii Flacci Opera Omnia, with a Commentary by Arthur John Maclean*. Bibliotheca Classica. London, 1853. Print.
- Horace. *Satires, Epistles and Ars Poetica*. Trans. H. Rushton Fairclough. Loeb Classical Library 194. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 2005. Print.
- Johnson, Richard. *Aristarchus Anti-Bentleianus Quadraginta Sex Bentleii Errores super Q. Horatii Flacci Odarum Libro Primo Spissos Nonnullos, et Embescendos; Item per Notas Universas in Latinitate Lapsus Foedissimos Nonaginta Ostendens*. [My trans.: *The Anti-Bentleian Aristarchus Demonstrating Forty-Six Conspicuous Mistakes on Bentley's Part in the First Book of Horace's Odes of Which He Should Be Ashamed; As Well As Ninety Disgraceful Mistakes in the Latin of his Notes*.] Nottingham, 1717. Print.

Johnson, Samuel. *The Lives of the Most Eminent English Poets; With Critical Observations on their Works*. 4 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2006. Print.

Jonson, Ben. *Epigrams, The Forest, Underwoods*. The Facsimile Text Society Publication 34. New York: Columbia UP, 1936. Print.

Juvenal & Persius. *D. Junii Juvenalis, et Auli Persii Flacci Satyrae: Accurate Cornelio Schrevelio cum Veteris Scholiastae et Variorum Commentariis*. Leiden, 1648; enl. edn., Amsterdam, 1684. Print.

Juvenal & Persius. *Juvenal and Persius*. Trans. Susanna Morton Braund. Loeb Classical Library 91. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 2014. Print.

Kennett, White. *A Sermon Preach'd before the Arch-bishop, Bishops and Clergy of the Province of Canterbury, in Convocation Assembled, in the Cathedral Church of St. Paul in London*. Translated from the Latin. London, 1711. Web. 25 May 2018.

Kepler, Johannes. *Somnium; The Dream, or Posthumous Work on Lunar Astronomy*. Trans. Edward Rosen. Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 1967. Print.

King, William. *Dialogues of the Dead*. London, 1699. Print.

King, William. *The Original Works of William King, LL.D. Advocate of Doctors Commons; Judge of the High Court of Admiralty and Keeper of the Records in Ireland, and Vicar General to the Lord Primate. Now First Collected into Three Volumes: with Historical Notes, and Memoirs of the Author*. Ed. John Nichols. London, 1776. Print.

(King, William.) *The Transactioneer*. 1700. Augustan Reprint Society. Publication Nos. 251-2. Los Angeles: U of California at Los Angeles, 1988. Print.

Lister, Martin. *A Journey to Paris in the Year 1698*. Ed. Raymond P. Stearns. Facsimile Reprints in the History of Science, 4. Urbana: U of Illinois P, 1967. Print.

Lodge, Thomas. *The Complete Works of Thomas Lodge*. New York: Russell & Russell, 1963. Print.

Lucian. *Chattering Courtesans and Other Sardonic Sketches*. Trans. Keith Sidwell. London: Penguin, 2004. Print.

Lucian. *Works*. Vol. 2. Trans. A.M. Harmon. Loeb Classical Library 54. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1968. [Contains the *Icaromenippus*.]

Lucian. *Works*. Vol. 7. Trans. A.M. Harmon, K. Kilburn, and M.D. Macleod. Loeb Classical Library 431. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 2014. [Contains the *Dialogues of the Dead*.]

Malalas, John. *Historia Chronica*. Oxford: Sheldonian Theatre, 1691. Web. 13 January 2011.

Mallet, David. *Of Verbal Criticism: An Epistle to Mr. Pope. Occasioned by Theobald's Shakespear and Bentley's Milton*. London, 1733. Print.

Marmion, Shackerley. *The Antiquary*. London, 1641. Print.

Martial. *Epigrams*. Ed. & trans. D.R. Shackleton Bailey. The Loeb Classical Library 95. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1993. Print.

*Memoirs of the Extraordinary Life, Works, and Discoveries of Martinus Scriblerus*. Ed. Charles Kerby-Miller. New York: Oxford UP, 1988. Print.

Meursius, Johannes. *Orchestra. Sive, De Saltationibus Veterum*. Leiden, 1618. Print.

Midnight, Mary. *The so Much Talk'd of and Expected Old Woman's Dunciad. Or, Midwife's Master-piece. Containing the Most Choice Collection of Humdrums and Drivellers, that Was ever Expos'd to Public View. With Historical, Critical, and Explanatory Notes, by Margelina Scribelinda Macularia*. London, 1751. Web. 31 October 2014.

*A Miscellany of the Wits: Select Pieces by William King, D.C.L., John Arbuthnot, M.D., and Other Hands*. With an Introduction by K.N. Colville. Scholar's Library 2. London: P. Allen, 1920. Print.

Mondschein, Dee. "Virgilius Restauratus: A Translation." *The Scriblerian and the Kit-Cats* 33 (2001): 182-8. Print.

*Naps upon Parnassus*. London, 1658. Web. 25 May 2018.

Nashe, Thomas. *Have with You to Saffron Walden*. London, 1596. Print.

Nashe, Thomas. *Works*. Eds. Ronald B. McKerrow and F.P. Wilson. 5 vols. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1958. Print.

Newton, Isaac. *The Principia: Mathematical Principles of Natural Philosophy*. Trans. I. Bernard Cohen and Anne Whitman with the assistance of Julia Budenz. Berkeley, CA: U of California P, 1999. Print.

Parnell, Thomas. *Collected Poems*. Ed. Claude Rawson and F. P. Lock. Newark: U of Delaware P, 1989. Print.

Parnell, Thomas. *Homer's Battle of the Frogs and Mice: with the Remarks of Zoilus. To Which Is Prefix'd, the Life of the Said Zoilus*. London, 1717. Print.

Peacham, Henry. *The Compleat Gentleman*. 2<sup>nd</sup> edn. London, 1634. Web. 3 January 2019.

Pepys, Samuel. *The Diary of Samuel Pepys*. Ed. Robert Latham and William Matthews. 11 vols. London: G. Bell and Sons/Bell & Hyman, 1970-83. Print.

*Philosophical Transactions*. 70 vols. (Vol. 1, 1665-1666 - Vol. 70, 1780). Part One. New York: Johnson Reprint Corporation; New York: Kraus Reprint Corporation, 1963-1965. Print.

*Philosophical Transactions Giving some Accompt [later: Account] of the Present Undertakings, Studies and Labours of the Ingenious, in many Considerable Parts of the World*. Vol. 1, No. 1 - Vol. 26, No. 324. 1665/6 - 1708/9. Print.

Pope, Alexander. *The Correspondence of Alexander Pope*. Vol. 2. 1719-1728. Ed. George Sherburn. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1956. Print.

Pope, Alexander. *The Correspondence of Alexander Pope*. Vol. 3. 1729-1735. Ed. George Sherburn. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1956. Print.

Pope, Alexander. *The Correspondence of Alexander Pope*. Vol. 4. 1736-1744. Ed. George Sherburn. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1956. Print.

Pope, Alexander. *The Dunciad, variorum; with the Prolegomena of Scriblerus. Reproduced in Facsimile from the First Issue of the Original Edition in 1729.* With an Introductory Essay by Robert Kilburn Root. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 1929. Print. [Dunciad 1]

Pope, Alexander. *The Dunciad. The Poems of Alexander Pope.* Vol. 5. Ed. James Sutherland. Repr. London: Methuen, 1993. Print. [Dunciad 2]

Pope, Alexander. *The Dunciad (1728) and the Dunciad Variorum (1729). The Poems of Alexander Pope.* Vol. 3. Ed. Valerie Rumbold. Harlow: Pearson Longman, 2007. Print. [Dunciad 3]

Pope, Alexander. *The Dunciad in Four Books.* 2<sup>nd</sup> edn. Ed. Valerie Rumbold. Harlow: Pearson Longman, 2009. Print. [Dunciad 4]

Pope, Alexander. *The Iliad.* Trans. Alexander Pope. London: 1715. Print.

Pope, Alexander. *Pastoral Poetry and An Essay on Criticism. The Poems of Alexander Pope.* Vol. 1. Eds. E. Audra and Aubrey Williams. London: Methuen, 1961. Print. [Essay]

Pope, Alexander. *Selected Prose of Alexander Pope.* Ed. Paul Hammond. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1987. Print. [Prose]

Pope, Alexander. *The Works of Alexander Pope.* Eds. W. Elwin and W.J. Courthope. 10 vols. London, 1871-86. Print.

Ed. Pope, Alexander. *The Works of Shakespear in Six Volumes,* collated and corrected by the former editions of Mr Pope. New York: AMS Press, 1969. Print.

Rabelais, François. *Garganta and Pantagruel.* Trans. and ed. M.A. Screech. London: Penguin, 2006. Print.

Rabelais, François. *Oeuvres Completes.* Ed. Mireille Huchon. Paris: Gallimard, 1994. Print.

Ravenscroft, Edward. *The Anatomist, or The Sham Doctor.* London, 1697. Web. 10 July 2018.

Scriblerus Secundus [Fielding, Henry]. *Tom Thumb. A Tragedy.* London, 1730. Print.

Scriblerus Secundus [Fielding, Henry]. *The Tragedy of Tragedies, or, The Life and Death of Tom Thumb the Great.* London, 1731. Print.

Selden, John. *Marmora Arundelliana.* London, 1628. Print.

Shadwell, Thomas. *The Virtuoso.* Ed. Marjorie H. Nicolson and David S. Rodes. Regents Restoration Drama Series. Lincoln, Nebraska: U of Nebraska P, 1966. Print.

Shadwell, Thomas. *The Virtuoso.* Ed. Juan A. Prieto-Pablos, Maria José Mora, Manuel J. Gómez-Lara and Rafael Portillo. Seville: Secretariado de Publicaciones de la Universidad de Sevilla, 1997. Print.

Shaftesbury, The Third Earl of (Cooper, Anthony Ashley). *Characteristicks of Men, Manners, Opinions, Times.* 3<sup>rd</sup> edn. 3 vols. London, 1723. Web. 23 October 2018.

Sham-Scribler (Hickes, George). *Postscript for Postscript, By Way of Answer to Dr. Kennet's Gentleman-like Treatment of the Person that Translated and Explain'd his Sermon for Him.* London, 1711. Web. 19 January 2018.



Smart, Christopher. *The Hilliad: An Epic Poem. To Which Are Prefixed, Copious Prolegomena and Notes Variorum. Particularly, Those of Quinbus Flestrin Esq; and Martinus Macularis, M.D. Acad. Reg. Scient. Burdig. &c. Soc.* Dublin, 1753. Print.

Ed. Stephens, John Calhoun. *The Guardian*. Lexington, KY: UP of Kentucky, 1982. Print.

Stubbe, Henry. *The Plus Ultra Reduced to a Non Plus: Or, A Specimen of Some Animadversions upon the Plus Ultra of Mr. Glanvill, wherein Sundry Errors of some Virtuosi Are Discovered, the Credit of the Aristotelians in Part Re-advanced; and Enquiries Made about . . . The Deceitfulness of Telescopes. The World in the Moon, and a Voyage Thither . . .* London, 1670. Web. 13 January 2011.

Swift, Jonathan. *The Correspondence of Jonathan Swift*. Ed. Harold Williams. 5 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963-5. Print.

Swift, Jonathan. *The Drapier's Letters to the People of Ireland against receiving Wood's Halfpence*. Ed. Herbert Smith. Repr. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1965. Print.

Swift, Jonathan. *Gulliver's Travels*. Ed. Claude Rawson. Oxford World's Classics. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2008. Print.

Swift, Jonathan. *Gulliver's Travels*. Ed. David Womersley. The Cambridge Edition of the Works of Jonathan Swift. Vol. 16. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2012. Print.

Swift, Jonathan. *Parodies, Hoaxes, Mock Treatises: Polite Conversation, Directions to Servants and Other Works*. Ed. Valerie Rumbold. The Cambridge Edition of the Works of Jonathan Swift. Vol. 2. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2013. Print.

Swift, Jonathan. *The Poems of Jonathan Swift*. 2<sup>nd</sup> edn. 3 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1966. Print.

Swift, Jonathan. *The Prose Writings of Jonathan Swift*. Ed. Herbert Davis. 14 vols. Oxford: 1939-1968. Print.

Swift, Jonathan. *A Tale of a Tub and Other Works*. Ed. Angus Ross and David Woolley. Oxford World's Classics. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2008. Print. [*Tale*]

Swift, Jonathan. *A Tale of a Tub and Other Works*. Ed. Marcus Walsh. The Cambridge Edition of the Works of Jonathan Swift. Vol. 1. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2010. Print. [*Tale II*]

Swift, Jonathan. *The Works of Jonathan Swift: containing additional letters, tracts, and poems not hitherto published; with notes and a life of the author*. Ed. Sir Walter Scott. 19 vols. Edinburgh, 1814. [*Works*]

Swift, Jonathan and Alexander Pope. *Miscellanies in Prose and Verse*. 4 vols. London, 1727-32. Print.

*Tauronomachia: Or A Description of a Bloody and Terrible Fight between Two Champions, Taurus and Onos, at Gresham College*. London, 1719. Print.

Temple, Sir William. *Five Miscellaneous Essays*. Ed. Samuel Holt Monk. Ann Arbor: The U of Michigan P, 1963. Print.

Theobald, Lewis. *Shakespeare Restored: Or, A Specimen of the Many Errors, As well Committed, as Unamended, by Mr. Pope in his Late Edition of this Poet*. Eighteenth Century Shakespeare 5. London: Frank Cass, 1971. Print.

Theophrastus. *The Characters of Theophrastus*. Ed. R.G. Ussher. Rev. edn. London: Bristol Classical Press, 1993. Print.

Torkos, J.J. and William Burnet. "Observationes Anatomico-Medicae, de Monstro Bicorniporeo Virineo A. 1701. Die 26 Oct. in Pannonia, Infra Comaromium, in Possessione Szony, Quondam Quiritum Bregetione, in Lucem Edito. Atque A. 1723. Die 23 Febr. Pisonii in Caenobio Monialium S. Ursulae Morte Functo Ibidemque Sepulto." *Philosophical Transactions (1683-1775)* 50 (1757-8): 311-22. Print.

Varro. *M. Terentii Varronis Saturarum Menippearum Fragmenta*. Leipzig: BSB B.G. Teubner Verlagsgesellschaft, 1985. Print.

Villars, Abbé de (Nicolas-Pierre-Henri). *The Count of Gabalis: or, The Extravagant Mysteries of the Cabalists: Exposed in Five Pleasant Discourses on the Secret Sciences*. Trans. Philip Ayres. London, 1680. Print.

Virgil. *Eclogues; Georgics; Aeneid I-VI*. Ed. and trans. H.R. Fairclough. New edn. rev. G.P. Goold. Loeb Classical Library 63. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1999. Print.

Whiston, William and Humphry Ditton. *A New Method for Discovering the Longitude both at Sea and Land, Humbly Proposed to the Consideration of the Publick*. London, 1714. Print.

Wilkins, John. *The Discovery of a World in the Moone. Or, A Discourse tending to Prove, That 'tis Probable There May Be Another Habitable World in that Planet*. London, 1638. Web. 18 April 2011.

Wilkins, John. *A Discourse Concerning a New World and Another Planet in Two Books. The Discovery of a New World or, A Discourse Tending to Prove, That 'tis Probable There May Be Another Habitable World in the Moone. With a Discourse Concerning the Possibility of a Passage Thither*. 3<sup>rd</sup> rev. and enl. edn. with *A Discourse Concerning A New Planet Tending to Prove, That 'tis probable our Earth is One of the Planets. The Second Booke, now First Published*. London, 1640. Web. 18 April 2011.

Wilkins, John. *Mathematical Magick*. London, 1648. Print.

Woodward, John. *An Account of Some Roman Urns, and other Antiquities: Lately Digg'd Up Near Bishops-Gate. With Brief Reflections upon the Antient and Present State of London*. London, 1713. Web. 10 July 2018.

Woodward, John. *An Essay Toward A Natural History of the Earth*. London, 1695. Print.

Woodward, John. *The State of Physick: and of Diseases; with an Inquiry into the Causes of the Late Increase of Them: but More Particularly of the Small-pox. With some Considerations upon the New Practice of Purgeing in that Disease*. London, 1718. Print.

Wotton, William. *Reflections upon Ancient and Modern Learning*. London, 1694. Print.

Wotton, William. *Reflections upon Ancient and Modern Learning; with a Dissertation upon the Epistles of Phalaris, Themistocles, Socrates, Euripides &c. and Aesop's Fables by Dr. Bentley*. London, 1697. Print.

## SECONDARY SOURCES

- Aitken, G.A. *The Life and Works of John Arbuthnot*. Oxford, 1892. Print.
- Allen, Robert J. *The Clubs of Augustan London*. Harvard Studies in English 7. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1933. Print.
- Andrade, E.N. da C. "The Birth and Early Days of the Philosophical Transactions." *Notes and Records of the Royal Society of London* 20 (1965): 9-27. Print.
- Applebaum, Wilbur. Review of Lawrence M. Principe's *The Aspiring Adept. Robert Boyle and his Alchemical Quest*. *Albion: A Quarterly Journal Concerned with British Studies* 31.3 (1999): 472-3. Print.
- Bailey, Nathan. *An Universal Etymological English Dictionary*. London, 1721. Web. 13 January 2011.
- Baldick, Chris. *The Oxford Dictionary of Literary Terms*. 3<sup>rd</sup> edn. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2008. Print.
- Baldwin, Edward Chauncey. "A Suggestion for a New Edition of Butler's *Hudibras*." *PMLA* 26 (1911): 528-48. Web. 16 June 2018.
- Bartholomew, A.T. *Richard Bentley, DD: A Bibliography of his Works and of All the Literature Called Forth by his Arts or his Writings*. Cambridge: Bowes and Bowes, 1908. Print.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail. *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*. Ed. and trans. Caryl Emerson. Minneapolis, U of Minnesota P, 1984. Web. 27 May 2017.
- Beattie, Lester M. *John Arbuthnot. Mathematician and Satirist*. Harvard Studies in English 16. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1935. Print.
- Bell, Ilona. "Gender Matters: The Women in Donne's Poems." *The Cambridge Companion to John Donne*. Ed. Achsah Guibbory. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2006. 117-32. Print.
- Bennett, Kate. "Thomas Shadwell (c.1640-1692), playwright and poet". *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. General Editor, David Cannadine. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2004. Web. 6 May 2018.
- Blake, John Ballard. *A Short Title Catalogue of Eighteenth Century (sic) Printed Books in the National Library of Medicine*. Bethesda: National Institutes for Health [for the] National Library of Medicine, 1979. Print.
- Bond, Richmond P. *English Burlesque Poetry 1700-50*. Harvard Studies in English 6. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP: 1932. Print.
- Borgman, Albert S. *Thomas Shadwell: His Life and Comedies*. New York: B. Blom, 1969. Print.

Bragg, Melvyn. "Interrogating Nature – to Reveal God's Way?" *Oxford Today* 22.3 (2010): 16-18. Print.

Brown, Huntingdon. *Rabelais in English Literature*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1933. Print.

Brückmann, Patricia Carr. *A Manner of Correspondence: A Study of the Scriblerus Club*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's UP, 1997. Print.

Bruun, S. "Who is Who in Samuel Butler's *The Elephant in the Moon*." *English Studies: A Journal of English Language and Literature* 50 (1969): 381-9. Print.

Bruun, S. "The Date of Samuel Butler's *The Elephant in the Moon*." *English Studies: A Journal of English Language and Literature* 55 (1974): 133-9. Print.

Burke, Ulick Ralph. *Sancho Panza's Proverbs, and Others which Occur in Don Quixote*. With a literal English translation, notes, and an Introduction by Ulick Ralph Burke. 3<sup>rd</sup> edn. London: Pickering & Chatto, 1892. Print.

Bush, Douglas. *English Literature in the Earlier Seventeenth Century 1600-1660*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1952. Print.

Burrow, Colin. "Roman Satire in the Sixteenth Century." *The Cambridge Companion to Roman Satire*. Ed. Kirk Freudenburg. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2005. 243-260. Print.

Bush, Douglas. *English Literature in the Earlier Seventeenth Century 1600-1660*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1945. Print.

Carley, James P. "Leland, John (c. 1503-1552), poet and antiquary." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. General Editor, David Cannadine. Oxford: Oxford UP: 2004. Web. 16 January 2019.

Carruthers, Mary. *The Book of Memory. A Study of Memory in Medieval Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2008. Print.

Case, Arthur E. *Four Essays on Gulliver's Travels*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 1945. Print.

Chambers, Douglas D. C. "Evelyn, John (1620-1706)." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. General Editor, David Cannadine. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2004. Web. 1 May 2018.

*Characters from the Histories and Memoirs of the Seventeenth Century with an Essay on the Character and Historical Notes* by David Nichol Smith. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1918. Print. [Seventeenth-Century Characters.]

Chartres, Richard and David Vermont. *A Brief History of Gresham College, 1597-1997*. London: Gresham College, 1998. Print.

Chico, Tita. "Gimcrack's Legacy: Sex, Wealth, and the Theater of Experimental Philosophy." *Comparative Drama* 42 (2008): 29-49. Print.

Condren, Conal. *Hobbes, the Scriblerians and the History of Philosophy*. London: Routledge, 2015. Print.

- Cook, Harold J. "Sydenham, Thomas (1624-1689), physician." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. General Editor, David Cannadine. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2004. Web. 17 January 2019.
- Coppola, Al. "Retraining the Virtuoso's Gaze: Behn's *Emperor of the Moon*, The Royal Society, and the Spectacles of Science and Politics." *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 41 (2008): 481-506. Print.
- Courtney, William Prideaux. "William Oldisworth." *Dictionary of National Biography from the Earliest Times to 1900*, 14: 1008-9. Print.
- Cummins, Juliet & and David Burchell, eds. *Science, Literature and Rhetoric in Early Modern England*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007. Print.
- Curtiss, Joseph Toy. "Butler's Sidrophel." *PMLA* 44 (1929): 1066-78. Print.
- De Quehen, Hugh. "Butler, Samuel (bap. 1613, d. 1680)." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. General Editor, David Cannadine. Oxford UP, 2004. Web. 6 May 2018.
- The Dictionary of National Biography. From the Earliest Times to 1900*. 1885-1901. Ed. Sir Leslie Stephen and Sir Sidney Lee. 22 vols. Repr. London: Oxford UP, H. Milford, 1937-8. Print. [DNB]
- Dictionary of Scientific Biography*. Editor-in-chief, Charles Coulston Gillespie. 16 vols. New York: Charles Scribner, 1970-1980.
- Disraeli, Isaac. *Calamities and Quarrels of Authors*. London: Frederick Warne, n.d. Print.
- Dobson, Michael and Stanley Wells, eds. *The Oxford Companion to Shakespeare*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2001. Print.
- Drabble, Margaret, ed. *The Oxford Companion to English Literature*. 6<sup>th</sup> edn. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2000. Print.
- Drakakis, John. "Marmion, Shackerley (1603-1639)." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. General Editor, David Cannadine. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2004. Web. 20 March 2018.
- Eddy, William A. "Rabelais, – A Source for *Gulliver's Travels*." *Modern Language Notes* 37 (1922): 416-8. Print.
- Ehrenpreis, Irvin. *Swift: The Man, His Works, and the Age*. 3 vols. London: Methuen, 1962-83. Print.
- Empson, William. "Milton and Bentley: The Pastoral of the Innocence of Man and Nature." *Some Versions of Pastoral*. London: The Hogarth Press, 1986. 149-91. Print.
- Erskine-Hill, Howard. *Gulliver's Travels*. Landmarks of World Literature. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1993. Print.
- Ferber, Michael. *A Dictionary of Literary Symbols*. 2<sup>nd</sup> edn. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2007. Print.
- Finch, Jeremiah. "Musaeum Clausum." *Times Literary Supplement* 13 November 1937: 871. Print.

- Fontes da Costa, Palmira. *The Singular and The Making of Knowledge at the Royal Society of London in the Eighteenth Century*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2009. Print.
- Fowler, Alastair. *Kinds of Literature. An Introduction to the Theory of Genres and Modes*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982. Print.
- Fox, Adam. "Aubrey, John (1626-1697)." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. General Editor, David Cannadine. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2004. Web. 20 March 2018.
- Foxon, D.F., ed. *English Verse, 1701-1750: A Catalogue of Separately Printed Poems with Notes on Contemporary Collected Editions*. 2 vols. London: Cambridge UP, 1975. Print.
- Fraenkel, Eduard. *Horace*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997. Print.
- Frye, Northrop. *The Anatomy of Criticism: Four Essays*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 1957.
- Frye, Northrop. *The Secular Scripture: A Study of the Structure of Romance*. The Charles Eliot Norton Lectures, 1974-1975. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1976. Print.
- Genette, Gérard. *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation*. Trans. Jane E. Lewin. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1997. Print.
- Gilde, Joseph M. "Shadwell and the Royal Society: Satire in *The Virtuoso*." *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 10 (1970): 469-90. Print.
- Gingerich, Owen. *The Eye of Heaven. Ptolemy, Copernicus, Kepler*. New York: American Institute of Physics, 1993. Print.
- Gottesman, Ronald and Scott Bennett, eds. *Art and Error: Modern Textual Editing*. London: Methuen, 1970. Print.
- Grafton, Anthony. *Joseph Scaliger: A Study in the History of Classical Scholarship*. 2 vols. Oxford-Warburg Studies. Oxford: Clarendon, 1983-93. Print.
- Grafton, Anthony. *The Footnote: A Curious History*. London: Faber and Faber, 1997. Print.
- Griffin, Dustin. *Authorship in the Long Eighteenth Century*. Newark: U of Delaware P, 2014. Print.
- Griffin, Dustin. *Satire: A Critical Introduction*. Lexington, KY: UP of Kentucky, 1994. Print.
- Griffith, R.H. *Alexander Pope. A Bibliography*. 2 vols. Austin, TX: U of Texas P, 1922 & 1927. Print.
- Guerinot, J.V. *Pamphlet Attacks on Alexander Pope, 1711-1744: A Descriptive Bibliography*. London: Methuen, 1969. Print.
- Hall, A. Rupert & Marie Boas Hall. "The Intellectual Origins of the Royal Society. London and Oxford." *Notes and Records of the Royal Society of London* 23 (1968): 157-68. Print.
- Hammond, Brean. "Allegory in Swift's 'Voyage to Laputa'." *KM80: A Birthday Album for Kenneth Muir*. Liverpool: Liverpool UP, 1987. 65-67. Print.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

---

- Handley, Stuart. "Cotton, Sir Robert Bruce, first baronet (1571-1631)." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. General Editor, David Cannadine. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2004. Web. 20 March 2018.
- Hanson, Craig. *The English Virtuoso: Art, Medicine, and Antiquarianism in the Age of Empiricism*. Chicago: Chicago UP, 2009. Print.
- Haugen, Kristine. *Richard Bentley: Poetry and Enlightenment*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 2011. Print.
- Henderson, Steven. "'Deceptio Visus': Aphra Behn's Negotiation with Farce in *The Emperor of the Moon*". *Aphra Behn (1640-1689): Identity, Alterity, Ambiguity*. Ed. Mary Ann O'Donnell, Bernard Dhuicq and Guyonne Leduc. Paris: Harmattan, 2000. Print.
- Horne, William C. "Curiosity and Ridicule in Samuel Butler's Satire on Science." *Restoration: Studies in English Literary Culture, 1660-1700* 7.1 (1983): 8-18. Print.
- Houghton, Walter. "The English Virtuoso in the Seventeenth Century: Part 1." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 3 (1942): 51-73. Web. 16 April 2011.
- Houghton, Walter. "The English Virtuoso in the Seventeenth Century: Part 2." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 3 (1942): 190-219. Web. 16 April 2011.
- Jack, Ian. *Augustan Satire: Intention and Idiom in English Poetry, 1660-1750*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1961. Print.
- Jagger, Nicholas. "Austin, Samuel (fl. 1652-1671)." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. General Editor, David Cannadine. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2004. Web. 20 March 2018.
- Jarvis, Simon. *Scholars and Gentlemen: Shakespearean Textual Criticism and Representations of Scholarly Labour, 1725-1765*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995. Print.
- Jebb, R.C. *Bentley*. London: Macmillan, 1882. Print.
- Jolliffe, Harold Richard. *Critical Methods and Influence of Bentley's Horace*. PhD Thesis. Chicago: U of Chicago, 1939. Print.
- Jones, Richard Foster. "The Background of the Attack on Science in the Age of Pope." *Pope and his Contemporaries: Essays Presented to George Sherburn*. Ed. James L. Clifford and Louis A. Landa. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1949. 96-114. Print.
- Keener, Frederick M. *English Dialogues of the Dead. A Critical History, an Anthology, and a Check List*. New York: Columbia UP, 1973. Print.
- Klima, Gyula. "The Medieval Problem of Universals." *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Ed. E.N. Zalta. Stanford: Stanford University, 2017. Web. 9 Dec. 2018.
- Laprevotte, Guy. "'The Elephant in the Moon' de Samuel Butler. Le context et la satire." *Études Anglaises* 25 (1972): 466-78. Print.
- Lempriere's Classical Dictionary of Proper Names Mentioned in Ancient Authors*. New edn. Rev. with additions by F.A. Wright. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1978. Print.

Levine, J.M. "Woodward, John (1665/1668-1728)." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. General Editor, David Cannadine. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2004. Web. 1 May 2018.

Levine, Joseph M. *Dr. Woodward's Shield. History, Science, and Satire in Augustan England*. 1977. Rev. edn. Ithaca, NY: Cornell UP, 1991. Print.

Lewalski, Barbara K. "On Looking into Pope's Milton." *Milton Studies* 11 (1978): 29-50. Print.

Lewis, Peter. *Fielding's Burlesque Drama: Its Place in the Tradition*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 1987. Print.

Lloyd, Claude. "Shadwell and the Virtuosi." *PMLA* 44 (1929): 472-94. Print.

*London in 1710: From the Travels of Zacharias Conrad von Uffenbach*. Trans. and ed. W.H. Quarrel and Margaret Mare. London: Faber and Faber, 1934. Print.

Loveman, Kate. *Reading Fictions, 1660-1740: Deception in English Literary and Political Culture*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008. Print.

Lund, Roger D. "'More Strange than True': Sir Hans Sloane, King's *Transactioneer*, and the Deformation of English Prose." *Studies in Eighteenth-Century Culture* 14 (1985): 213-30. Print.

Lund, Roger D. "The Eel of Science: Index Learning, Scriblerian Satire, and the Rise of Information Culture." *Eighteenth Century Life* 22 (1998): 18-42. Print.

Lynall, Gregory. *Swift and Science: The Satire, Politics, and Theology of Natural Knowledge, 1690-1730*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillian, 2012. Print.

MacGregor, Arthur. *Curiosity and Enlightenment: Collectors and Collections from the Sixteenth to the Nineteenth Century*. New Haven: Yale UP, 2007. Print.

MacGregor, Arthur. "Sloane, Sir Hans, baronet (1660-1753), physician and collector." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. General Editor, David Cannadine. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2004. Web. 19 July 2018.

Mack, Maynard. *Alexander Pope: A Life*. New Haven, CT: Yale UP, 1985. Print.

Marshall, Ashley. "The Myth of Scriblerus." *British Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies* 31 (2008): 77-99. Web. 23 November 2018.

Marshall, Ashley. *The Practice of Satire in England, 1658-1770*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins UP, 2013. Print.

McLaverty, James. *Pope, Print, and Meaning*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2001. Print.

Metzger, Bruce M. *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration*. 3<sup>rd</sup> enl. edn. New York: Oxford UP: 1992. Print.

Miola, Robert S. *Early Modern Catholicism: An Anthology of Primary Sources*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2007. [See pages 422-9 for extracts from Richard Verstegan's *A Restitution of Decayed Intelligence in Antiquities*, 1605.] Print.

Momigliano, Arnaldo. *Essays in Ancient and Modern Historiography*. Blackwell's Classical Studies. Oxford: Blackwell, 1977. Print.



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

---

- Monk, James Henry. *Life of Richard Bentley, D.D., Master of Trinity College, and Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge*. 2 vols. 2<sup>nd</sup> edn. London, 1833. Print.
- Nicolson, Marjorie Hope. *Pepys' Diary and the New Science*. Charlottesville, VA: UP of Virginia, 1965. Print.
- Nicolson, Marjorie Hope. *Science and Imagination*. Ithaca, NY: Great Seal Books, 1962. Print.
- Nicholson, Marjorie and Nora M. Mohler. "The Scientific Background of Swift's Voyage to Laputa." 1937. *Science and Imagination*. Ithaca, NY: Great Seal Books, 1962. Print.
- Norbrook, David. "May, Thomas (b. in or after 1596, d. 1650)." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. General Editor, David Cannadine. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2004. Web. 24 July 2018.
- [On Oldisworth's Horace Translations], *Notes and Queries*, Vol. 8, 3<sup>d</sup> Series, Number 194, 16 September 1865: 229. Print.
- The Oxford Classical Dictionary*. Ed. Simon Hornblower and Antony Spawforth. 3<sup>d</sup> edn. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1996. Print.
- The Oxford Companion to the History of Modern Science*. Ed. J.L. Heilbron. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2003. Print.
- The Oxford Companion to Music*. Ed. Alison Latham. Rev. edn. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2002. Print.
- Oxford Dictionary of National Biography: From the Earliest Times to the Year 2000*. Ed. H.C.G. Matthew and Brian Harrison. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2004. Print. (ODNB)
- Pardo Garcia, P.J. "Reino Unido. *Don Quijote*". *Gran Enciclopedia Cervantina*. Ed. Carlos Alvar. Madrid: Castalia, forthcoming. Web. <http://hdl.handle.net/10366/118562/>. 5 January 2019.
- Pardo García, Pedro Javier. "Satire on Learning and the Type of the Pedant in Eighteenth-Century Literature." *BELLS. Barcelona English Language and Literature Studies* 13 (2004): 1-11. Web. [www.publicacions.ub.edu/revistes/bells13/PDF/articles\\_10.pdf/](http://www.publicacions.ub.edu/revistes/bells13/PDF/articles_10.pdf/). 9 Dec. 2018.
- Parry, Graham. *The Seventeenth Century. The Intellectual and Cultural Context of English Literature, 1603-1700*. London: Longman, 1989. Print.
- Parry, Graham. *The Trophies of Time: English Antiquaries of the Seventeenth Century*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2000. Print.
- Patterson, Annabel. "Satirical Writing: Donne in Shadows." *The Cambridge Companion to John Donne*. Ed. Achsah Guibbory. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2006. 201-216. Print.
- Phiddian, Robert. *Swift's Parody*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1995. Print.
- Preston, Claire. *Thomas Browne and the Writing of Early Modern Science*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2005. Print.
- Principe, Lawrence M. *The Scientific Revolution: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2011. Print.
- Pritchard, Jonathan. "Dennis, John (1658-1734), literary critic." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. General Editor, David Cannadine. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2004. Web. 8 Aug 2014.

- Pritchard, Jonathan. "D'Urfey, Thomas (1653?-1723)." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. General Editor, David Cannadine. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2004. Web. 20 March 2018.
- Pumfrey, Stephen. "The *Selenographia* of William Gilbert: His Pre-Telescopic Map of the Moon and his Discovery of Lunar Libration." *Journal for the History of Astronomy* 42 (2011): 195-203. Print.
- Quintana, Ricardo. "Samuel Butler: A Restoration Figure in a Modern Light." *English Literary History* 18 (1951): 7-31. Print.
- Reed, Edward Bliss. "Herrick and *Naps upon Parnassus*." *Modern Language Notes* 31 (1916): 111-4. Print.
- Ricks, Christopher. *Milton's Grand Style*. Oxford: Oxford UP: 2001. Print.
- Robinson, Christopher. *Lucian and his Influence in Europe*. London: Duckworth, 1979. Print.
- Robinson, Ken. "The Skepticism of Butler's Satire on Science: Optimistic or Pessimistic?" *Restoration: Studies in English Literary Culture, 1660-1700* 7.1 (1983): 1-7. Print.
- Rogers, Pat. *The Alexander Pope Encyclopedia*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 2004. Print.
- Rogers, Pat. "Gulliver and the Engineers." *Modern Language Review* 70 (1975): 260-70. Print.
- Ronan, C.A. and Harold Hartley. "Sir Paul Neile F.R.S. (1613-1686)." *Notes and Records of the Royal Society of London* 15 (1960): 159-65. Print.
- Rose, Margaret A. *Parody: Ancient, Modern, and Post-Modern*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1993. Print.
- Rowe, Galen O. "The Adynaton as a Stylistic Device." *The American Journal of Philology* 86 (1965): 387-96. Print.
- Rowlands, M. B. "Wood, William (1671-1730)." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. General Editor, David Cannadine. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004. Web. 7 Dec 2014.
- Schaffer, Simon. *What Are the Novel Ideas in the Principia Mathematica?* Windows on Genius 14. Joint Information Systems Committee. Web. 5 May 2018. <https://youtu.be/RX4cNJyXcTI/>
- Shanahan, John. "Theatrical Space and Scientific Space in Thomas Shadwell's *Virtuoso*." *Studies in English Literature 1500-1900* 49 (2009): 549-71. Web. 18 April 2011.
- Shapin, Steven and Simon Schaffer. *Leviathan and the Air-pump: Hobbes, Boyle and the Experimental Life*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton UP, 1985. Print.
- Shapiro, Barbara J. *John Wilkins 1614-1672. An Intellectual Biography*. Berkeley, CA: U of California P, 1969. Print.
- Sherburn, George. *The Early Career of Alexander Pope*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1934. Print.
- Sherburn, George. "The Fortunes and Misfortunes of *Three Hours after Marriage*". *Modern Philology* 24 (1926): 91-109. Print.

---

BIBLIOGRAPHY

---

- Slagle, Judith B. "'A Great Rabble of People': The Ribbon-Weavers in Thomas Shadwell's *The Virtuoso*." *Notes and Queries* 36 (1989): 351-4. Web. 16 April 2011.
- Smith, Frederick N. "Scientific Discourse: *Gulliver's Travels* and *The Philosophical Transactions*." *The Genres of Gulliver's Travels*. Ed. F.N. Smith. Newark, DE: U of Delaware P, 1990. 139-62. Print.
- Spence, Joseph. *Observations, Anecdotes, and Characters of Books and Men Collected from Conversation*. 1820. Ed. James M. Osborn. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1966. Print.
- Sprat, Thomas. *The History of the Royal-Society of London, For the Improving of Natural Knowledge*. London, 1667. Print.
- Stephen, Leslie. "Arbutnot, John." *The Dictionary of National Biography*. Eds. Sir Leslie Stephen and Sir Sidney Lee. London: Oxford UP, 1937/8. 1: 534-7.
- Suarez, Michael F. S. J. "Swift's Satire and Parody." *The Cambridge Companion to Jonathan Swift*. Ed. Christopher Fox. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2003. 112-27. Print.
- Sutherland, James. *English Literature of the Late Seventeenth Century*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969. Print.
- Sutherland, James. *English Satire*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1958.
- Swann, Marjorie. *Curiosities and Texts: The Culture of Collecting in Early Modern England*. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 2001. Print.
- Swinford, Dean. *Through the Daemon's Gate. Kepler's Somnium, Medieval Dream Narratives, and the Polysemy of Allegorical Motifs*. New York: Routledge, 2006. Print.
- Syfret, R.H. "Some Early Critics of the Royal Society." *Notes and Records of the Royal Society of London* 8 (1950): 20-64. Print.
- Taylor, Aline Mackenzie. "Sights and Monsters and Gulliver's Voyage to Brobdingnag." *Tulane Studies in English* 7 (1957): 29-82. Print.
- Ward, John. *The Lives of the Professors of Gresham College*. London, 1740. Print.
- Warton, Joseph. *Essay on the Genius and Writings of Pope*. 3rd edn. 2 vols. London, 1772 & 1782. Print.
- Watson, George, ed. *The New Cambridge Bibliography of English Literature*. Vol. 2. 1660-1800. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1971. Print.
- Weinbrot, Howard D. *Menippean Satire Reconsidered: From Antiquity to the Eighteenth Century*. Baltimore, MN: Johns Hopkins UP, 2005. Print.
- Williams, Aubrey L. *Pope's Dunciad. A Study of its Meaning*. London: Methuen, 1955. Print.
- Yeo, Richard. *Encyclopaedic Visions: Scientific Dictionaries and Enlightenment Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2001. Print.



## APPENDIX: SELECTED CHARACTER SKETCHES

### **John Earle's Character Sketch of *An Antiquarie* (1628)<sup>135</sup>**

Hee is a man strangely thriftie of Time past, & an enimie indeed to his Maw, whence hee fetches out many things whe (sic) they are now all rotten and stinking. Hee is one that hath that unnaturall disease to bee enamour'd of old age, and wrinckles, and loves all things (as Dutchmen doe Cheese) the better for being mouldy and worme-eaten. He is of our Religion, because wee say it is most ancient; and yet a broken Statue would almost make him an Idolater. A great admirer he is of the rust of old Monuments, and reads onely those Characters, where time hath eaten out the letters. Hee will goe you forty miles to see a Saints Well, or ruin'd Abbey: and if there be but a Crosse or stone foot stoole in the way, hee'l be considering it so long, till he forget his iourney. His estate consists much in shekels, and Roman Coynes, and hee hath more Pictures of Caesar, then *Iames* or *Elizabeth*. Beggars cozen him with musty things which they have rak't from dunghills, and he preserves their rags for precious Reliques. He loves no Library, but where there are more Spiders volums then Authors, and looks with great admiration on the Antique worke of Cob-webs. Printed books he contemnes, as a novelty of this latter age; but a Manu-script he pores on everlastingly, especially if the cover be all Moth-eaten, and the dust make a Parenthesis betweene every Syllable. He would give all the Bookes in his Study (which are rarities all) for one of the old Romane binding, or sixe lines of *Tully* in his owne hand. His chamber is hung commonly with strange Beasts skins, and is a kind of Charnel-house of bones extraordinary, and his discourse upon them, if you will heare him shall last longer. His very atyre is that which is the eldest out of fashion, and you may picke a Criticism out of his Breeches. He never looks upon himself till he is gray hair'd, and then he is pleased with his owne

---

<sup>135</sup> John Earle, *Micro-cosmographie*, n. pag.

Antiquitie. His Grave do's not fright him, for he ha's been us'd to Sepulchers, and hee likes Death the better, bee cause it gathers him to his Fathers.

**“Character of a Pedant” (1696), sometimes attributed to Mary Astell<sup>136</sup>**

For Schollars, though by their acquaintance with Books, and conversing much with Old Authors, they may know perfectly the Sense of the Learned Dead, and be perfect Masters of the Wisdom, be thoroughly inform'd of the State, and nicely skill'd in the Policies of Ages long since past, yet by their retir'd and unactive Life, their neglect of Business, and constant Conversation with Antiquity, they are such Strangers to, and so ignorant of the Domestick Affairs and manners of their own Country and Times, that they appear like the Ghosts of Old Romans rais'd by Magick. Talk to them of the *Assyrian*, or *Persian* Monarchies, the *Grecians* or *Roman* Common-wealths. They answer like Oracles, they are such finish'd State-men, that we shou'd scarce take 'em to have been less than Confidants of *Semiramis*, Tutours to Cyrus the great, old cronies of *Solon* and *Lycurgus*, or Privy Councillours at least to the Twelve *Caesars* successively; but engage them in a Discourse that concerns the present Times, and their Native Country, and they hardly speak the Language of it, and know so little of the affairs of it, that as much might reasonably be expected from an animated *Egyptian* Mummy. They are very much disturbed to see a Fold or a Plait amiss in the Picture of an Old *Roman* Gown, yet take no notice that their own are thred-bare out at the Elbows, or Ragged, and suffer more if *Priscian's* Head be broken than if it were their own. They are excellent Guides, and can direct you to every Ally, and turning in old *Rome*; yet lose their way at home in their own Parish. They are mighty admirers of the Wit and Eloquence of the Ancients; yet had they liv'd in the time of *Cicero*, and *Caesar* wou'd have treated them with as much supercilious Pride, and disrespect as they do now with Reverence. They are great hunters of ancient Manuscripts, and have in great Veneration any thing, that has scap'd the Teeth of Time and Rats, and if Age have obliterated the Characters, 'tis the more valuable for not being legible. But if by chance they can pick out one Word, they rate it higher than the whole Author in Print, and wou'd give more for one Proverb of *Solomons* under his own Hand, than for all his Wisdom. These Superstitious, bigotted Idolaters of time past, are Children in their understanding all their lives; for they hang so incessantly upon the leading Strings of Authority, that their Judgments like the Limbs of some *Indian* Penitents, become altogether cramped and motionless for want of use.

---

<sup>136</sup> Mary Astell, *An Essay in Defense of the Female Sex*, 27-29.

**“Character of a Virtuoso” (1696), sometimes attributed to Mary Astell<sup>137</sup>**

There are another sort of Impertinents, who, as they mind not the Business of other Men where it concerns ‘em not, neglect it likewise where it does; and amuse themselves continually with the Contemplation of those things, which the rest of the World slight as useless, and below their regard. Of these the most Egregious is the *Virtuoso*, who is one that has sold an Estate in Land to purchase one in *Scallop, Conch, Muscle, Cockle Shells, Periwinkles, Sea Shrubs, Weeds, Mosses, Sponges, Coralls, Corallines, Sea Fans, Pebbles, Marchasites* and *Flint stones*; and has abandon’d the Acquaintance and Society of Men for that of *Insects, Worms, Grubbs, Maggots, Flies, Moths, Locusts, Beetles, Spiders, Grashoppers, Snails; Lizards* and *Tortoises*. His study is like *Noah’s Ark*, the general Rendezvous of all Creatures in the *Universe*, and the greatest part of his Moveables are the remainders of his Deluge. His Travels are not design’d as Visits to the Inhabitants of any Place, but to the Pits, Shores and Hills; from whence he fetches not the Treasure, but the Trumpery. He is ravish’d at finding an uncommon shell, or an odd shap’d Stone, and is desperately enamour’d at first sight of an unusual markt Butter-flie, which he will hunt a whole day to be Master of. He trafficks to all places, and has his Correspondents in e’ry part of the World; yet his Merchandizes serve not to promote our Luxury, nor increase our Trade, and neither enrich the Nation, nor himself. A Box or two of *Pebbles* or *Shells*, and a dozen of *Wasps, Spiders* and *Caterpillars* are his Cargoe. He values a *Camelion* or *Salamanders Egg*, above all the Sugars and Spices of the *West* and *East-Indies*; and wou’d give more for the Shell of a *Star-fish*, or *Sea Urchin* entire, than for a whole *Dutch Herring Fleet*. He visits Mines, Colepits, and Quarries frequently, but not for that sordid end that other Men usually do *viz.* gain; but for the sake of the fossile Shells and Teeth that are sometimes found there. He is a smatterer at *Botany*, but for fear of being suspected of any useful design by it, he employs his curiosity only about *Mosses, Grasses, Brakes, Thistles, &c.* that are not accus’d of any virtue in Medicine, which he distinguishes and divides very nicely. He preserves carefully those *Creatures*, which other Men industriously destroy, and cultivates sedulously those Plants, which others root up as Weeds. He is the Embalmer of deceas’d Vermin, and dresses

---

<sup>137</sup> Mary Astell, *An Essay in Defense of the Female Sex*, 96-108.

his Mummyes with as much care, as the Ancient *Egyptians* did their Kings. His Cash consists much in old Coins, and he thinks the Face of *Alexander* in one of 'em worth more than all his Conquests. His Inventory is a list of the Insects of all Countries, and the Shells and Pebbles of all Shores, which can no more be compleat without two or three of remarkable *Signatures*, than an *Apothecaries* Shop without a *Tortoise* and a *Crocodile*, or a Country *Barber's* without a batter'd *Cittern*. A piece of Ore with a Shell in it is a greater Present than if it were fine Gold, and a string of *Wampompeag* is receiv'd with more joy, than a *Rope of Orient Pearl*, or *Diamonds* wou'd be. His Collection of *Garden Snails*, *Cockle Shells* and *Vermine* compleated, (as he thinks) he sets up for a *Philosopher*, and nothing less than Universal Nature will serve for a Subject, of which he thinks he has an entire History in his *Lumber Office*. Hence forward he *struts* and *swells*, and despises all those little insignificant Fellows, that can make no better use of those noble incontestable Evidences of the Universal Deluge, *Scallop* and *Oyster Shells*, than to stew *Oysters*, or melt *Brimstone* for *Matches*. By this time he thinks it necessary to give the World an *Essay* of his Parts, that it may think as highly of 'em (if possible) as he does himself; and finding *Moses* hard beset of late, he resolves to give him a lift, and defend his Flood, to which he is so much oblig'd for sparing his darling Toys only. But as great Masters use, he corrects him sometimes for not speaking to his Mind, and gives him the lie now and then in order to support his Authority. He shakes the World to Atoms with ease, which melts before him as readily as if it were nothing but a Ball of Salt. He pumps even the Center, and drains it of imaginary stores by imaginary Loopholes, as if punching the Globe full of holes cou'd make his *Hypothesis* hold Water. He is a Man of *Expedition*, and does that in a few days, which cost *Moses* some Months to compleat. He is a Passionate Admirer of his own Works without a Rival, and superciliously contemns all *Answers*, yet the least *Objection* throws him into the Vapours. He sets up for a grand *Philosopher*, and palms *Hypotheses* upon the World, which future Ages may (if they please) expect to hear his Arguments for; at present he is in no humour to give 'em any other satisfaction than his own word, that he is infallible. Yet those that have a Faith complacent enough to take a Gentleman's word for his own great Abilities, may perhaps be admitted to a sight of his grand Demonstration, his *Raree Show*; the particulars of which he repeats to 'em in a whining *Tone*, e'ry whit as formal and merry, though not so Musical, as the Fellows that used formerly to carry *theirs at their Backs*. His ordinary discourse is of his *Travels under Ground*, in which he has gone farther (if he may be believ'd) than a whole Warren of *Conies*. Here he began his Collection of Furniture for his Philosophical *Toy Shop*, which he will conclude with his Fortune, and then like all Flesh revert to the place from whence he came, and be translated only from one Shop to another.



This, *Madam*, is another sort of Impertinence our Sex are not liable to; one wou'd think that none but *Mad Men*, or highly *Hypochondriacal*, cou'd employ themselves at this rate. I appeal to you, or indeed to any Man of Sense, whether acts like the wiser Animal; the man that with great care, and pains distinguishes and divides the many varieties of Grass, and finds no other Fruit of his labour, than the charging of his Memory with abundance of superfluous Names; or the Ass that eats all promiscuously, and without distinction, to satisfy his *Appetite* and support *Nature*. To what purpose is it, that these Gentlemen ransack all Parts both of *Earth* and *Sea* to procure these *Triffles*? It is only that they may give their Names to some yet unchristen'd Shell or Insect. I know that the desire of knowledge, and the discovery of things yet unknown is the Pretence; But what Knowledge is it? What Discoveries do we owe to their Labours? It is only the Discovery of some few unheeded Varieties of Plants, Shells, or Insects, unheeded only because useless; and the Knowledge, they boast so much of, is no more than a Register of their Names, and Marks of Distinction only. It is enough for them to know that a *Silk Worm* is a sort of *Caterpillar*, that when it is come to maturity Weaves a *Web*, is metamorphos'd to a *Moth-Flye*, lays Eggs, and so Dies. They leave all further enquiry to the Unlearned and Mechanicks, whose business only they think it to prosecute matters of Gain and Profit. Let him contrive, if he can, to make this *Silk* serviceable to *Mankind*; their *Speculations* have another *Scope*, which is the sounding some wild, uncertain, conjectural *Hypothesis*, which may be true or false; yet Mankind neither Gainers nor Losers either way a little in poin of *Wisdom* or Convenience. These men are just the reverse of a *Rattle Snake*, and carry in their *Heads*, what he does in his *Tail*, and move Laughter rather than Regard. What improvements of *Physick*, or any useful Arts, what noble Remedies, what serviceable Instruments have these *Mushrome*, and *Cockle shell* Hunters oblig'd the World with? For I am ready to recant if they can shew so good a Med'cine as Stew'd *Prunes*, or so necessary an Instrument as a *Flye Flap* of their own Invention and Discovery. Yet these are the Men of exalted Understandings, the Men of elevated Capacities, and sublime Speculations, that Dignifie and Distinguish themselves from the rest of the World by Specious Names, and Pompous Titles, and continue notwithstanding as very *Reptiles* in Sense, as those they converse so much with.

I wou'd not have any Body mistake me so far, as to think I wou'd in the least reflect upon any sincere, and intelligent Enquirer into Nature, of which I as heartily wish a better knowledge, as any *Vertuoso* of 'em all. You can be my Witness, *Madam*, that I us'd to say, I thought Mr. *Boyle* more honourable for his learned Labours, than for his Noble Birth; and that the *Royal Society*, by their great and celebrated Performances, were an Illustrious

Argument of the Wisdom of the *August Prince*, their Founder of happy *Memory*; and that they highly merited the *Esteem, Respect* and *Honour* paid 'em by the Lovers of Learning all *Europe* over. But tho' I have a very great Veneration for the *Society* in general, I can't but put a vast difference between the particular Members that compose it. Were *Supererogation* a Doctrine in Fashion, 'tis probable some of 'em might borrow of their Fellows merit enough to justify their Arrogance, but alas they are come an Age too late for that trick; They are fallen into a Faithless, Incredulous Generation of Men that will give credit no farther than the visible Stock will extend: And tho' a Vertuoso should swell a Title-Page even till it burst with large Promises, and sonorous Titles, the World is so ill natur'd as not to think a whit the better of a Book for it. 'Tis an ill time to trade with implicate Faith, when so many have so lately been broken by an overstock of that *Commodity*; no sooner now a days can a Man write, or steal an Hypothesis, and promise Demonstration for it hereafter in this or the next World; but out comes some malicious Answer or other, with Reasons in hand against it, overthrows the credit of it, and puts the poor Author into Fits. For though a great Philosopher that has written a Book of three Shillings may reasonably insult, and despite a six penny Answer, yet the Indignity of so low pric'd a Refutation wou'd make a *Stoick* fret, and *Frisk* like a Cow with a Breeze in her Tail, or a Man bitten by a *Tarantula*. Men measure themselves by their *Vanity*, and are greater or less in their own Opinions, according to the proportion they have of it; if they be well stock'd with it, it may be easie to confute, but impossible to convince 'em. He therefore that wou'd set up for a great Man, ought first to be plentifully provided of it, a then a Score of *Cockle Shells*, a dozen of *Hodmandods*, or any Trifle else is a sufficient Foundation to build a Reputation upon. But if a Man shall abdicate his lawful Calling in pure affection to these things, and has for some years spent all the Time and Money he was Master of in prosecution of this Passion, and shall after all hear his *Caterpillars* affronted, and his *Butter-flies* irreverently spoken of, it must be more provoking to him, than 'tis to a *Lion* to be pull'd by the *Beard*. And if, when to crown all his Labours, he has discover'd a Water so near a kin to the famous one, that cou'd be kept in nothing but the hoof of an Ass, that it was never found but in the *Scull* of the same *Animal*; a Water that makes no more of melting a *World*, than a *Dutchman* does of a *Ferkin* of *Butter*; and when he has written a Book of Discoveries, and Wonders thereupon, if (I say) the Impertinent Scriblers of the Age, will still be demanding *Proofs* and writing *Answers*, he has reason to thrown down his *Pen* in a rage, and pronounce the world, that cou'd give him such an interruption, unworthy to be blest with his future labours, and breath eternal Defiance to it, as

irreconcilable, as the quarrel of the Sons of *Oedipus*. To which prudent Resolution, let us leave him till he can recover his Temper.

**Samuel Butler's Character Sketch of "A Virtuoso" (first published 1759)<sup>138</sup>**

Is a Well-willer to the Mathematics—He persues Knowledge rather out of Humour than Ingenuity, and endeavours rather to seem, than to be. He has nothing of Nature but an Inclination, which he strives to improve with Industry; but as no Art can make a Fountain run higher than its own Head; so nothing can raise him above the Elevation of his own Pole. He seldom converses but with Men of his own Tendency, and wheresoever he comes treats with all Men as such, for as Country-Gentlemen use to talk of their Dogs to those that hate Hunting, because they love it themselves; so will he of his Arts and Sciences to those that neither know, nor care to know any Thing of them. His Industry were admirable, if it did not attempt the greatest Difficulties with the feeblest Means: for he commonly slights any Thing that is plain and easy, how useful and ingenious soever, and bends all his Forces against the hardest and most improbable, tho' to no Purpose if attained to; for neither knowing how to measure his own Abilities, nor the Weight of what he attempts, he spends his little Strength in vain, and grows only weaker by it—And as Men use to blind Horses that draw in a Mill, his Ignorance of himself and his Undertakings makes him believe he has advanced, when he is no nearer to his End than when he set out first. The Bravery of Difficulties does so dazzle his eyes, that he prosecutes them with as little Success, as the Taylor did his Amours to *Queen Elizabeth*. He differs from a Pedant, as *Things* do from *Words*; for he uses the same Affectation in his Operations and Experiments, as the other does in Language. He is a Haberdasher of small Arts and Sciences, and deals in as many several Operations as a baby-Artificer does in Engines. He will serve well enough for an Index, to tell what is handled in the World, but no further. He is wonderfully delighted with Rarities, and they continue still so to him, though he has shown them a thousand Times; for every new Admirer, that gapes upon them, sets him a gaping too. Next these he loves strange natural Histories; and as those, that read Romances, though they know them to be Fictions, are as much affected as if they were true, so is he, and will make hard Shift to tempt himself to believe them first to be possible,

---

<sup>138</sup> Samuel Butler, *Genuine Remains* 2: 185-9.

and then he's sure to believe them to be true, forgetting that *Belief upon Belief is false Heraldry*. He keeps a Catalogue of the names of all famous Men in any Profession, whom he often takes Occasion to mention as his very good Friends, and old Acquaintances. Nothing is more pedantic than to seem too much concerned about Wit or Knowledge, to talk much of it, and appear too critical in it. All he can possibly arrive to is but like the Monkeys dancing on the Rope, to make Men wonder, how 'tis possible for *Art* to put *Nature* so much out of her Play.

His Learning is like those Letters on a Coach, where many being writ together no one appears plain. When the King happens to be at the University, and Degrees run like Wine in Conduits at public Triumphs, he is sure to have his Share; and though he be as free to chuse his Learning as his Faculty, yet like St. *Austin's* Soul *creando infunditur, infundendo creatur*. *Nero* was the first Emperor of his Calling, tho' it be not much for his Credit. He is like an Elephant that, though he cannot swim, yet of all Creatures most delights to walk along a River's Side; and as in Law, *Things that appear not, and things that are not, are all one*; so he had rather not be than not appear. The Top of his Ambition is to have his Picture graved in Brass, and published upon Walls, if he has no Work of his own to face with it. His want of Judgment inclines him naturally to the most extravagant Undertakings, like that of *making old Dogs young, telling how many Persons there are in a Room by knocking at a Door, stopping up of Words in Bottles, &c.* He is like his Books, that contain much Knowledge, but know nothing themselves. He is but an Index of Things and Words, that can direct where they are to be spoken with, but no further. He appears a great Man among the ignorant, and like a Figure in Arithmetic, is so much the more, as it stands before Ciphers that are nothing of themselves. He calls himself an *Antisocordist* a Name unknown to former Ages, but spawned by the Pedantry of the present. He delights most in attempting Things beyond his Reach, and the greater Distance he shoots at, the further he is sure to be off his Mark. He shows his Parts, as Drawers do a Room at a Tavern, to entertain them at the Expence of their Time and Patience. He inverts the Moral of that Fable of him, that caressed his Dog for fawning and leaping up upon him, and beat his Ass for doing the same Thing; for it is all one to him, whether he be applauded by an Ass, or a wiser Creature, so he be but applauded.