

April 1981

Pope, Pedagogues, and Politicians

William E. Rivers
Auburn University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ecommons.udayton.edu/udr>

Recommended Citation

Rivers, William E. (1981) "Pope, Pedagogues, and Politicians," *University of Dayton Review*. Vol. 15: No. 1, Article 13.

Available at: <https://ecommons.udayton.edu/udr/vol15/iss1/13>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in University of Dayton Review by an authorized editor of eCommons. For more information, please contact mschlangen1@udayton.edu, ecommons@udayton.edu.

Pope, Pedagogues, and Politicians

William E. Rivers

In March of 1743 while talking with Joseph Spence, Alexander Pope intimated that, had circumstances been different, he might have written a major work on the faults of the English educational system. Pope's comment on that occasion reveals the importance he attached to such an endeavor:

As I had a vast memory and was sickly and so full of application, had I chanced to have been of the religion of the country I was born in, and been bred at the usual places of education, I should probably have written something on that subject, and against the methods now used there. I believe I might have been more useful that way than any other.¹

Pope's statement was not a spur-of-the-moment remark. His deep interest in education and his perception of its vital importance to his society can be seen in the notes he made in 1734 toward the writing of his "opus magnum."² Though he never finished that single, great ethic work, Pope's thoughts on education did eventually find their way into print in the fourth book of the *Duncaid* (1743). Pope thus had the interest and the time to formulate carefully his ideas about education and to consider how best to present those ideas in his poetry. Here, as elsewhere in Pope's poetry, his philosophical position and his poetic technique were his own unique adaptations of what he encountered in his reading. The range of authors Pope may have drawn upon even in his few lines on grammar school education is wide and interesting. The purpose of this article is to present briefly a few of the many works that probably influenced his satire of the grammar schools and to suggest how and why he altered and blended these sources as he did.

Pope's satire of grammar school education in the fourth book of the *Dunciad* very clearly shows his belief that the practices current in the English educational system were a threat to the nation's cultural and social fabric. For Pope, a poet whose art depended heavily on his readers' appreciation of all of England's literary antecedents, the failure of the grammar schools to properly educate young Englishmen was especially deplorable and deserving of satire. However, in Pope's eyes, more dangerous than what students failed to learn in the schools was the one thing they did learn there -- a subservient, noncritical, non-analytical habit of mind that had a degenerating impact on all the cultural, religious, and political institutions in which they later participated.

In his perception of this potentially destructive habit of mind Pope joined almost all the educators and philosophers who had for over two centuries criticized the prevailing methods of teaching classical languages. Specifically, these writers had pointed to two major faults in grammar school education, both of which Pope satirized: (1) the excessive use of corporal punishment and (2) the narrow grammatical approach to teaching language that more often than not encouraged too great an emphasis on memorization.

All those who opposed the excessive use of physical punishment condemned it as cruel; however, the major thrust of the arguments presented by both classical and humanist authors was that the practice generated a relationship between scholar and master that was not conducive to either true intellectual or social development. These writers believed that the use of corporal punishment retarded students' development in both areas because it encouraged them to obey without thinking the demands of an authoritarian master; thus potential for independent thought and action was severely narrowed. Those writers opposed to the excessive use of physical punishment advocated an approach that produced a cheerful, relaxed atmosphere which inspired students to learn out of interest, in an intellectual response, and not out of fear, in a physical or emotional reaction.

Although opposition to excessive physical punishment was most prevalent in England during the late sixteenth, the seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries, many of these writers refer to classical and humanist authors to support their assertions thus indicating the existence of a tradition in criticism that Pope would surely have known. For example, Robert Burton in his *Anatomy of Melancholy* quoted from Fabius's denunciation of whipping schoolmasters;³ later in the seventeenth century Henry Peachum strengthened his anticorporal punishment section in *The Complete Gentleman* by mentioning Seneca, Pliny, Quintilian, Erasmus, and Vives;⁴ and, only a year before Pope's *New Dunciad* appeared, George Turnbull quoted from one of Plato's Socratic dialogues to support his argument against corporal punishment.⁵ These writers were joined by many other influential English educators such as John Brinsley, Obadiah Walker, and John Locke.⁶

The grammatical approach to teaching language brought together an even more diverse and prestigious group of critics⁷ mainly because that method, with its inevitable emphasis on rote memorization, threatened to undermine the very purpose of grammar school education. The generally acknowledged purpose of the grammar schools was to develop students' intellectual capacity and moral sensitivity through the study of Latin and Greek grammar -- a study which was also designed to prepare them for more advanced examinations of the classics in the universities. The statutes of the schools allowed for instruction in rhetoric and logic, but their curricula was in practice usually limited to grammatical studies. Although this practice seems exceedingly narrow to twentieth-century minds, these two classical languages and the literature in them offered ample material for profitable study. "Grammar," we should remember, was originally understood to include the literature in a language as well as the rules that governed that language's use. The great weakness of this curriculum came not so much from the prescribed grammatical studies as from (1) the schoolmasters' narrow conception of grammar as only the rules which governed the use of a language, and (2) the schoolmasters' memory-taxing method of teaching that "grammar." Students were forced to memorize the complex and lengthy set of rules found in a Latin grammar -- usually Lily's -- often before they even knew the meanings of the words they were declining or conjugating. Faced with that formidable and

seemingly nonsensical task, schoolboys had to substitute any rational response and simply memorize. Many became quite adept at the game and could repeat the rules, as Eilhardus Lubinus and John Clarke put it, like “Parats”; but like “Parats” they often knew the verbal patterns without understanding them.⁸ The writers in the tradition criticizing the grammatical method thus had sound reasons for believing that the grammatical method (especially when compounded with the threat of harsh physical punishment) did little to help students really learn the languages they studied and to discourage development of the students’ ability to reason, to assimilate, to question, and to assert.

Ironically, Lily’s Grammar, the standard Latin grammar used in Britain from the mid-sixteenth century through the eighteenth century, was a product of the early English humanists’ (specifically John Colet’s, John Lily’s, and Desiderius Erasmus’s) efforts to simplify the long and complicated medieval grammars of Donatus and Precisian. However, by 1542 when it was authorized by Henry VIII (only a few years after it first appeared), Lily’s grammar had been reprinted, emended, and expanded so often that it had become longer and more complex than the standard grammars it was originally designed to simplify.⁹ Although attacks directed specifically against Lily’s Grammar began before the eighteenth century, criticisms of that text seem to have been especially prevalent in the first half of the eighteenth century when Pope was thinking about his satire.¹⁰

Despite their pointed attacks on the methods employed in the grammar schools, these critics who preceded Pope mainly concerned themselves with brief analyses of why their own alternative approaches -- usually programs based on reading with little memorization and restricted use of corporal punishment -- were effective. Most of these writers, though they repeatedly asserted that the old methods had undesirable consequences, did not comment expansively on the ultimate social and cultural consequences of these methods.¹¹ Pope, however, as a recorder of the ways Dulness permeates a whole society, looked beyond the immediate pedagogical problems to the effects the old methods had on human institutions. He was especially concerned about their impact on one very important institution -- government. Furthermore, Pope’s repeated parallels between grammar schools and political institutions -- especially Parliament -- imply that he saw a clear cause-effect relationship between the docile, noncritical habit of mind stimulated in grammar schools and the non-thinking, almost passive obedience of an authoritarian leader. This latter attitude Pope believed to be a major cause of corruption in government.

The parallels between grammar school and government in this section of the poem are familiar to any student of *The Dunciad*: the reference to the “pale Boy-Senator” (line 147) and Pope’s ironic claim in the note to line 148 that these “youthful Senators” are not “under the undue influence of any *Master*,” the Spectre’s statement of regret that “the charm” of the grammar school has been lost “in yonder House of Hall” on a few men (i.e. Wyndam, Talbot, Murray, and Pult’ney) (lines 165-170); and the Goddess Dulness’s desire to “turn the Council to a Grammar School” (lines 175-182). But Pope uses one other very subtle yet

effective paralleling technique to draw his reader's attention to the relationship between the grammar schools and government -- Parliament in particular. Though Pope does mention both Eton and Winchester ("Winton") in this section, the grammar school he has most in mind is obviously Westminster School. This identification hinges mainly on the reader's recognition that the "Spectre" is Richard Busby, the famous seventeenth-century headmaster of Westminster School. Almost every eighteenth-century reader would have easily moved from the few hints about the "Spectre's" identity to Busby. Once this mental jump was made, the "Spectre's" description of his pedagogical techniques would be seen mainly as a description of what occurred at Westminster School under Busby's rule. This identification works well for Pope because Westminster the town was the location of both the school and the Houses of Parliament and gave its name to both. Therefore, when Pope used the phrase "Westminster's bold race/Shrink, and confess the Genius of the place" the alert reader would think both of the school and the Houses of Parliament -- of students cowed by a stern master and MP's docilely obeying the suggestions of party leaders.

Although Pope draws upon this parallel subtly for his satire, at least two earlier anonymous eighteenth-century writers made more direct use of the common name "Westminster" for the Houses of Parliament and the school to build satirical comparisons. Since Pope was intensely interested in politics and since he was intimate with key Tory politicians, he probably knew both satires; either or both of these short pieces could have suggested the parallel. The earlier of these anonymous pieces, "The Quarrel of the School-Boys at Athens, as lately acted at a school near Westminster," appeared in 1717 and is obviously a political allegory dealing with the chaotic situation during 1714 when Parliament had to choose a successor to Queen Anne. The author of this piece first outlines the characters of three "students" who were leaders in the controversy. He probably had in mind Pope's friend Bolingbroke (a Tory in power in 1714 who supported the Pretender); Marlborough (who, although he was of no party, supported the claim of George I); and Robert Walpole (a powerful Whig even in 1714 and a backer of George's claim). After clarifying the controversy between these "students," the author describes the arrival of a new "Schoolmaster" (George I) who arrived "on shore" "with an awful frown upon his brow, and. . . his rod in his hand," and ended the students' quarrel.¹² Although readers a century later may have had problems recognizing the political nature of this allegory,¹³ contemporary readers would have no trouble seeing the parallel between the school and Parliament and realizing its implications.

A second example of the parallel appeared in *The Craftsman* in 1727. The strong anti-Walpolian sentiment of this piece makes it much closer to Pope's use of the parallel than the 1717 pamphleteer's version. *The Craftsman*, edited by Nicholas Amhurst, was published by Bolingbroke and Pulteney as a vehicle through which Walpole's administration could be attacked. As a friend and political ally of Bolingbroke, Pope participated in founding the periodical and doubtlessly followed its progress with interest.¹⁴ For these reasons, Pope would probably have been familiar with the following satirical "Advertisement" which appeared after the essay in the forty-second installment of the periodical (May 1727).

Rivers: Pope, Pedagogues, and Politicians

This is to give Notice, to all Noblemen with large Families and small Estates, decayed Gentlemen Gamesters, and others, that, in the great *School* in *Westminster*, Boys are thoroughly instructed in all Parts of useful Learning. The said *School* is furnished with a *Master*, and one *Usher* who does all the business himself, and keeps his Scholars in such order, that the *Master* never attends but upon some great Occasion. This *School* is of a more excellent Foundation than any that were ever yet known; for the Scholars, instead of *paying* for their Learning, are *rewarded* for every Lesson the *Usher* gives them; provided they are *perfect in it*, and have it ready at their Fingers Ends.

N. B. This is no *Free School*¹⁵

The aloof “Master” who leaves his “Usher” to “teach” his charges was obviously George I and the “Usher,” Walpole. The “lessons” the “Usher” gave the “Scholars,” or the members of Parliament, dealt with how they should vote. The “rewards” were hopes by the “Scholars” that by pleasing this powerful man they might receive honors or lucrative positions in government. (Walpole’s actual comment that the newly created Order of Bath would be “an artful bank of thirty-six ribbands to supply a fund of favours”¹⁶ is testimony enough to the methods he used to woo his followers.) The play on the word “free” in the last sentence is the key to the major emphasis in the piece. The first possible meaning of “free” in the phrase “free school” would be a “school in which learning is given without pay” (Johnson’s definition of “freeschool” accepted by the OED). However, this meaning would contradict the earlier statement that the scholars “instead of paying for their Learning, are rewarded. . .,” and thus must be rejected. The first meaning of “free” when not associated with school is “not in bondage to another” and the variations on that meaning include the ideas of freedom of action and thought.¹⁷ Thus when the advertisement reads “This is no Free School,” it means that the students do not enjoy the liberty of free action and thought. They are slaves in bondage to the Usher who metes out rewards for “Passive obedience and Non-resistance,” as Bolingbroke put it,¹⁸ and are in fact “paying” a moral price though not a monetary one. The author¹⁹ of this advertisement in *The Craftsman* was therefore using the parallel between a grammar school and Parliament to make the same point about government Pope made a few years later.

The allegory in the 1717 pamphlet and the satire in *The Craftsman* advertisement, though based on the same comparison of schools and government Pope later adopted, differ from his use in an important way. Both earlier authors use the comparison only as a means of describing or satirizing a political situation. In neither instance do grounds exist to justify the conclusion that the author was also seriously criticizing grammar schools in any way. Westminster School was simply a very workable metaphor for these authors because of the corresponding names. By describing the political situations in a grammar school context they easily revealed the childish, trifling, or subservient nature

of the politicians involved. Pope's satire, however, works both ways -- as a satire on both the educational and political situations. Furthermore, they are linked so as to imply that the educational institutions were responsible in large part for the problems in government. Pope's suggestion is that the typical grammar school curriculum and method of instruction, both of which encouraged nonthinking memorization of rules and passive obedience to the demands of a master, created in the student an intellectual and psychological dependence that in later life made him very likely to accept the same relationship with a political leader. Toward the end of Book IV of the *Dunciad* Pope brings in Silenus to review the course of education and at this point explicitly states what was before only strongly implied:

"First slave to Words, then vassal to a Name,
Then dupe to Party; child and man the same;"

(*Duncaid*, IV, 501-502)

The "child and man" are the same because they have the same habit of mind -- a nonthinking acceptance of authority. The grammar schools drilled the attitude into them as young boys until they did indeed become "slaves" and "vassals." That same attitude operated in them later as men to make them "dupe(s) to a Party" or a political leader. This explicit suggestion taken along with the strong implicit suggestions of that relationship (the parallels between school and government pointed out above) show that Pope did wish the readers of his *Dunciad* to see a cause-effect relationship between early education and later intellectual attitudes.²⁰ Furthermore, the reader who is familiar with Pope's famous couplet from his *Epistle to Cobham*,

'Tis Education forms the common mind,
Just as the Twig is bent, the Tree's inclined,
(101-102)²¹

should have no doubts about his intention in *The Dunciad*.

Given the ideas on learning current in the age and given Pope's obvious interest in education and the theory of education, his belief that childhood experience determined later attitudes is not surprising. In fact, the currency of this idea and Pope's probable acceptance of it can easily be demonstrated by turning briefly to two authors whose works had an undeniably strong influence on Pope: John Locke and Henry St. John, Lord Bolingbroke.

The whole concept of a childhood experience having an impact on adult behavior is congruent with the Lockean concept of the mind as a *tabula rasa* at birth.²² Locke contended that a newborn child's mind was devoid of innate ideas and that knowledge was acquired only by experience. Although a man could continue to learn all his life, those things taught or experienced in his childhood would be much more likely to have a strong influence on later intellect and character because the child's mind, which Locke referred to at various times as an "empty cabinet," a "white paper," or a "dark room,"²³ was less cluttered and thus much more receptive to any stimulus. Therefore, a way of thinking or an attitude established in early youth would be permanently imprinted on the

mind and thus help determine later behavior and thought. His recognition that early education was a major factor in determining character and intellect led Locke to write his *Treatise on Education*, one of the most powerful influences on eighteenth-century educational thought.

Locke's ideas were "in the air" all during Pope's lifetime and were an obvious influence on him and many other authors²⁴ including Bolingbroke, Pope's "guide, philosopher, and friend."²⁵ In fact, Bolingbroke gave Pope his copy of the essay probably in the late 1720's when both of them were engaged in "philosophical" studies.²⁶ However, because of the many personal, political, and philosophical exchanges between Bolingbroke and Pope, Bolingbroke's Lockean ideas may have provided a more direct stimulus for Pope's position than Locke's *Essay on Human Understanding*. The following passage, one of the few direct references Bolingbroke made to education, is from one of the *Letters or Essays Addressed to Alexander Pope* ("Essay the Fourth: Concerning Authority in Matters of Religion") which Bolingbroke said he personally sent to Pope and which Pope presumably read with particular attention.²⁷ It should, therefore, carry great weight in any examination of Pope's ideas on education. The essay begins with a very Lockean analysis of how men learn and yet fail to learn to think for themselves:

All men are apt to have a high conceit of their own understandings, and to be tenacious of the opinions they profess; and yet almost all men are guided by the understandings of others, not by their own, and may be said more truly to adopt, than to beget, their opinions. Nurses, parents, paedagogues, and after them all, that universal paedagogue custom, fill the mind with notions that it had no share in framing, which it receives as passively, as it receives the impressions of outward objects, and which, left to itself, it would never have framed perhaps, or would have examined afterward. Thus prejudices are established by education, and habits by custom. We are taught to think what others think, not how to think for ourselves; and while the memory is loaded, the understanding remains unexercised, or exercised in such trammels as constrain it's (sic) motions, and direct it's (sic) pace, till that which was artificial becomes in some sort natural, and the mind can go no other.²⁸

Although Bolingbroke was referring to a general characteristic of education on all levels, he does deal with the basic ideas which recur in Pope's analysis of the effect of grammar school education on later life. Bolingbroke was concerned that so many men simply accept without question the opinions of other men, living and dead, and so few actually think for themselves. He traced this failure to the teaching techniques of parents, nurses, pedagogues, and (by implication) clergymen. His basic point was that if the child is not challenged to think, to reason, to understand but is instead only asked, or even forced, to accept the pronouncements of an authority figure -- a parent, teacher, or minister for example -- then the child will develop an unquestioning, uncritical mind. He will learn to "think what others think" in all matters and be, for the most part, a docile, unthinking follower, instead of an independent, inquiring thinker.

Bolingbroke was obviously moving from his general statement about a failure in education to a discussion of the acceptance of authority in religion and its inhibition of any rational consideration of religion. It is only a short step from Bolingbroke's emphasis to Pope's emphasis on grammar school education as a major cause of a passive habit of mind which later produces passive obedience in certain political situations.

Though Pope (aware of the contrary examples of Pulteney and Wyndham among others) could hardly have believed that all those who attended the grammar schools would turn out to be political lackeys in later life, he obviously did think that there was a clear relationship in a great many cases. Traditionally, the highest temporal purpose of education was to train men to serve their nation. Because their decisions affected the freedom and welfare of all their countrymen as well as their country's place in the precarious affairs of the world at large, service in government was the greatest worldly responsibility Englishmen could undertake. Therefore, thoughtful, educated men were essential to maintain and develop England as a free and great nation. If the schools failed to produce such men, then the delicate fabric of freedom and culture the English had woven over the centuries was in grave danger.

Auburn University

- ¹Joseph Spence, *Observations, Anecdotes, and Characteristics of Books and Men*, ed. James M. Osborn, 2 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1966) I, 21-22 (item #49).
- ²Miriam Leranbaum's *Alexander Pope's 'Opus Magnum': 1729-1744* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977) is perhaps the best account of the extensive study and planning Pope put into his unfinished ethic masterpiece and the place of education in his scheme.
- ³Robert Burton, *Anatomy of Melancholy*, ed. Floyd Dell and Paul Jordan Smith. (New York: Farrar and Rinehart, 1927), pp. 284-285.
- ⁴Henry Peacham, *The Complete Gentlemen*, ed. Virgil B. Heltzel. (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1962), pp. 34-35.
- ⁵George Turnbull, *Observations upon Liberal Education, In all Its Branches...* (London: A. Miller, 1742), pp. 22-25.
- ⁶John Brinsley, *Ludus Literarius or the Grammar School*, ed. E. T. Campagnae. (Liverpool: The Liverpool University Press, 1913). p. 307; Obadiah Walker, *Of Education. Especially of Young Gentlemen*, 6th ed. (London: H. Gellibrand for R. Welling, 1699), pp. 40-44; John Locke, *The Educational Writing of John Locke*, edited with intro. by James L. Axtell. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968), p. 22.
- ⁷Critics of the purely grammatical method of teaching language include Desiderius Erasmus, Francois Rabelais, Roger Ascham, Juan Lius Vives, Michel de Montaigne, Eilardus Lubinus, John Amos Comenius, John Brinsley, Henry Peachum, Joseph Webb, Samuel Hartlib, John Milton, John Dury, Abraham Cowley, Charles Hoole, John Eachard, John Locke, Richard Johnson, John Clarke, J.T. Philips, and George Turnbull. The fullest discussion of the classical and humanist influences on Pope's satire of education is found in Aubrey L. Williams' *Pope's Duncaid: A Study of Its Meaning* (1955; reprint Methuen & Co., Ltd., 1968), pp. 104-123.
- ⁸See Samuel Hartlib's translation of Lubinus's "Epistolary Discourse before a New Edition of the New Testament" (1616) in *The True and Readie Way to Learn the Latin Tongue* (London: R. and W. Leybourn, 1654), p. 9 and Clarke, pp. 128-129. Lubinus's full description of a parrot-like scholar he observed is perhaps the best available example of the failure of the grammatical method to teach Latin. The scholar he describes in the following passage is seventeen years old.
- He under his Master had learned exactly at the fingers end the Precepts or Rules of Grammar, together with the Examples which were added to the Precepts, but he could not rehearse them otherwise than Parats. . . .For he knew neither the use of Rules nor Examples, but committed all things to memory at the command of his master, as if it were enough to learn the Latin Tongue, to repeat the Rules of Grammar which thou doest not understand, or of whose use thou art ignorant; for scarce could he combine or put together three or four Latin words stumblingly, as if he were troubled with the hichet or yexing.
- ⁹For detailed discussions of the development of Lily's Grammar before and after 1542 see Chapter XVI of Foster Watson's *The Old Grammar Schools: The English Grammar Schools to 1660: Their Curriculum and Practice* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1908), pp. 243-259, and Chapter VIII of W. Carew Hazlitt's *Schools, School Books and School Masters* (London: J. W. Jarvis & Sons, 1888), pp. 117-134.

- ¹⁰Three of them Pope could have known were Richard Johnson, *Grammatical Commentaries: Being an Apparatus To A New National Grammar: By way of Animadversion Upon the Falsities, Redundancies, and Defects of Lilly's System Now in Use* (London: Printed for the Author, 1706), preface; John Clarke, *An Essay upon the Education of Youth in Grammar-Schools*, 2nd edition (London: A. Bettesworth, 1730), pp. 10, 17; J. T. Phillips, *A Compendious Way of Teaching Ancient and Modern languages* (London: W. Meadows, 1727), p. 4.
- ¹¹A few earlier writers who did outline the grave consequences of a poor education in more detail include John Dury, *The Reformed School, in Samuel Hartlib and the Advancement of Learning*, ed. Charles Webster (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970), p. 150; John Eachard, *The Grounds and Occasions of the Contempt for the Clergy and Religion Enquired into, In a Letter to R. L.* (London: W. Godbin, 1670), p. 10.
- ¹²*The Gentleman's Magazine* by Sylvanus Urban, gent, Vol. XC, Part 1 (June 1820), p. 603.
- ¹³The contributor of this pamphlet to the *Gentleman's magazine* ("Westmonasteriensis") mistakenly interpreted the pamphlet as an allegorical treatment of an event within Westminster School; in August 1820 (Vol. XC, Part II, p. 98) "Notator" asked "is Westmonasteriensis serious in supposing the Tracts he mentions really relate to a rebellion in a school? Do not his extracts clearly shew them to be political?" In the November 1820 issue (Vol. XC, Part II, p. 419) "Westmonasteriensis" replied admitting a political reading was probable and made several suggestions.
- ¹⁴Several scholars have commented on Pope's presence at Bolingbroke's estate in the summer of 1726 when *The Craftsman* was being planned. For example, see Ronald Paulson, *Hogarth: His Life, Art, and Times* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1971), I, 170; Charles B. Realey, *The Early Opposition to Sir Robert Walpole, 1720-1727* (Lawrence, Kansas: University Press, 1931), p. 199; and Walter Sichel, *Bolingbroke and His Times: The Sequel, Period II, March 1715 - December 1751* (London: James Nisbet and Co., 1920), p. 253.
- ¹⁵Caleb D'Anvers (pseud.), *The Craftsman* (London: R. Francklin, 1731), I, 265.
- ¹⁶I(ssac) S(anders) L(eadam), "Robert Walpole," *DNB*, II, 647.
- ¹⁷*OED*, IV, 520-1.
- ¹⁸See note to *Dunciad*, IV, 176.
- ¹⁹The authorship of the advertisements in *The Craftsman* is uncertain. Sichel gives Amhurst some of them but does not specify which ones (see p. 254). Since many were probably written as page fillers, Amhurst, as editor, probably wrote most of them. Sichel does identify Arbuthnot as author of the advertisement in No. 16 on dullness (p. 253).
- ²⁰Pope's plan to place his epistles on government ("Of the principles and Use of Civil and Ecclesiastical Polity") and education ("Of the Use of Education") under the same heading ("Epist. III -- with respect to Society") in his unfinished "Opus Magnum" is perhaps another indication of his perception of their close connection. See Leranbaum, pp. 28-29.
- ²¹All quotations from *The Dunciad* and Pope's other poetry are from *The Twickenham Edition of the Poems of Alexander Pope*, John Butt, general editor, 11 vols. (London: Methuen and Co. Ltd; New Haven: Yale University Press, 1950-1969).
- ²²John Locke, *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*, ed. A. S. Pringle-Patterson (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1924), Book II, Chap. i, sec. 2.

Rivers: Pope, Pedagogues, and Politicians

²³Ibid., Book I, Chap. ii sec. 15; Book II, Chap. i, sec. 2; Book II, Chap. ii, sec. 17.

²⁴Kenneth MacLean in *John Locke and English Literature of the Eighteenth Century* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1936), pp. 32-48, discusses the influence of the concept of the *tabula rasa* of the eighteenth century literature, but only mentions Pope briefly.

²⁵*Essay on Man*, Epistle IV, 390. See Maynard Mack's introduction to Pope's *Essay on Man*, Twickenham edition, III-I, xxvi-xxxi, for Bolingbroke's possible influence on that poem.

²⁶See Maynard Mack, "Pope's Books: A Biographical Survey with a Finding List," in *English Literature in the Age of Disguise*, ed. Maxmilliam E. Novak (University of California Press: Berkeley, 1977), pp. 215; 271 (Item No. 105).

²⁷Henry St. John, Lord Viscount Bolingbroke, *Works*, 8 vols. (London: J. Johnson, 1809), V, 71 ff.; L(eslie) S(tephen), "Henry St. John," *DNB*, XVII, 633.

²⁸St. John, VI, 267.

