

Additions to A Tale of a Tub

Textual and Historical Introduction

If circumstances made it “not convenient” for him to put his name to *A Tale of a Tub*,¹ and virtually the rest of his writings over thirty-five years, Swift cannot have been surprised by the difficulties that ensued. Apart from the false claims and attributions when he came to assemble collections of his work, he faced a second moment of truth in deciding what to disown for posterity in the long term. In a formal sense, he had disowned the *Tale* and its companion pieces by excluding them from his *Miscellanies* and his *Works*.² Parts of the *Tale*, with *A Discourse concerning the Mechanical Operation of the Spirit*, were repeatedly claimed by his cousin, Thomas Swift.³

In 1720, a publisher at The Hague brought out the largest collection of Swift’s writings to date, using a bogus imprint, “by Order of the Society *de propagando, &c.*,” with the title *Miscellaneous Works, Comical & Diverting*. The volume included *A Tale of a Tub*, *A Discourse concerning the Mechanical Operation of the Spirit*, and *The Battle of the Books* (in that order) as well as some choice items from Swift’s *Miscellanies in Prose and Verse* of 1711 (TEERINK AND SCOUTEN 2). The author’s identity was not revealed, but it was adumbrated. Some not so cryptic initials on the title page, T. R. D. J. S. D. O. P. I. I., pointed towards The Reverend Dr Jonathan Swift Dean of St Patrick’s in Ireland, and in his Advertisement, the Bookseller when declaring all items to be “generaly attributed to the same

¹ See the sidenote in *A Discourse concerning the Mechanical Operation of the Spirit*: “It was thought neither safe nor Convenient to Print it” (Online.Swift, forthcoming).

² Motte’s successor, Charles Bathurst, was the first to add the *Tale* to Swift’s *Miscellanies* in Volume XII (1746) and in Volume I of *Works* (1751) (TEERINK AND SCOUTEN 67 and 82).

³ See the Historical Introductions to *A Tale of a Tub* and the *Discourse concerning the Mechanical Operation of the Spirit* (Online.Swift, forthcoming).

Author,” surmised in a teasing disclosure by disavowal: “So long as Dr. *Swift* does not own the *Tale of a Tub*, I think no man has a right to charge him with it, whatever common Fame may report.”⁴

The texts of the *Tale*, the *Discourse*, and the *Battle* were all reprinted from the 12mo piracy of 1711 (TEERINK AND SCOUTEN 224), which in turn derived from the authorized third edition of 1704,⁵ explanatory footnotes were added, and at one point startling fresh material was inserted, all arranged in a block. These Additions combine in one sequence a set of chapter summaries (pp. 247-52, 261-64) drawn up from the fifth edition (1710) and, interpolated, some ‘abstracts’ of unedited matter, “*The History of Martin*” (pp. 253-58, 259-61), embodying its own “*Digression on the nature usefulness & necessity of Wars & Quarels*” (pp. 258-59), and at the end a draft “PROJECT, *For the universal benefit of Mankind*” (pp. 264-66). Perhaps because the chapter summaries might be (mis)taken for the habitual *Table des Matières* of books in French, they were made to serve a second purpose by the addition of relevant page numbers in 1720. These relate to Nutt’s published text, implying that they may well have originated with the Dutch publisher.⁶

In his Advertisement, the bookseller quoted from the letter of an unnamed correspondent, testifying that the additional matter came from a whole manuscript of *A Tale of a Tub*, which he described in some detail.⁷ The last third of this Advertisement reiterated a claim which had first been raised in Curll’s *Complete Key to the Tale of a Tub* and which divided authorship between Jonathan and Thomas Swift.⁸ Although bearing a

⁴ *Miscellaneous Works, Comical and Diverting*, pp. v-vi.

⁵ See the Textual Introduction to the *Discourse concerning the Mechanical Operation of the Spirit* (Online.Swift, forthcoming).

⁶ For the summaries, not printed here, see GUTHKELCH AND NICHOL SMITH, pp. 298-301, 307-9, 311.

⁷ *Miscellaneous Works, Comical and Diverting* (London, 1720), pp. iii-ix (TEERINK AND SCOUTEN 17).

⁸ *Miscellaneous Works, Comical and Diverting*, pp. vii-ix; Edmund Curll, *A Complete Key to A Tale of a Tub* (London: Edmund Curll, 1710), pp. 1-4.

London imprint, the book was printed in Holland, as its type and printer's ornaments demonstrate, and it is encountered in both English and Continental contemporary bindings. The new materials have been taken into Swift's *Works* since Nichols collected them in 1779,⁹ but have always been accompanied by editorial doubt of their authenticity.¹⁰ These doubts were probably fed by the bizarre nature of *Miscellaneous Works, Comical & Diverting*: the volume was unconnected with the first publisher of the *Tale*, or his assigns or successors in the copyrights; it was printed and published in Holland; and its additional material was introduced with a mysterious air characteristic of unauthorized publications and fabricated writing.

Sir Walter Scott was one of the first to pinpoint the critical dilemma. In an introductory note to the Additions, he emphasized the changes of plan, tone, and narrative evident between "*The History of Martin*" and Swift's declared position in his Apology to satirize "*the numerous and gross Corruptions in Religion and Learning*" as well as to celebrate "*the Church of England as the most perfect of all others in Discipline and Doctrine*" (*Prose Works*, I, 1, 2):

The hints or fragments of allegory, here thrown out, are not in unison with the former part of the *Tale*, either in political principle or in the conduct of the fable. The tone of many passages is decidedly not only Whiggish, but of the Low Church, and the author is forced, somewhat awkwardly, to introduce two Martins instead of one; the first representing the sect of Luther, the second the Church of England. The fragment does not appear in the first edition; and to me has much more the appearance of a rough draught, thrown aside and altered, than of any continuation of the original story.¹¹

⁹ It has to be said, however, that the unauthorized London edition of *The History of Martin* of 1742, reissued in 1744 with the sheets of the 1742 printing and a new title page (TEERINK AND SCOUTEN 783 and 784) attributed the pamphlet to "the Rev. D—N S—N." It contains only *The History of Martin* and its Digression but neither "A Project" nor "*A Description of the Kingdom of Absurdities*."

¹⁰ *A Supplement to Dr Swift's Works*, 3 vols (London: J. Nichols, 1779), III, 28-38 (TEERINK AND SCOUTEN 90). See also *Prose Works*, I, xxxii.

¹¹ SCOTT XI, 200n.

This unfavourable comment notwithstanding, Scott accepted Swift as the author; at the same time, he proposed the solution ostensibly ignored, or rejected, by his fellow editors, before and after him: the Additions of 1720 are working papers, discarded drafts. The only problem Sir Walter did not account for is how and in what way the publisher at The Hague was able to secure this material for *Miscellaneous Works, Comical & Diverting*.

Herman Teerink, himself a Dutchman,¹² was able to link the 1720 volume with Thomas Johnson, a Scottish bookseller at The Hague, who advertised it along with other books in English in the early 1720s. Johnson was established at The Hague from 1701 to 1728, and then at Rotterdam until his death in 1735, both as foreign-language bookseller and publisher of works in Latin, French, and English.¹³ The list of his publications is impressive both for number and quality; it included a pioneer series of seventy English plays from Shakespeare to the reign of Queen Anne, in small format (1712-15).¹⁴ Among the latest English books Johnson reprinted (all in “neat & correct” pocket volumes) are the 1717 quarto of Pope’s *Works*, Prior’s 1718 folio, the whole of Pope’s *Iliad*, Rowe’s 1719 translation of Lucan’s *Pharsalia*, and Addison’s *Works*.¹⁵ All of these have a London imprint, in addition to Thomas Johnson’s name with his device, a large

¹² Daniel Traister, “The History of the Herman Teerink Collection of the Works of Jonathan Swift at the University of Pennsylvania Library,” *Swift Studies*, 10 (1995), 80-88.

¹³ Ernst Ferdinand Kossmann, *De boekhandel te ’s-Gravenhage tot het eind van de 18de eeuw* (The Hague: Nijhoff, 1937), pp. 206-7. See also TEERINK AND SCOUTEN 17; W. J. B. Pienaar, *English Influences in Dutch Literature and Justus van Effen as Intermediary* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1929), pp. 102-4; F. J. A. Jagtenberg, *Jonathan Swift in Nederland, 1700-1800* (Deventer: Sub Rosa, 1989), pp. 118-21.

¹⁴ Herbert L. Ford, *Shakespeare, 1700-1740: A Collation of the Editions and Separate Plays, with Some Account of T. Johnson and R. Walker* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1935), pp. 46-51.

¹⁵ See the list of books printed and sold by Johnson in Matthew Prior, *Poems on Several Occasions* (London: printed for T. Johnson, 1720) (ESTC T014946). Precise bibliographical descriptions of all these titles may be found in PASSMANN AND VIENKEN II, 1490, 1524, 1493-95, 1108; I, 7-8.

roundel monogram TJ, on the title page, and some contain his three-page list of books in English, Swift's *Miscellaneous Works* of 1720, among them. This makes it very likely that Johnson had an export trade to England. The fine edition of Horace's *Poemata* (1721), which he published for Alexander Cunningham,¹⁶ has either a "Hagae Comitum" imprint of his own or "Londini" naming the brothers Vaillant and N. Prevost, French emigré booksellers in the Strand.¹⁷ It was accompanied in the same year by Cunningham's long, controversial *Animadversiones* directed against Richard Bentley's edition of 1711, with the same alternative imprints.¹⁸ Johnson's edition of Prior's *Poems* – "a new Edition with some Additions" – appeared just after the Swift volume in 1720, and likewise reprints "Part of a Letter, sent to the Publisher of this new Edition."¹⁹ His Pope's *Iliad* has a Bookseller's Advertisement calling it "correct as well as neat."²⁰

Miscellaneous Works was produced in breach of the provisions of Queen Anne's Copyright Act.²¹ Benjamin Tooke had entered both the *Tale* and *Miscellanies in Prose and Verse* of 1711, from which Johnson derived the greater part of his copy for 1720, in the Stationers' Register on 10 April 1710.²² It is presumably for this reason that Johnson's monogram was left off

¹⁶ ODNB, s.v. "Alexander Cunningham of Block (c.1650-1730)."

¹⁷ See *Q. Horatii Flacci poemata ex antiquis codd. & certis observationibus emendavit, variasque scriptorum & impressorum lectiones adjecit Alexander Cuningamius* (Londoni: Fratres Vaillant et N. Prevost, 1721; Hagae Comitum: Thomam Jonsonium, 1721 [ESTC T46152]).

¹⁸ *Alexandri Cuningamii animadversiones, in Richardi Bentleii notas et emendationes ad Q. Horatium Flaccum* (Londoni: Fratres Vaillant et N. Prevost, 1721 [ESTC T021209]; Hagae Comitum: Thomam Jonsonium, 1721 [ESTC T224193]).

¹⁹ Prior, *Poems on Several Occasions*, pp. 449-51.

²⁰ *The Iliad of Homer*, trans. Alexander Pope (London: by T. J. for B. L., 1729), I, sig. *3r (ESTC T154182).

²¹ Mark Rose, "Copyright, Authors, and Censorship," *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain, V: 1695-1830*, eds Michael F. Suarez, SJ, and Michael L. Turner (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), pp. 118-31 (118-23).

²² *Correspondence*, ed. Woolley, I, 285n5. Woolley's transcription of the unpublished entry is available in his own copy of the Scholar Press reprint of

the title page, and the London imprint, while obliquely parodying papal propaganda,²³ names no bookseller. The Bookseller's Advertisement consists of two long quotations, two-thirds of which were lifted from an anonymous letter and one-third from Curll's *Complete Key*. The second paragraph is an extended, and gratuitous, attack on Richard Bentley, explained by Johnson's current preoccupation with Cunningham's *Animadversiones* (1721); and the later sentence, "I think it will take very well (especially when done so neat & correct as you are used to doe),"²⁴ points to his frequently expressed concern with neatness and accuracy in all his publications. It is instructive to compare the Advertisement with the fresh one supplied for the 1734 Dutch reprint of Johnson's 1720 text of the *Tale*.²⁵ Of chief interest is the paragraph accounting for the "considerable *Additions*" to the *Tale*, proclaimed on the title page in 1720:

As for the Manuscript I told you I had seen, which contains a great deal more than what is printed, I would very willingly have taken a copy of what is omitted, & have sent it you; but I was not allowed that liberty, having only had leave to read it. I can assure you I found those parts not at all inferior to the others that are printed; but I believe some prudential considerations have hindered their publication. I have writ down the heads of the most material, as near as I can now remember, on the leaves put in at the end of my book, where you'll find a general Table or Index of the whole work, which may serve for a Recapitulation to those that have read it through. I have extended such parts as have not been printed, something more largely than the others, & as near as I can remember in the Authors own words.²⁶

As for the text of "such parts as have not been printed," it is remarkable that "*The History of Martin*" should follow a heading, in larger type,

Miscellanies in Prose and Verse, introd. C. P. Daw (Menston, Yorkshire, 1972), now at the Ehrenpreis Centre (EC 8069).

²³ Ostensibly, the reference is to the papal commission *De propaganda fide*, later renamed Sacred Congregation of Propaganda (ODCC, p. 1131).

²⁴ *Miscellaneous Works, Comical and Diverting*, p. vi.

²⁵ *A Tale of a Tub* (London, 1734), sig. *2r-v (TEERINK AND SCOUTEN 235).

²⁶ *Miscellaneous Works, Comical and Diverting*, pp. iv-v.

“Abstract of what follows after Sect. IX in the Manuscript.” This direction is specific enough, and is repeated unchanged in the 1734 reprint. (As 1734 bears every indication that it, too, came from Thomas Johnson, no doubt an error here could have been corrected.) It provides an important clue in determining the character and authenticity of the new materials. Whereas, in 1920, GUTHKELCH reprinted the direction without questioning it (pp. lviii, 302), in 1958, his reviser NICHOL SMITH silently changed the section number to read “X” (GUTHKELCH AND NICHOL SMITH, p. lxi) and added a footnote asserting that “IX” was a mistake (p. 302n1). In fact, in 1720, “*The History of Martin*” is positioned after the Section X chapter summary, and not the Section IX summary. Since this arrangement was probably made out of concern for typographical layout – Section X neatly filled out the remaining lower half of page 252, so that “*The History of Martin*” could commence formally at the head of the next page – the literal wording of Johnson’s heading is *prima facie* to be accepted. It was also accepted the following year by Johnson’s fellow publisher at The Hague, Henri Scheurleer, when he issued the first French translation of the *Tale*, *Le Conte du Tonneau* (1721): on p. 236, Scheurleer repositioned “*The History of Martin*” immediately after Section IX as directed by the heading “après la Section IX.”²⁷ And the discrepancy in 1720 was registered by Nichols.²⁸

²⁷ Scheurleer was followed by Swift’s German translators, Georg Christian Wolf und Johann Heinrich Waser, who both positioned “*The History of Martin*” and its Continuation as well as the “*Digression on the nature usefulness & necessity of Wars & Quarels*” after “*A Digression concerning Madness*” (*Des berühmten Herrn D. Swifts Märigen von der Tonne*, 2 vols [in one] [Altona: auf Kosten guter Freunde, 1729], I, 196-206; *D. Jonath. Swifts Märigen von der Tonne*, in *Satyrische und ernsthafte Schriften von Dr. Jonathan Swift*, III [Hamburg und Leipzig, 1758], 214-25). Both retained the 1704 order of titles, however, making the *Discourse concerning the Mechanical Operation of the Spirit* follow *The Battle of the Books*.

²⁸ *A Supplement to Dr Swift’s Works, being the Fourteenth in the Collection containing Miscellanies in Prose and Verse* (London: J. Nichols, 1779), p. 347 (TEERINK AND SCOUTEN 87).

This element of physical description is to be considered with two others occurring through the 1720 Additions.

At the conclusion of “*The History of Martin*,” another direction is printed: “NB. Some things that follow after this are not in the MS. but seem to have been written since to fill up the place of what was not thought convenient then to print” (p. 8, l. 27 – p. 9, l. 2). If “*The History of Martin*” has been correctly positioned, the inference is bound to be that Sections X, XI, and The Conclusion (that is, the remainder of the *Tale* as subsequently written and published) were not then present. As Curll’s *Complete Key* asserts (highlighted by a pointing hand) that “The Fragment concerning *Enthusiasm* was intended to be brought in hereabouts”²⁹ – more specifically, early in Section XI as published – there is reason to suspect that the urtext of *A Tale of a Tub* was incomplete at this point as the two cousins had left it.

Section X also betrays signs of earlier disturbance. It is headed in the first and subsequent editions “*A Tale of a Tub*,” in common with each alternating installment of the allegory, but it is in fact another digression, from beginning to end. As a result, in 1720, the 1704 order of titles was not followed, the *Discourse concerning the Mechanical Operation of the Spirit* being brought forward from its terminal position to appear in the text, as well as the chapter summaries, immediately after the *Tale*. The 1720 Additions then conclude with “A Project,” followed by the third and final element of physical description, “*Here ends the Manuscript, there being nothing of the following piece in it*” (p. 10, ll. 33-34). This note refers to *The Battle of the Books*, which formed no part of the *Tale* and which, as filler material for the 1704 volume, comes last in 1720.

From the beginning, Swift’s editors have tended to dismiss the new material, belittling it either as an imitation or a continuation which tried to capitalize on the *Tale*’s success.³⁰ The first to voice his reservations was Justus

²⁹ *A Complete Key to A Tale of a Tub*, p. 24.

³⁰ GUTHKELCH AND NICHOL SMITH, pp. lx-lxiv; Herbert Davis, Introduction, *Prose Works*, I, xxxii. This idea was already aired in 1742 by the unauthorized

van Effen, the first translator of *A Tale of a Tub* into French, who expressed his views in a three-page excursus, “Remarque du Traducteur,” placed with his rendering of them.³¹ Van Effen was a professional man of letters,³² who did not accept the pretence that “*The History of Martin*” was a reconstruction, “as near as I can remember in the Authors own words.” It was true, he felt, that it had no less “wit” but this “wit” was not of the sort that distinguished the *Tale*: “*Il y a de l’esprit infiniment, mais ce n’est pas la même sorte d’esprit si particulier à l’Auteur du Conte*” (I, 250). The allegory was not as well sustained; it was pressed too far beyond the existing one; above all, van Effen continued, it was too obvious and, unlike the *Tale*, insufficiently indeterminate: “*Il suffit d’avoir une legere idée de l’Histoire pour n’y trouver rien d’Enigmatique, ce qui est fort éloigné du tour qui regne generalement dans le reste de l’Ouvrage*” (I, 251). As a result, van Effen cast doubt on the authenticity of the new material (I, 249-50), but in the end, he did not have the courage of his own conviction. Rather than relegate “*The History of Martin*” from the canon, he assured his audience that “his criticism was not intended to detract from the merit of the piece [Ce que j’en dis n’est pas pour rien ôter au merite de cet extrait],” praising it as valuable, and even suggesting that the reading public was to be grateful for it: “*Je le trouve plein de feu, & de fine plaisanterie, & je crois que le public doit savoir gré à l’Editeur Anglois de le lui avoir communiqué, & à moi de l’avoir traduit.*”³³ Here, it is useful to remember that from 1715 to 1718 van Effen

London edition of *The History of Martin*, whose subtitle announces it as “a Proper SEQUEL to *The Tale of a Tub*.”

³¹ *Le Conte du Tonneau* (The Hague: Henri Scheurleer, 1721), pp. 249-52 (TEERINK AND SCOUTEN 263). See also GUTHKELCH AND NICHOL SMITH, p. lxiii.

³² See, in addition to the titles listed in note 13, James L. Schorr, *The Life and Works of Justus van Effen* (Laramie, Wyoming: University of Wyoming, 1982).

³³ VAN EFFEN, p. 251, echoing The Booksellers Advertisement of 1720: “I found those parts not at all inferior to the others that are printed” (*Miscellaneous Works, Comical and Diverting*, p. v).

wrote for the *Journal Littéraire*,³⁴ published at The Hague by Thomas Johnson, and that he was using the 1720 *Miscellaneous Works* text of the *Tale* as soon as Johnson published it;³⁵ Scheurleer, van Effen's publisher, was located in the same city and eventually bought Johnson's business after his death. If anyone had access to the facts, so far as they were known, or knowable, van Effen is the most likely candidate. But even if he did have access to the facts, he did not let on about them in his "Remarque du Traducteur," which is not in any way conducive to clarifying them.

In 1779, John Nichols followed van Effen's precedent by quietly incorporating the 1720 Additions into his *Supplement to Dr. Swift's Works*. But when introducing them in a brief comment, he pointed in another, more specific direction as to their author: "Though certainly not the Dean's, they appear to have been written by some one, who had very attentively considered the subject. If we might be allowed to *guess* at their author, we should say that it was *Thomas Swift*."³⁶ A statement like this is bound to revivify the old (and new) myth that Jonathan's cousin has to be allowed a share in *A Tale of a Tub* and the *Discourse concerning the Mechanical Operation of the Spirit*; a situation in which little can be recovered with certainty.³⁷ But even so, it now seems possible to speculate with more confidence on what has troubled earlier commentators.

Working papers are discarded drafts, rejected notes and jottings, disjointed reflections of ideas and images as well as information resulting from reading and hearsay; in a sense, they are failed attempts and are bound to be uncharacteristic. This insight may account for the differences in plan,

³⁴ Pienaar, *English Influences in Dutch Literature and Justus van Effen as Intermediary*, pp. 186-88; Schorr, *The Life and Works of Justus van Effen*, p. 58.

³⁵ Marie-Luise Spieckermann, "Swift in Germany in the Eighteenth Century: A Preliminary Sketch," *The Reception and Reputation of Jonathan Swift in Germany: Essays and Investigations*, eds Hermann J. Real, *et al.* (Dublin, Oxford, London: Maunsel, 2002), pp. 15-38 (18-19).

³⁶ *A Supplement to Dr Swift's Works*, III, 2na.

³⁷ See the Historical Introductions to *A Tale of a Tub* and the *Discourse concerning the Mechanical Operation of the Spirit* (Online.Swift, forthcoming).

tone, and narrative between “*The History of Martin*” and the *Tale*’s religious allegory, so shrewdly highlighted by Sir Walter Scott. At the same time, it is certain that Thomas Swift was in Jonathan’s confidence at some stage during the book’s composition.³⁸ This familiarity may have afforded Thomas access to his cousin’s working materials, thus creating the chance for him to forward it to Thomas Johnson at The Hague, one way or another. Having blazoned his desire for some of the glory as early as 1705,³⁹ Thomas hardly needed, as John Nichols conjectured in 1779,⁴⁰ a more practical expedient to release them for publication.

The Bookseller’s Advertisement of 1720 shows many indications that it was compiled by Johnson himself, hastily and ostensibly without a great deal of help from the English source of his Additions; consequently, he relied on Curll’s *Key* (1710). He also did so for the explanatory notes which he, or his editor or collaborator, provided and which are miscellaneous borrowings from Curll’s *Key* (1710), supplemented by notes pilfered from both the *Tale*’s fifth edition of 1710 and Wotton’s *Observations* of 1705, not to mention the odd pedestrian contribution of his own. Johnson’s clues as to the physical makeup of his manuscript source ring true. They gain in credibility when they are found to dovetail with Thomas Swift’s testimony to dislocation in the final sections of the *Tale* and to the textual fortunes of the *Discourse*. A conjectural reconstruction of what may have happened is as follows:

An initial blue-print plan of alternating Tale (even numbers) and Digressions (odd numbers) was maintained up to, and including, Section IX (“*A Digression concerning Madness*”). The even-numbered Section X should have taken up the religious allegory, and in fact it is headed *A Tale of*

³⁸ Robert Martin Adams, “Jonathan Swift, Thomas Swift, and the Authorship of *A Tale of a Tub*,” *Modern Philology*, 64 (1967), 198-232. See also the Historical Introduction to the *Discourse concerning the Mechanical Operation of the Spirit* (Online.Swift, forthcoming).

³⁹ *Correspondence*, ed. Woolley, I, 112n1; ROSS AND WOOLLEY, pp. 192-98.

⁴⁰ See Nichols’s Advertisement in *A Supplement to Dr Swift’s Works*, III, 3-8.

a Tub. In substance, it is another Digression, however, and only as late as 1720 was it given the appropriate title (“*The Authors Compliment to the Readers &c.*” [pp. 147-53]). In the book’s completed and published form in 1704, there were two consecutive Digressions. But if its heading is anything to go by, Section X was presumably the planned location of the abandoned “*History of Martin*,”⁴¹ which embodied midway, in sketch form, its own “*Digression on the nature usefulness & necessity of Wars & Quarels*” (pp. 6-7). In retrospect, the editor of 1720 noted that what Thomas supplied – “*The History of Martin*” – “was not thought convenient then to print.”⁴² After Thomas had disappeared from the scene, its place was taken by the existing Section X, which Thomas Johnson said was “not in the MS. but seem[ed] to have been written since to fill up the place.”⁴³ The tour-de-force Section XI (properly headed *A Tale of a Tub*), which describes the post-Reformation history of the Dissenting churches in Jack’s insane adventures, and which should also have taken in the *Discourse concerning the Mechanical Operation of the Spirit: A Fragment*,⁴⁴ was in the last stages composed to compensate for the loss of “*The History of Martin*.” Meanwhile, Jonathan’s energy turned the *Fragment* into the separate entity published in 1704. Only the Conclusion was needed to round off the work.

Closer examination of the *Tale*’s overall structure, more particularly its shifts in the symbolic roles the brothers play as the religious allegory proceeds,⁴⁵ bears out this view. Swift first describes the primitive Christians,

⁴¹ For reasons unknown, Thomas Swift assigned this section to himself in Lady Betty Germain’s copy of 1704, which he annotated (Cambridge University Library, Williams Collection, no 270; see also Harold Williams, “Swift’s ‘Tale of a Tub,’” *Times Literary Supplement*, 30 September 1926, p. 654; GUTHKELCH AND NICHOL SMITH, p. xviii1).

⁴² *Miscellaneous Works, Comical and Diverting*, p. 261.

⁴³ *Miscellaneous Works, Comical and Diverting*, p. 261.

⁴⁴ See Thomas Swift’s holograph annotation in a first-edition copy of *A Tale of a Tub*, blank page opposite p. 283 (Cornell University Library).

⁴⁵ Phillip Harth, *Swift and Anglican Rationalism: The Religious Background of “A Tale of a Tub”* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1961), pp. 13-18, and *passim*.

he then pictures the Church of Rome establishing its authority over medieval Christianity, and follows this story up with the breaking away of Lutherans and Calvinists from papal authority, from which in turn the Church of England and the Church of Scotland develop. With such a progression, it seems reasonable to assume that there was a *raison d'être* for a continuation, that Swift needed to consider an extension of the parable in which to exercise his sardonic wit on the later fortunes of the Reformation, its ups and downs in its progress across England *and* Europe throughout the seventeenth century. The *Complete Key* drives this point home in the remark that *A Tale of a Tub* was “intended to couch the general History of Christianity; shewing the rise of all the remarkable Errors of the *Roman Church*; in the same order they enter'd, and how the Reformation endeavour'd to root 'em out again, with the different Temper of *Luther* from *Calvin* (and those more violent Spirits) in the way of his Reforming ... and withal so particular, that he thought not to pass by the Rise of any one single Error or its Reformation.”⁴⁶ It is for this reason that “*The History of Martin*,” the most important of the three hitherto neglected or dismissed pieces, takes the story up to the moment of writing, including the discomfiture of the Nonjurors during the reign of William III, James II's abortive attempt to renew his claim to the English throne, and the subsequent military events in Ireland (see pp. 7-8).

The fact that, in the published version of 1704, there was a gap in the narrative pattern is undeniable. Both Peter and Jack are accorded extended treatment in the *Tale*, Peter in Section IV (*Prose Works*, I, 65-76) and Jack in Sections VI and XI (*Prose Works*, I, 83-89, 120-31). Martin begins to assume an identity of his own in Section VI, but his name is dropped almost at the same moment with the observation, “And this is the nearest Account I have been able to collect, of *Martin's* Proceedings upon this great Revolution” (*Prose Works*, I, 85). He is taken up again only in two brief

⁴⁶ *A Complete Key to the “Tale of a Tub”* (London: Edmund Curll, 1710, reprinted Menston, Yorkshire: The Scholar Press, 1970), pp. 3-4; quoted in The Booksellers Advertisement, in *Miscellaneous Works, Comical and Diverting*, pp. vii-viii.

sentences at the very end of the *Tale* (*Prose Works*, I, 131). Indeed, Martin is conspicuously absent throughout, and it is therefore natural to expect that Swift should at some stage have made an attempt to fit him as a more equal character into the story. Given the fact that it took Swift a decade or so to beat the published volume of 1704 into shape, it is more than probable that, in this taxing and laborious formation period, some parts should have been reshaped and rearranged as well as altered and dropped.

At the same time, Swift seems to have had second thoughts about Martin; perhaps, he even needed to have second thoughts about this flawed representative of his own church. In the Apology added to the fifth edition of the *Tale*, he had paid the Church of England a backhanded compliment, claiming that the *Tale* celebrated “*the Church of England as the most perfect of all others in Discipline and Doctrine*” (*Prose Works*, I, 2). “*The most perfect of all others*” means that the Established Church was only *relatively* perfect, “*more perfect*” than other churches, but not *absolutely* perfect. Had it been absolutely perfect, it might not have been conducive to furnishing “numerous and gross Corruptions in Religion” as “*Matter for a Satyr*” (*Prose Works*, I, 1). It is for this reason that Martin, the representative of the Church of England (*Prose Works*, I, 84), is the weakest of the three brothers in the *Tale*. Swift made Martin’s character weak because Martin had a role to play in the satiric programme he had set out to write in the *Tale*. Being expected to personify, or imply, “a virtue which [Swift] desired to recommend,”⁴⁷ Martin is a failure as he does not represent any virtue. The claim that Swift “was clearly protesting his orthodoxy ... not playing the critic”⁴⁸ misses the point. Not only did “that great and famous *Rupture*” (*Prose Works*, I, 74) in the history of the Christian church, the Reformation, not initiate a reform in the post-Reformation history of the churches represented by Peter and Jack; it also had had no distinctive effect on the Established Church. In Swift’s satirical strategy, then, Martin had to remain

⁴⁷ Ehrenpreis, *Mr Swift*, p. 188.

⁴⁸ Philip Pinkus, *Swift’s Vision of Evil: A Comparative Study of “A Tale of a Tub” and “Gulliver’s Travels”*, 2 vols (University of Victoria, British Columbia, 1975), I, 27.

an inconspicuous, shady character, and it is for this reason presumably that Swift never elaborated “The History of Martin.” To that extent, it is indicative of a change in thinking, an alteration of plan, a trimming of the sails. As Thomas Johnson, or his editor, although finding “The History of Martin” “not at all inferior,” wisely suspected, “prudential considerations” had hindered its earlier publication.⁴⁹

The discarded material also bears some resemblance to Swift’s canonical work, and this perhaps makes it easier to accept the publisher’s account of its origin. Between the published texts of 1704 and that of *Gulliver’s Travels* in 1726, there are two instances of duplicated material, which link the works to their author in a special sense.⁵⁰ In some of the Additions to 1720, similar correspondences may be found with Swift’s other writings. “*The History of Martin*” particularly chimes with Swift’s well-documented views and attitudes, such as his inveterate hostility towards Henry VIII and the Scots;⁵¹ it also reflects his impressive historical erudition largely resulting from the historiographical works he studied, and “abstracted,” during his great reading period at Moor Park in 1697/8.⁵² Both the “Digression” and “A Project,” too, suggest a number of verbal parallels.

⁴⁹ The Booksellers Advertisement, in *Miscellaneous Works, Comical and Diverting*, p. v.

⁵⁰ For the first, see GUTHKELCH AND NICHOL SMITH and Richard Porson’s deduction (p. 70n5). The second instance is from *The Battle of the Books*: “The Champions of each side should be coupled together ... that like the blending of contrary Poysons, their Malignity might be employ’d among themselves” (p. □) may be compared with *Gulliver’s Travels*: “Two nice Operators saw off the Occiput of each Couple ... in such a Manner that the Brain may be equally divided ...that the two half Brains being left to debate the Matter ... within the Space of one Scull” (*Prose Works*, XI, 189 [III, vi, 6]).

⁵¹ See, among others, Dirk F. Passmann and Heinz J. Vienken, “‘That ‘Hellish Dog of a King’: Jonathan Swift and Henry VIII,” *Henry VIII: In History, Historiography, and Literature*, ed. Uwe Baumann (Frankfurt on Main: Peter Lang, 1992), pp. 241-79, and Christopher Fox, “Swift’s Scotophobia,” *Bullán: An Irish Studies Journal*, 6, no 2 (2002), 43-65.

⁵² REAL (1978), pp. 25-28, 128-32.

“*A Digression on the nature usefulness & necessity of Wars & Quarels*” is set down in note form. It is clear from Swift’s correspondence that he jotted preliminary ideas down in the form of notes, which he later developed and expanded. He called these “hints,” fruitful, happy thoughts “owing as much to good Fortune as to Invention,” he told Gay later in life.⁵³ Sometimes, they were phrases merely; sometimes, terse but grammatically complete sentences. In dealing with Sir William Temple’s manuscripts, Swift even went as far as to print two of Temple’s incomplete works, which were left in the form of “Heads, Designed for an Essay upon the Different Conditions of Life and Fortune.” In explaining the reason for this decision in *The Publisher to the Reader*, Swift not only paid his former employer and patron a pretty compliment, he also spelled out why “hints” were valuable and important: “I believe there are few who will not be content to see even the First Draughts of any thing from this Author’s Hand.”⁵⁴ Heads, or hints, afforded a vista of the creative work *in statu nascendi*.

The Digression’s relevance to the antiwar criticism in both *The Conduct of the Allies* and *Gulliver’s Travels* (IV, v, 3) is most obvious.⁵⁵ Here, a memorable sentence from the Digression is used again, with italics for emphasis, in the later: “War is an attempt to take by violence from others a part of what they have & we want” (p. 6, 7-8) is echoed by “Sometimes our Neighbours *want* the *Things* which we *have*, or *have* the *Things* which we

⁵³ *Correspondence*, ed. Woolley, III, 603-4, 429.

⁵⁴ Preface to Temple’s *Miscellanea: The Third Part*, ed. Hermann J. Real, with the assistance of Kirsten Juhas, Dirk. F. Passmann, and Sandra Simon (Online.Swift/Ehrenpreis Centre for Swift Studies, Münster, October 2011) [<http://www.anglistik.uni-muenster.de/Swift/online.swift/works/temples/miscellanea>], p. 7.

⁵⁵ Angus Ross, “‘The Grand Question Debated’: Swift on Peace and War,” *Swift, the Enigmatic Dean*, pp. 247-60; Ian Simpson Ross, “Satire on Warmongers in *Gulliver’s Travels*, Books One and Two,” *The Perennial Satirist: Essays in Honour of Bernfried Nugel, Presented on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday*, eds Peter E. Firchow and Hermann J. Real (Münster: LIT, 2005), pp. 49-65. This essay lists all pertinent studies on the subject.

want,”⁵⁶ and so is the catch phrase, “War, Famine & Pestilence”: “It is a very justifiable Cause of War to invade a Country,” Gulliver explains, “after the People have been wasted by Famine, [and] destroyed by Pestilence.”⁵⁷ The diction throughout “A Digression” is familiar and loaded pejoratively, too: “Brutes,” “mean men,” “great ones,” “Grandeur & Heroism,” “modern noble or stronger appetites,” “excellency of human nature” (pp. 6-7). “Brutes” draws in Swift’s lifelong preoccupation with *le mythe animal*, which found expression in *Gulliver’s Travels* at some length (IV, iii). Swift likewise utilized the commonplace comparison between the human, or natural, body and the body politic on a number of occasions, before and after.⁵⁸ Detested professions – lawyers and judges, physicians and soldiers – recur in *Gulliver* (IV, v) and “The Beasts’ Confession to the Priest,”⁵⁹ and in the Additions, lists often trail off into “&c.” (p. 8, l. 25), as they did, for example, in *Resolutions 1699*. Finally, the last two sentences of “A Digression” are very much in Swift’s manner (p. 7, ll. 9-12).

“A Project, *For the universal benefit of Mankind*,” also in note form and equally eloquent as well as amusing within its brief scope, likewise displays a number of characteristic features.⁶⁰ For one thing, it evinces Swift’s fascination with *Terra Australis incognita*, referred to twice in the *Tale* (*Prose Works*, I, facing p. 1; 66). For another, it anticipates the modality of another mock subscription proposal years later in the Advertisement for “The Author’s Critical History of his own Times,” first published in Faulkner’s *Dublin Journal* (18-21 March 1731/2).⁶¹ In the first instance,

⁵⁶ *Prose Works*, XI, 246 (IV, v, 4).

⁵⁷ *Prose Works*, XI, 246 (IV, v, 4).

⁵⁸ *A Discourse of the Contests and Dissensions*, in *Prose Works*, I, 193-97, and *Gulliver’s Travels*, in *Prose Works*, XI, 187 (III, vi, 2).

⁵⁹ *Poems*, ed. Williams, II, 599-608, ll. 79-92, 113-40.

⁶⁰ This has the character of a satirical leitmotif in Swift: “Universal Improvement of Mankind” (*A Tale*, title page), “universal Benefit of Human kind” and “universal Benefit of Mankind” (*Prose Works*, I, 114, 117).

⁶¹ *Prose Works*, V, 346-47.

however, “A Project, *For the universal benefit of Mankind*” is connected with the themes of the *Tale*’s Section IX (pp. 9-10).

The final fragment, which features as “*A Description of the Kingdom of Absurdities*” in the list of “Treatises wrote by the same Author” preceding the *Tale*, has an even better pedigree. It first appeared in the “Biographical Anecdotes” of John Nichols’s *Supplement to Dr Swift’s Works*.⁶² Nichols presented this information as an addendum to “An Account of the Life of the Reverend Jonathan Swift, D.D.” by the editor, John Hawkesworth;⁶³ a convenient arrangement since most of it derived from the Revd Dr John Lyon’s (1702-90) marginal annotations in his own copy of Hawkesworth’s *Life*.⁶⁴ Commenting on the statement that “during this time” (Swift’s three last years at Trinity College, Dublin), “he also drew the first sketch of his *Tale of a Tub*,”⁶⁵ Lyon added: “He wrote also an Acc^t of y^e Kingdom of Absurditys at y^e same time, as appears from some sketches of it in his own hand”⁶⁶ – “In y^e early Editions of y^e Tale of a Tub such a Tract is mentioned as intended by y^e anonymous Author.”⁶⁷ From Lyon’s use of the spelling “Absurditys,” it seems possible that he had the manuscript before him, but even if he did, he

⁶² *A Supplement to Dr Swift’s Works*, I, xix (TEERINK AND SCOUTEN 90).

⁶³ HAWKESWORTH, I, 1-76.

⁶⁴ Lyon’s annotated copy of John Hawkesworth’s *Life of the Revd. Jonathan Swift, D.D.* (Dublin: S. Cotter, 1755) (TEERINK AND SCOUTEN 1344). Sarah Cotter’s was the only separate printing of this work. In London, the *Life* appeared as part of Volume I of Hawkesworth’s edition of Swift’s *Works*, first published earlier in 1755. Lyon’s copy is in the National Art Reference Library, Victoria and Albert Museum, South Kensington, today (shelfmark 48.D.39) (A. C. Elias, Jr, “Swift’s *Don Quixote*, Dunkin’s *Virgil Travesty*, and Other New Intelligence: John Lyon’s ‘Materials for a Life of Dr. Swift,’ 1765,” *Swift Studies*, 13 [1998], 27-104 [p. 28n1]).

⁶⁵ HAWKESWORTH, I, 7.

⁶⁶ GUTHKELCH AND NICHOL SMITH, p. 351.

⁶⁷ See *The Works of the Rev. Jonathan Swift, D.D., Dean of St Patrick’s, Dublin*, 24 vols (London: J. Johnson, *et al.*, 1803), I, 84: “In the ‘Tale of a Tub’ such a tract is mentioned, as intended by the same author. N.”

omitted to transcribe the text.⁶⁸ In 1779, Nichols printed Lyon's two sentences, and interpolated the text of Swift's sketches without explanation. He in fact had Lyon's copy of Hawkesworth's *Life* in his possession for some time, securing Swift's text of "The Kingdom of Absurdities" directly, or through an intermediary, either from Lyon in Dublin, or from Deane Swift in Worcester. In a letter to the *Gentleman's Magazine* signed "J. N." and dated "*Red-Lion Passage*, Nov. 18, 1778," Nichols says of "The Kingdom of Absurdities": "I have a few slight sketches, copied from his own hand, intended for that 'Account.'"⁶⁹

⁶⁸ Forster Collection, MS 579, p. 15 (*Forster Collection: A Catalogue of the Paintings, Manuscripts, Autograph Letters, Pamphlets, etc.* [London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1893], p. 53).

⁶⁹ *The Gentleman's Magazine*, 48 (1778), 521-23 (p. 522).

The Reception of *Additions to A Tale of a Tub*⁷⁰

Van Effen, Justus. “Extrait, Sommaire, ou Abregé de ce qui suit dans le Manuscript, après la Section IX.” *Le Conte du Tonneau ... traduit de l’Anglois*, 2 vols (in one) (The Hague: Henri Scheurleer, 1721), I, 236-49 [without “A Project, *For the universal benefit of Mankind*” and *A Description of the Kingdom of Absurdities*”].

Van Effen, Justus. “Extrait, sommaire ou abrégé de ce qui suit dans le manuscrit, après la section IX.” *Le Conte du Tonneau*, 3 vols (Lausanne et Geneve: Marc-Mich. Bousquet, 1756), I, 236-49 [without “A Project, *For the universal benefit of Mankind*” and *A Description of the Kingdom of Absurdities*”].

Van Effen, Justus. “Extrait, Sommaire, ou Abbregé de ce qui suit dans le Manuscrit, après la Section IX.” *Le Conte du Tonneau*, 3 vols (The Hague: Henri Scheurleer, 1757), I, 234-47 [without “A Project, *For the universal benefit of Mankind*” and *A Description of the Kingdom of Absurdities*”].

Wolf, Georg Christian. “Auszug, Summe oder kurtzer Begriff dessen, was nach der neunten Abtheilung im Manuscript folget.” *Des berühmten Herrn D. Swifts Märhen von der Tonne*, 2 vols (in one) (Altona: auf Kosten guter Freunde, 1729), I, 196-206 [without “A Project, *For the universal benefit of Mankind*” and *A Description of the Kingdom of Absurdities*”].

⁷⁰ This bibliography records only the holdings of the Ehrenpreis Centre; it does not pretend to be complete.