

An Apology For the &c.

Commentary

p. 1:

AN APOLOGY *For the, &c.* - Headnote] It is tempting to read the Apology as Swift's *Apologia pro satira sua* (Miriam Kosh Starkman, *Swift's Satire on Learning in "A Tale of a Tub"* [Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1950], pp. 11-12), but any such assumption is misleading. The 'Satirist's Apologia' is a distinct subtype of satire with generic conventions of its own, of which Swift was well aware from his reading of Horace (*Satyrae*, in *Quintus Horatius Flaccus*, ed. Daniel Heinsius [Leiden: Elzevir, 1628], pp. 152-54 [II, i]), Persius (*Satyrae*, in *Avli Persii Flacci Satyrarvm liber vnvs*, ed. Joseph Lang [Freiburg: Johannes Maximilian Helmlin, 1608], pp. 2-6 [I]), and Juvenal (*Satyrae*, in *Decii Ivnii Iuuenalis Satyrae omnes*, ed. Joseph Lang [Freiburg: Johannes Maximilian Helmlin, 1608], pp. 2-6 [I] [PASSMANN AND VIENKEN II, 905-6, 999]). The most significant of these features is "the device of a conversation between [the satirist] and an interlocutor," who "speaks of the animosity which the satirist inevitably arouses toward himself gives warning that the satirist runs the risk of incurring the disfavour of his influential friends or faces even graver dangers, and urges the poet to turn his attention to some other field of literature." The satirists' replies to these appeals are essentially the same, emphasizing an "irresistible impulse to speak out," provoked by a sense of moral outrage and buttressed by the example of illustrious predecessors (Lucius Rogers Shero, "The Satirist's *Apologia*," *University of Wisconsin Studies in Language and Literature*, no 15, Classical Studies, ser. 2 [Madison, 1922], pp. 148-67 [154-55, 163]; see also P. K. Elkin, *The Augustan Defence of Satire* [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973], pp. 100-11). All of this is conspicuously absent from the Apology, except that Swift by invoking an 'apology' pays "lip service to the form" (Raymond A. Anselment, "*Betwixt Jest and Earnest': Marprelate, Milton, Marvell, Swift & the Decorum of Religious Ridicule*" [Toronto, Buffalo, London: University of Toronto Press, 1979], p. 136). Instead, it is more appropriately described as an 'explanatory' introduction, whose "ever-present tonal ambiguity," its "bewildering mixture of fact and fiction," modulates from serious factuality to teasing parody to downright aggression, it warns and threatens at the same time, suggesting very

early on that Swift the author of the *Tale* and his Apologist “are not of identical minds” (Raymond A. Anselment, “*A Tale of a Tub*: Swift and the ‘Men of Tast,’” *The Huntington Library Quarterly*, 37 [1974], 265-82 [p. 267 and n4]; Philip Pinkus, *Swift’s Vision of Evil, I: “A Tale of a Tub”* [University of Victoria, British Columbia, 1975], p. 27; Robert M. Philmus, “Andrew Marvell, Samuel Parker, and *A Tale of a Tub*,” *Swift Studies*, 14 [1999], 71-98 [p. 74]; Howard D. Weinbrot, *Menippean Satire Reconsidered: From Antiquity to the Eighteenth Century* [Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2005], p. 121). On the other hand, it is questionable that the Apologist, who is manifestly not a Grub Street hack, should be identical with “the persona of the Tale-teller” (Kate Loveman, *Reading Fictions, 1660-1740: Deception in English Literary and Political Culture* [Aldershot, Hampshire: Ashgate, 2008], pp. 155-56).

In his annotated copy of GUTHKELCH AND NICHOL SMITH, Ehrenpreis usefully suggests to compare the Apology with the Eleventh Letter of Pascal’s pseudonymous *Lettres provinciales* ([EC 431], p. 3), a series of eighteen letters written to defend Pascal’s friend Antoine Arnauld against Jesuit casuistry, the ‘Cologne’ 1669 edition of which was in Swift’s library (PASSMANN AND VIENKEN II, 1382). While generically and stylistically the similarities between Pascal and Swift seem rather remote, the two men are united in their convictions, first, that “laughter at religion has to be distinguished from laughter at those who profane religion with their extravagant opinions [il y a bien de la difference entre rire de la Religion, & rire de ceux qui la profanent par leurs opinions extravagantes],” and, second, that laughter and ridicule, mockery and irony may be adequate means of reclaiming men from their errors, being sanctioned as these means are by the example of God, the Prophets, and Christ themselves, and thus being not unworthy of Christians (*Les Provinciales: ou, les lettres écrites par Louis de Montalte*, 7th ed. [Cologne: Nicolas Schoute, 1669], pp. 204-28 [206]).

For the, &c.] Possibly because “&c.” is generally shorthand for unpleasant attributes, both sexual indelicacies and others (GORDON WILLIAMS I, 448-49), it became Swift’s secret code, used in communications with his publisher, “to avoid specifically naming his master-work” (*Correspondence*, ed. Woolley, I, 282 and n2; III, 526 and n11; see also *Journal to Stella*, ed. Williams, I, 47 and n50). Additionally, the “etc.” may here be intended as an ironical echo of the widespread controversy about the Oath which was “formulated by Convocation in 1640 to be taken by all clergy” and whereby “archbishops, bishops, deans, and

archdeacons, &c.” had to approve “the doctrine, discipline, and government of the Church of England” (“A Dialogue between Two Zealots upon the &c. in the Oath,” *The Poems of John Cleveland*, eds Brian Morris and Eleanor Withington [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967], pp. 4-5, 82-86; Heimo Ertl, *Die Scheinheiligen Heiligen: das Bild der Puritaner im Zerrspiegel satirischer und polemischer Literatur des 17. Jahrhunderts* [Frankfurt am Main and Bern: Peter and Herbert Lang, 1977], pp. 183-84). See also *Resolutions 1699*, 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/resolutions1699/>], gloss on [4].

p. 1, ll. 1-2 *IF good and ill Nature equally operated upon Mankind, I might have saved my self the Trouble of this Apology*] Swift’s Apologist is bent on mischief from the start, laying, in a tone of pretended, or playful, impatience, waste of time at the door of his ill-natured critics. This smacks more of counter-attack and retaliation than of apology, all the more so when it turns out that what is declared to be a formal defence, or self-justification for *past* errors, is in fact an ‘explanation’ “for the Satisfaction of future Readers” (p. 5, ll. 29-30) who, paradoxically, have not even seen the *Tale* by the time its ‘Apology’ is being written, and who, as a result, were unable to take offence. Appearances notwithstanding, Swift silences his critics by shrugging them off, thinking it “unnecessary to take any notice of such Treatises as have been writ against this ensuing Discourse,” the *Tale* (p. 5, ll. 30-31). This ‘argument’ is a first parody of Swift’s “Answerer,” William Wotton, who, in 1705, had claimed the same justification for himself: “You [the addressee, Anthony Hammond] know the true Reasons and Inducements of my Writing the *Reflexions* at first; I cannot think it needed any Apology then, and so I do not write this Letter as an Apology now” (William Wotton, *A Defense of the Reflections upon Ancient and Modern Learning ... with Observations upon “The Tale of a Tub”* [London: Tim. Goodwin 1705], p. 540).

p. 1, ll. 3-6 *for it is manifest by the Reception the following Discourse hath met with, that those who approve it, are a great Majority among the Men of Taste*] While that may not be an exaggeration, few contemporary judgements have

survived in writing. An exception is Francis Atterbury, Dean of Carlisle in 1704, who, in a letter not published before 1784, praised the *Tale* “as an original in it’s kind, full of wit, humour, good sense, and learning” that “the town [was] wonderfully pleased with.” At the same time, Atterbury conceded that the *Tale*’s success was rather a *succès de scandale*, warning that the author “hath reason to conceal himself, because of the prophane strokes in that piece, which would do his reputation and interest in the world more harm than the wit can do him good” (*Swift: The Critical Heritage*, ed. Kathleen Williams [London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1970], p. 36). In 1716, Sir Richard Blackmore complained that the author of the *Tale*, whom he characterized as “this impious Buffoon,” not only escaped “Affronts and the Effects of publick Resentment,” but was also “caress’d and patroniz’d by Persons of great Figure and of all Denominations” (*Essay upon Wit* [1716], Augustan Reprint Society, ser. 1, no 1 [1946], p. 217). It seems more than likely that Swift would have taken notice of these orally transmitted responses during his London stay from November 1707 to June 1709 (Ehrenpreis, *Dr Swift*, pp. 195-349).

p. 1, ll. 6-7 *yet there have been two or three Treatises written expressly against it*
 William Wotton, *A Defense of the Reflections upon Ancient and Modern Learning ... with Observations upon “The Tale of a Tub”*, printed both separately and as part of the third edition of Wotton’s *Reflections upon Ancient and Modern Learning* ([London: Tim. Goodwin, 1705] [TEERINK AND SCOUTEN 223]; A. T. Bartholomew and J. W. Clark, *Richard Bentley, D.D.: A Bibliography of his Works and of All the Literature Called Forth by his Acts or his Writings* [Cambridge: Bowes and Bowes, 1908], p. 40 [*133]); William King, *Some Remarks on “The Tale of a Tub”* ([London: A. Baldwin, 1704] [TEERINK AND SCOUTEN 834]), published on 10 June (Stephen Karian, “Edmund Curll and the Circulation of Swift’s Writings,” *Reading Swift* [2008], pp. 99-129 [111]). As Ehrenpreis notes in his annotated copy of the *Tale* (GUTHKELCH AND NICHOL SMITH [EC 431], p. 3), later broadsides would be fired from Daniel Defoe (*The Consolidator* [1705], The Stoke Newington Daniel Defoe Edition, eds Michael Seidel, et al. [New York: AMS, 2001], pp. 14, 179), Sir Richard Blackmore (*Essay upon Wit* [1716], pp. 217-18) and the Earl of Shaftesbury, among others (Anselment, “*Betwixt Jest and Earnest’: Marprelate, Milton, Marvell, Swift & the Decorum of Religious Ridicule*, pp. 157-58).

p. 1, ll. 7-8 *besides many others that have flirted at it occasionally*] *Flirt*, “To propel or throw with a jerk or sudden movement” (OED), the usual meaning in Swift (*Poems*, ed. Williams, I, 137, l. 20; 219, l. 110; II, 364, l. 38). It is doubtful whether *The Tale of a Tub, Revers’d* (1705), a free adaptation of Furetière’s *Nouvelle allégorique* of 1658 (A. C. Guthkelch, “*The Tale of a Tub, Revers’d* and *Characters and Criticisms upon the Ancient and Modern Orators, etc.*,” *The Library*, 3rd ser., 4 [1913], 270-84), may justly be described as a “flirt” (GUTHKELCH AND NICHOL SMITH, p. 3n2). Other candidates reflecting on the *Tale* in a hostile manner were Defoe in the *Consolidator* (London: B. Bragge, 1705), Tom D’Urfey in *An Essay towards the Theory of the Intelligible World* of [1705], and Charles Gildon in *The Golden Spy* (London: J. Woodward and J. Morphew, 1709) (ELLIS, p. 226). For a more complete list of “Criticism, Imitations, &c.” see TEERINK SCOUTEN 997-1014A.

p. 1, ll. 8-9 *without one Syllable having been ever published in its Defence, or even Quotation to its Advantage, that I can remember*] In June 1709, or possibly a year earlier when Swift embarked on the Apology, this statement was correct. While it may be true that Swift was given to understand that “the town [was] wonderfully pleased with [the *Tale*]” (see gloss on ll. 3-6), it is equally true that there had been no *published* defence: “Here is one pose of the extreme Juvenalian, or apocalyptic, or severe Menippean satirist: a brave lonely figure fights against enormous odds to preserve virtue in distress” (Weinbrot, *Menippean Satire Reconsidered: From Antiquity to the Eighteenth Century*, p. 122).

p. 1, ll. 10-11 *except by the Polite Author of a late Discourse between a Deist and a Socinian*] Swift alludes to Francis Gastrell (1662-1725), the future Bishop of Chester, whom he befriended in 1711 (*Journal to Stella*, ed. Williams, I, 296n10; II, 377-78), who had published *The Principles of Deism Truly Represented and Set in a Clear Light: In Two Dialogues between a Sceptick and a Deist* (London: John Morphew, 1708) before they met, and who had paid Swift the compliment of being “an Ingenious Author” (p. 54).

Deist] Both ‘Socinian’ and ‘Deism’ are terms of denunciation in religious and philosophical controversy of the second half of the seventeenth century.

Although its semantic spectrum is elusive and Deism failed to develop a coherent system of its own (Karl-Josef Walber, *Charles Blount (1654-1693), Frühaufklärer: Leben und Werk* [Frankfurt and New York: Peter Lang, 1988], pp. 237-62), in polemical usage, the term tended to be considered a camouflage for the even more disreputable contemporary attitude towards atheism, as becomes clear, for example, in Richard Bentley's first Boyle Lecture, *The Folly of Atheism, and (what is now called) Deism* (1692): "There are some infidels among us that not only disbelieve the *Christian* religion, but oppose the assertions of *Providence*, of the *immortality* of the soul, of an universal *judgment* to come, and of any *incorporeal* essence; and yet, to avoid the odious name of *Atheists*, would shelter and screen themselves under a new one of *Deists*, which is not quite so obnoxious" (*The Works*, ed. Alexander Dyce, 3 vols [Hildesheim and New York: Georg Olms, 1971 [1836-38], III, 1-26 [p. 4]; for further sources, see, in addition to Walber, *Charles Blount (1654-1693), Frühaufklärer*, pp. 237-62, Hermann J. Real "An horrid Vision': Jonathan Swift's '(On) the Day of Judgement,'" *Swift and his Contexts*, eds John Irwin Fisher, Hermann J. Real, and James Woolley [New York: AMS 1989], pp. 65-96 [77-79]). Swift had his share in disseminating this hostile stance in his sermon "On the Trinity," in which he elaborated his "fundamental opposition" towards the movement, particularly with regard to the nature of Faith (*Prose Works*, IX, 108-9).

Socinian] Socinianism, in the second half of the seventeenth century, was associated with the 'heresy' of two Italian theologians, Lelio Francesco Maria Sozini (1525-62), and his nephew, Fausto Paolo Sozzini (1539-1604), the most marked characteristic of whose doctrine was its Unitarianism, which rejected the doctrines of the Trinity and the Divinity of Christ (ODCC, pp. 1285, 1409). "They deny the eternal Divinity of the second Person of the Blessed Trinity," Thomas Blount stated laconically in his *Glossographia* of 1656 (BLOUNT, s.v.). A more detailed and informative account of the Socinian "Delusions" was available to Swift in Moréri's *Dictionary*, to which he subscribed in 1694: "*Faustus Socinus* held, *That the Arians had given too much to Jesus Christ*, asserting that *he was meer Man, had no Existence before Mary*, denied openly the *Pre-existence of the Word*, denied that the *Holy Ghost was a distinct Person*, and maintained, that the *Father alone was truly and properly God, exclusive of the Son and Holy Ghost*, alledging, that the *Name of God given to Jesus Christ in the Scriptures signifies no more than that he hath sovereign Power over all Creatures*" (MORÉRI s.v.). During

the late seventeenth-century debate known as the Socinian Controversy, anti-Trinitarian Socinianism was widely decried as “a step towards conversion to Islam,” aligned as Islam’s “spiritual forebear,” Mahomet, was with the ‘heretical’ theology and eschatology of the Sects, such as Familists, Anabaptists, and Quakers (Dirk F. Passmann, “The Dean and the Turk: Jonathan Swift, ‘Mahometanism,’ and Religious Controversy before *Discourse concerning the Mechanical Operation of the Spirit*,” *Swift Studies*, 22 [2007], 113-145 [pp. 129-41]).

p. 1, ll. 12-13 *since the Book seems calculated to live at least as long as our Language, and our Tast admit no great Alterations*] A self-ironical praise inasmuch as the *Tale*, implicitly, is granted but a very short lifespan. In his contribution to Steele’s *Tatler*; no 230, Swift deplored the flux of the English language, arguing that these “Alterations” had already set in: “These Two Evils, Ignorance and Want of Tast, have produced a Third; I mean the continual Corruption of our *English Tongue*” (*The Tatler*, ed. Donald F. Bond, 3 vols [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987], III, 190-96 [p. 191]; *Prose Works*, IV, 232). In his annotated copy of GUTHKELCH AND NICHOL SMITH (EC 431), Ehrenpreis suggests that Swift’s phrasing may have influenced that of Pope in the Advertisement to the *Dunciad Variorum*: “*Of the Persons it was judg’d proper to give some account: for sins it is only in this monument that they must expect to survive (and here survive they will, as long as the English tongue shall remain such as it was in the reigns of Queen ANNE and King GEORGE)*” (*The Dunciad*, ed. James Sutherland, 3rd ed. [London: Methuen, and New Haven: Yale University Press, 1963], p. 8).

p. 1, ll. 15-16 *The greatest Part of that Book was finished above thirteen Years since, 1696*] Since the Apology is signed “June 3, 1709” (p. 14, l. 14), the *Tale*’s composition is generally placed in, or around, 1696 and 1697: “It is difficult to see why [Swift] should have given these dates if the book was not written then,” Swift’s editors have ruled (GUTHKELCH AND NICHOL SMITH, p. xliii). But the case is not as simple and straightforward as that, some degree of mystification creeping in early in the Apology. It is by no means clear to what part of the *Tale* “*the greatest Part of that Book*” refers, tempting though it may be to suppose that Swift was hinting at the religious allegory. At the same time, he emphasized that “the greatest Part of that Book was *finished*,” not that it was “*written*,” in 1696. In other

words, writing could have begun earlier, but it is unknown how much earlier. It seems safe to suggest that Swift was not in holy orders when he first embarked on his project (GUTHKELCH AND NICHOL SMITH, p. 4n1). At the earliest, the beginnings are likely to have coincided with the period of intensive specialized study, 1692-94, preparatory to Swift's ordination on 13 January 1694/5, and may have continued beyond and well into his year at Kilroot (*Prose Works*, I, xvi). But then, it is doubtful whether Swift would have found circumstances in this run-down parish with its hostile Presbyterian atmosphere congenial to his work. It is true that he did meet cultured people worth knowing there, but he also needed to borrow books (*Correspondence*, ed. Woolley, I, 137 and n1; see also Ehrenpreis, *Mr Swift*, pp. 157-65), and there was nothing in the vicinity that remotely resembled Sir William Temple's (presumably well-stocked) library at Moor Park. Swift returned to Moor Park some time in the spring of 1696, presumably June, and shortly after seems to have resumed his customarily avid reading (REAL [1978], pp. 26-27, 128-32). This spell lasted well into 1697/8, some of it clearly spilling over into the *Tale* (see also the gloss on p. 1, ll. 17-18). All of this tends to cast doubt on 1696 as the end of composition.

p. 1, ll. 16 *which is eight Years before it was published* | *A Tale of a Tub* was published on 10 May 1704 (*The Daily Courant*, 10 May 1704); there was a pre-publication newspaper advertisement the day before (*The Post-Man*, 9 May 1704). Certainly, Swift was not heeding Horace's advice, in *De arte poetica* (l. 388), "to keep one's work for nine years" before publication (ELLIS, p. 227). For the reasons delaying publication, see Textual History, *A Tale of a Tub* (Online.Swift, forthcoming).

p. 1, ll. 17-18 *The Author was then young, his Invention at the Height, and his Reading fresh in his Head* | Some of Swift's most learned and perceptive readers have argued that the particular doctrinal bias evident in the religious allegory points to the period of intensive specialized study, 1692-94, preparatory to Swift's ordination in January 1694/5 (Phillip Harth, *Swift and Anglican Rationalism: The Religious Background of "A Tale of a Tub"* [Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1961], pp. 154-64). While this view is undoubtedly correct, it needs modifying, all the more so since the *Tale* is said to have been finished "eight Years" before publication (p. 1, l. 16). That date points towards

Swift's return to Moor Park some time in the spring of 1696, presumably June (Ehrenpreis, *Mr Swift*, pp. 169-71; *Correspondence*, ed. Woolley, I, 127-28n). The return was soon to be followed by the resumption of his omnivorous reading habits, in January 1696/7 (REAL [1978], pp. 128-32). An account of this, according to Sheridan in Swift's own hand (*The Life of the Rev. Dr. Jonathan Swift* [Dublin: Luke White, 1785], p. 22n*), was inserted in John Lyon's copy of Hawkesworth's *Life of the Revd. Jonathan Swift, D.D., Dean of St. Patrick's, Dublin* (Dublin: S. Cotter, 1755), in the National Art Library, Victoria and Albert Museum, South Kensington, today (shelfmark 48.D.39; see 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]).

In fact, there is evidence that Swift's most intense reading set in earlier than 1696/7. His biographer Patrick Delany affirms that, after his having taken the Oxford M.A. (5 July 1692) and his subsequent return to Moor Park, Swift "studied at least eight hours a day, one with another, for seven years," laying "a large and solid foundation of classick, and other learning" (*Observations upon Lord Orrery's Remarks on the Life and Writings of Dr. Jonathan Swift* [London: W. Reeve and A. Linde, 1754], p. 50; for Swift's interests in specific subjects and authors, see two essays by Heinz J. Vienken, "Jonathan Swift's Library, his Reading, and his Critics," *Walking Naboth's Vineyard: New Studies of Swift*, eds Christopher Fox and Brenda Tooley [Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1995], pp. 154-63; "Nobody has ever written a really good book about Jonathan Swift: Scouring the Recesses of the Swiftian Mind," *Reading Swift* [2003], pp. 147-57). More precisely, Swift's interest in theology and church history never stopped after 1695. Not only did he continue to study bulky ecclesiastical historians like Pietro Soave, better known as Father Sarpi (*History of the Council of Trent*, trans. Sir Nathanael Brent [London: J. Macock for Samuel Mearne, *et al.*, 1676 [PASSMANN AND VIENKEN III, 1704-5]), and Gilbert Burnet (*The History of the Reformation of the Church of England*, whose first two volumes were published in 1679 and 1681, with a second edition, also in two volumes, coming out in 1681 [London: Richard Chiswell]; see Brean S. Hammond, "Swift's Reading," *Reading Swift* [2003], pp. 133-46), he also took "copious extracts" from Fathers of the Church, such as St Cyprian and St Irenaeus, throughout 1697 and especially at the end of that year (Deane Swift, *An Essay upon the Life, Writings, and Character, of Dr. Jonathan Swift* [London: Charles

Bathurst, 1755], pp. 274-75), at the very time he was presumably engaged not only with the *Tale* but also the *Discourse's* thematically related 'History of Fanaticism' (J. R. Crider, "Dissenting Sex: Swift's 'History of Fanaticism,'" *Studies in English Literature*, 18 [1978], 491-508). It is hard to imagine that all these materials which Swift was so busy reading, annotating, and abstracting did not feed into a satire as erudite as that of the *Tale of a Tub* some way or another. Indeed, "the *Tale* shows traces of many books which he read in 1697 and 1698" (Ehrenpreis, *Mr Swift*, p. 187).

Besides, it is crucial to bear in mind that *A Tale of a Tub* not only consists of the religious allegory but also of substantial Preliminaries, some admittedly of a later date, as well as five Digressions. The Digressions bear more immediately on issues related to the Quarrel of the Ancients and the Moderns (Starkman, *Swift's Satire on Learning in "A Tale of a Tub"*; Ehrenpreis, *Mr Swift*, p. 187). This controversy first flared up in 1690, and again in 1694/5, but it peaked in 1698 and 1699 (Introduction to *The Battle of the Books*, 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/battleofthebooks/>], pp. 3-16). The composition of the *whole* of Swift's first masterpiece, then, covered a span of several years, possibly the whole decade, with Swift working on it intermittently, even in circumstances as adverse and bleak as those at Kilroot, Swift's first impoverished parish in the north-east of Ireland, where he was installed in March/April 1695 (*Correspondence*, ed. Woolley, I, 136-39 and n1; Ehrenpreis, *Mr Swift*, pp. 157-65). This view is confirmed by Swift himself, later in the Apology, that "*his Discourse [was] the Product of the Study, the Observation, and the Invention of several Years*" (p. 6, ll. 20-21). By contrast, there is no evidence substantiating the old rumour, first spread by Deane Swift and endorsed by W. H. Dilworth shortly afterwards (*An Essay upon the Life, Writings, and Character, of Dr. Jonathan Swift*, pp. 31-32; *The Life of Dr. Jonathan Swift, Dean of Saint Patrick's, Dublin* [London: G. Wright, 1758], p. 26; see also *Prose Works*, I, ix), that a nineteen-year-old Jonathan showed the manuscript of *A Tale of a Tub*, or sketches of it, to William Waring, Jr, Jane Waring (Varina's) brother, who was Swift's almost exact contemporary at Trinity College (*Correspondence*, ed. Woolley, I, 128n2; Anselment, "*Betwixt Jest and*

Earnest': Marprelate, Milton, Marvell, Swift & the Decorum of Religious Ridicule, pp. 127, 188).

In 1697/8, at the age of thirty (Creighton Gilbert, “When Did a Man in the Renaissance Grow Old?” *Studies in the Renaissance*, 14 [1967], 7-32 [p. 12]), Swift would probably no longer have been considered young by his contemporaries but “*Invention*” would have been credited to (his) ‘youth’: “INVENTION is the Talent of Youth, and Judgment of Age; so that our Judgment grows harder to please, when we have fewer Things to offer it,” the old Dean noted in *Thoughts on Various Subjects* (1727), echoing a conviction he had found detailed at greater length in Bacon’s *Essayes*: “And yet the Invention of *Young Men*, is more lively, then that of Old: And Imaginations streame into their Mindes better, and, as it were, more Divinely ... *Young Men*, are Fitter to Invent, then to Judge; Fitter for Execution, then for Counsell ... *Men of Age*, Object too much, Consult too long, Adventure too little, Repent too soone, and seldom drive Businesse home to the full Period” (Sir Francis Bacon, “Of Youth and Age,” *The Essayes or Counsells, Civill and Morall*, ed. Michael Kiernan [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985], pp. 130-31 [PASSMANN AND VIENKEN I, 125-27]). See also Joseph Glanvill, *Scepsis Scientifica* ([London: by E. Cotes for Henry Eversden, 1665], sig. c4r-v), which Swift had read before March 1699 (*Correspondence*, ed. Woolley, I, 137 and n1), and *Thoughts on Various Subjects* (*Thoughts on Various Subjects*, ed. Hermann J. Real, with the assistance of Kirsten Juhas, Dirk F. Passmann, and Sandra Simon [Online.Swift/Ehrenpreis Centre for Swift Studies, Münster, November 2011] [<http://www.anglistik.uni-muenster.de/Swift/online.swift/works/varioussubjects/>], gloss on aphorism 49).

p. 1, ll. 18-20 *By the Assistance of some Thinking, and much Conversation, he had endeavour'd to Strip himself of as many real Prejudices as he could* A thought anticipated by the *Tale* (“For, I think it one of the greatest, and best of human Actions, to remove Prejudices, and place Things in their truest and fairest Light” [*Prose Works*, I, 101]) and resumed, with some variation, in *Thoughts on Various Subjects* and *The Sentiments of a Church-of-England Man* as well as in a letter to Thomas Tickell of September 1725 (*Prose Works*, I, 243; II, 11; see also gloss on p. 1, ll. 19-20). The suggestion, more recently been proposed by some annotators, that “real Prejudices” is indicative of “anti-clerical, Old Whig language” (Ian Higgins, *Swift’s Politics: A Study in Disaffection* [Cambridge:

Cambridge University Press, 1994], pp. 120-22; WALSH, p. 320) does not seem germane to a context which allegedly deals not with corruptions in politics but with those in religion, not to mention the fact that Swift never seems to have thought much of the distinctions between Whig and Tory if only because of the indeterminacy of the semantic spectrum (see *Correspondence*, ed. Woolley, II, 270-71, 290, 359).

Conversation] Swift is alluding not only to Sir William Temple but also to his distinguished visitors, among them, the Duke and Duchess of Somerset, Henry Sidney, Earl of Romney, and even King William III, who “visited his old Friend often at Sheen [and Moor Park], and took his advice” (*Prose Works*, V, 193; Ehrenpreis, *Mr Swift*, pp. 91-93, 102-6).

endeavour'd to Strip himself of as many real Prejudices] Having been sent to Kensington to present his patron's advice which King William had sought on a burning political issue, the young Jonathan recorded in his autobiographical fragment, “Family of Swift”: “This was the first time that Mr Swift had ever any converse with [Courts], and he told his friends it was the first incident that helped to cure him of vanity” (*Prose Works*, V, 194).

pp. 1-2, ll. 20-2. *I say real ones, because under the Notion of Prejudices, he knew to what dangerous Heights some Men have proceeded*] “The worst Evil is,” Swift told Thomas Tickell in September 1725, “that when ill Opinions are instilled into great Men, they never think it worth their while to be undeceived, and so a little Man is ruined without the least Tincture of Guilt. And therefore the last time I was in the World, I refused to deal with a chief Minister, till he promised me upon his Honor never to be influenced by any ill Story of me, till he told it me plainly, and heard my Defence” (*Correspondence*, ed. Woolley, II, 598-99 and n1). While in 1725 Swift may have thought of Lord Treasurer Harley, Secretary of State St John, and Sir Simon Harcourt, the Lord Keeper, it is not entirely clear whom he was having in mind in 1709. One likely candidate is Sir William Temple (*Journal to Stella*, ed. Williams, I, 230).

p. 2

p. 2, ll. 2-4 *he thought the numerous and gross Corruptions in Religion and Learning might furnish Matter for a Satyr*]

Satyr] By Swift's time, this spelling no longer mirrors the etymology of 'satire' as correctly disentangled by Isaac Casaubonus in 1605 (*De satyrica Graecorum poesi & Romanorum satira*, ed. Peter E. Medine [Delmar, New York: Scholar's Facsimiles, 1973]). Casaubonus refuted the traditional philological connection with Greek *satyros*, the satyr-play of the Old Comedy (J. W. Jolliffe, "Satyre: Satura: Satyros: A Study in Confusion," *Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance*, 18 [1956], 84-95; Robert C. Elliott, *The Power of Satire: Magic, Ritual, Art* [Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1960], pp. 102-4), deriving 'satire' instead from *satura (lanx)*, "a large dish or platter, full of many different kinds of fruits," sometimes spelled *satira*. Casaubonus later became Dryden's chief source of information in the *Discourse concerning Satire*, which Swift knew (*The Poems of John Dryden*, ed. James Kinsley, 4 vols [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1958], II, 621-22; IV, 2010; see also Helmut Castrop, *Die varronische Satire in England, 1660-1690: Studien zu Butler, Marvell und Dryden* [Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1983], pp. 46-74). Although Dryden consistently favoured the spelling *satire*, the old form *satyr* continued to survive into the early eighteenth century. Swift used both forms indistinguishably, but *satyr* is the preferred spelling throughout the *Tale*, as it was in Sir William Temple (*Sir William Temples Essays "Upon Ancient and Modern Learning" und "Of Poetry": eine historisch-kritische Ausgabe mit Einleitung und Kommentar*, ed. Martin Kämper [Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1995], pp. 58, 68). As a result, Swift here hardly intended to cast a slur on the deficiencies of the Hack's classical learning.

Swift's, or rather the Apologist's, open declaration for satire at this point is at variance with the Hack's assurance later in the *Tale* to intend "a Discourse without one grain of Satyr intermixt; which is the sole point wherein I have taken leave to dissent from the famous Originals of our Age and Country" (*Prose Works*, I, 29). Indeed, 'satire' was claimed to be a 'hallmark' of Modernity. In his "Essay upon the Ancient and Modern Learning," Sir William Temple had frowned upon "the Vein of Ridiculing all that is serious and good" as "the Itch of our Age and Clymat" (*Sir William Temples Essays "Upon Ancient and Modern Learning" und "Of Poetry": eine historisch-kritische Ausgabe mit Einleitung und Kommentar*, ed. Kämper, pp. 40, 227 [ad 40.1435-42] and 69, 307 [ad 69.1038-71.1100]). In its altercation with the Spider, the representative of the Moderns, the Bee scoffs at the Spider's "*large Vein of Wrangling and Satyr*" (*The Battle of*

the Books, 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/battleofthebooks/>], p. 41, l. 25).

that would be useful and diverting] This formula mirrors the Horatian dichotomy of the function of poetry: “aut prodesse volunt, aut delectare poetæ [poets desire either to profit or to please]” (*Ars poetica*, in *Quintus Horatius Flaccus*, ed. Heinsius, p. 235 [l. 333] [PASSMANN AND VIENKEN II, 905-12]), re-employed in the title of *Various Thoughts, Moral and Diverting*.

p. 2, ll. 4-5 *He resolved to proceed in a manner, that should be altogether new*] Swift loved to tease his readers with this hackneyed ‘originality topos’, beginning as early as the *Tale*’s title page: “Juvatque novos decerpere flores, / Insignemque meo capiti petere inde coronam, / Unde prius nulli velarunt tempora Musæ [’Tis my joy to pluck new flowers and gather a glorious coronal for my head from spots whence before the muses have never wreathed the forehead of any man]” (Lucretius, *De rerum natura libri sex*, ed. Tannegui Lefèvre [Cambridge: by John Hayes for W. Morden, 1675], p. 26 [I, 928-30] [PASSMANN AND VIENKEN II, 1122]), which Swift read no less than three times in 1697/8. In addition to Lucretius, the topos had also been invoked by Horace: “Dicam insigne recens, adhuc / Indictum ore alio [I will sing of a noble exploit, recent, as yet untold by other lips]” (*Carmina*, in *Quintus Horatius Flaccus*, ed. Heinsius, p. 75 [III, xxv, 7-8] [PASSMANN AND VIENKEN II, 905-6]). In the *Tale*, Swift utilized it to turn the affectation for innovation and originality the modern Hack manifests from the very beginning on its head: “As a celebration of originality, the quotation [from Lucretius] casts a long shadow over any claim by the author to be an original; certainly a claim that is as paradoxical as it is self-subversive” (Michael G. Devine, “Disputing the ‘Original’ in Swift’s *Tale of a Tub*,” *Swift Studies*, 18 [2003], 26-33 [p. 27n6]). However, it is never quite clear whether the parody includes the Apologist, or Swift, who, paradoxically, both insist on the same claim (see the note on “*and it indeed touches the Author in a very tender Point, who insists upon it, that through the whole Book he has not borrowed a single Hint from any Writer in the World*” [p. 8, ll. 23-25]).

p. 2, ll. 5-7 *the World having been already too long nauseated with endless Repetitions upon every Subject*] A conviction Swift held throughout his life: “If the Press must needs be loaded, I had rather it should not be by my means,” he wrote in his Preface to Temple’s *Letters to the King* (p. 4, ll. 4-5; see also WALSH, p. 320), and returning from Brobdingnag, Gulliver counters Captain Thomas Wilcocks’s request to “oblige the World by putting [his Relation] in Paper and making it publick” with the remark that he thought the world was “already overstocked with Books of Travels” (*Prose Works*, XI, 147 [II, viii, 12]). See also the *Discourse concerning the Mechanical Operation of the Spirit* (Online.Swift, forthcoming).

p. 2, ll. 7-9 *The Abuses in Religion he proposed to set forth in the Allegory of the Coats, and the three Brothers, which was to make up the Body of the Discourse*]

Allegory] In his frequently reprinted and enlarged *Glossographia Anglicana Nova*, Thomas Blount, following Quintilian (*Institutio oratoria*, IX, ii, 46), defines ‘allegory’ as “a Figure in Rhetorick, consisting of one continued Metaphor running thro’ the whole Discourse” ([London: Dan. Brown, *et al.*, 1707], s.v.; see also LAUSBERG I, 441-42 [§ 895]). This definition lends itself to two conclusions, both interrelated:

first, allegory is a technique, or mode, of fiction-writing in which a narrative basis, a surface structure of characters, actions, and events, obviously and continuously refers to another, simultaneous structure of characters, actions, and events, ‘the fable proper,’ which is superimposed on it.

Second, like metaphor, allegory is a trope of transference in which an unknown, or imperfectly known, is described in terms of a known, but never explicitly so. Like metaphor, allegory is a figure of indeterminacy which invites, even requires, *readers* to decide on its meaning, thus introducing an element of hermeneutic instability, if not arbitrariness, into critical discourse. To some extent, allegory, as well as *allegoresis*, the way of reading it, is in danger of what every critic takes it to be, and, as a result, it may mean many things to many readers (Hermann J. Real, “Allegorical Adventure and Adventurous Allegory: Gulliver’s ‘Several Ridiculous and Troublesome Accidents’ in Brobdingnag,” *Qwerty*, 11 [2001], 81-87 [pp. 81-82]).

p. 2, ll. 9-10 *Those in Learning he chose to introduce by way of Digressions*] Swift makes the Hack praise Digressions as a “great *Modern Improvement*” (*Prose Works*, I, 90). Factually, this is not correct, digressions, which are also referred to as episodes, being constitutive, and *approved*, elements in ‘the architecture’ of classical epics, for example, as Swift well knew (see Running Commentary, *The Battle of the Books*, 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/battleofthebooks/>], on p. 31, ll. 16-20). In neoclassical theories of the genre, episodes are “those incidents by which the poet extends the action of his poem,” making sure all the while that the episodes “bear a close relation to the main action,” indeed being “a part of it, even as the limbs are parts of the body” (H. T. Swedenberg, Jr, *The Theory of the Epic in England, 1650-1800* [Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1944], pp. 19-20, and *passim*). In *Timber: or, Discoveries*, Jonson illustrated the relationship between plot and episode by an architectural metaphor: “For the *Episodes*, and digressions in a Fable, are the same that household stuffe, and other furniture are in a house ... For as a house, consisting of diverse materialls, becomes one structure, and one dwelling; so an Action, compos’d of diverse parts, may become one *Fable Epicke*” (*Ben Jonson*, eds C. H. Herford and Percy and Evelyn Simpson [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1954], VIII, 647-48). To that extent, the *Tale’s* digressions may be intended to highlight its Teller’s ‘originality’: their boasts notwithstanding, the Moderns are Ancients revived.

But then, digressiveness also marks the predominance of “Fancy,” which, “without the help of Judgement, is not commended as a Vertue,” Hobbes, in alliance with numerous seventeenth-century faculty psychologists, ruled in *Leviathan*. Lacking purposiveness, “Direction to some End,” Hobbes continued, “Fancy is one kind of Madnesse” apt to burst into rambling discourse, “into so many, and so long digressions, and Parentheses, that they may utterly lose themselves” ([London: Andrew Crooke, 1651], p. 33 [I, viii] [PASSMANN AND VIENKEN II, 870]). This view sufficiently accounts for the *Tale’s* digressions, suggesting as it does “the spasms of a disordered mind,” and indicating “departures which underscore the fragmentation and incoherence of [the Hack’s] thinking” (Michael V. DePorte, *Nightmares and Hobbyhorses: Swift, Sterne, and*

Augustan Ideas of Madness [San Marino: The Huntington Library, 1974], pp. 73-75).

For Swift, the teleology of narration was important. In his “Judicium de Herodoto post longum tempus relecto [judgement on Herodotus, reread after a long time],” he criticized the Father of History for “the countless digressions,” with which he “breaks off the thread of the narrative to the point of tedium, and from which arise his readers’ confusion and subsequent obliviousness [Cæterum diverticulis abundans ... filum narrationis ad tædium abrumpit. unde oritur ... legentibus confusio, et exinde oblivio]” (*Prose Works*, V, 243).

p. 2, ll. 10-12 *He was then a young Gentleman much in the World, and wrote to the Tast of those who were like himself*] Swift echoes himself, granting youth some mitigating circumstances: “His Youth excuses the former” (see Running Commentary, *An Answer to a Scurrilous Pamphlet*, ed. Kirsten Juhas, with the assistance of Dirk F. Passmann, Hermann J. Real, and Sandra Simon [Online.Swift/Ehrenpreis Centre for Swift Studies, Münster, October 2011] [<http://www.anglistik.uni-muenster.de/Swift/online.swift/works/scurrilouspamphlet/>], p. 20, l. 2).

much in the World] Swift returned to the seclusion of Moor Park in June 1696, and it is somewhat difficult to see why he would identify this ‘retirement’ with “the World,” unless one assumes that he was thinking of Sir William’s distinguished visitors (see the autobiographical fragment “Family of Swift,” *Prose Works*, V, 193; Ehrenpreis, *Mr Swift*, pp. 169-75; see also *A Tale of a Tub: With Introduction and Notes*, ed. Arthur Sale [London: University Tutorial Press, 1939], p. 155).

p. 2, ll. 12-14 *therefore in order to allure them, he gave a Liberty to his Pen, which might not suit with maturer Years, or graver Characters*] Another echo of *An Answer to a Scurrilous Pamphlet*: “he was certainly at Years of Discretion” (*An Answer to a Scurrilous Pamphlet*, ed. Kirsten Juhas, with the assistance of Dirk F. Passmann, Hermann J. Real, and Sandra Simon [Online.Swift/Ehrenpreis Centre for Swift Studies, Münster, October 2011] [<http://www.anglistik.uni-muenster.de/Swift/online.swift/works/scurrilouspamphlet/>], p. 20, ll. 2-3).

p. 2, ll. 14-16 *which he could have easily corrected with a very few Blots, had he been Master of his Papers for a Year or two before their Publication]* Commenting on Thomas Swift's claim to joint authorship of the *Tale* (Elias, *Swift at Moor Park*, pp. 226-27n13, 284n7; David Woolley, "Joint Authorship and *A Tale of a Tub*: Further Thoughts," *Monash Swift Papers*, no 1, eds Clive T. Probyn and Bryan Coleborne [Clayton, Victoria, 1987], pp. 1-25), after publication in May 1704, Swift told Benjamin Tooke in his letter of 29 June 1710: "I cannot but think that little Parson-cousin of mine is at the bottom of this; *for, having lent him a copy of some part of, &c.* and he shewing it, after I was gone to Ireland, and the thing abroad, he affected to talk suspiciously, as if he had some share in it" (*Correspondence*, ed. Woolley, I, 282 and n2 [our emphasis]). Swift reiterated the assertion that he was not "*Master of his Papers*" for a while several times in the Apology (pp. 11, l. 2; 14, ll. 28-29), obviously because he deemed it important. The available evidence suggests that Jonathan "lent his cousin a copied portion of the pre-publication manuscript, probably the sections devoted to satirizing abuses in religion," the parts claimed by Thomas (Karian, "Edmund Curll and the Circulation of Swift's Writings," pp. 112-13 and n41). Nevertheless, Swift has failed to convince some of his readers, who have taken his excuse for a "ruse" (Anselment, "*Betwixt Jest and Earnest*": *Marprelate, Milton, Marvell, Swift & the Decorum of Religious Ridicule*, p. 131). On the other hand, papers once in Swift's possession were "lent abroad" at times, as his controversy with Lady Giffard about the publication of Sir William Temple's *Memoirs* testifies (*Correspondence*, ed. Woolley, I, 270-72 and n, nn10, 11). See also Textual Introduction, *A Discourse concerning the Mechanical Operation of the Spirit* (Online.Swift, forthcoming).

p. 2, ll. 17-19 *Not that he would have governed his Judgment by the ill-placed Cavils of the Sour, the Envious, the Stupid, and the Tastless, which he mentions with disdain]*

p. 2, ll. 19-21 *He acknowledges there are several youthful Sallies, which from the Grave and the Wise may deserve a Rebuke]* See the note on "*The Author was then young*" (p. 1, ll. 17-18).

p. 2, ll. 21-25 *But he desires to be answerable no farther than he is guilty, and that his Faults may not be multiply'd by the ignorant, the unnatural, and uncharitable Applications of those who have neither Candor to suppose good Meanings, nor Palate to distinguish true Ones*] “Throughout the Apology references to the ‘Reader of Tast and Candor’ sustain the assumption of a qualified, élite audience” (Anselment, “*Betwixt Jest and Earnest’: Marprelate, Milton, Marvell, Swift & the Decorum of Religious Ridicule*, p. 133).

Candor] Here, not so much “honesty” (Charles Scruggs, “Sweetness and Light’: The Basis of Swift’s Views on Art and Criticism,” *Tennessee Studies in Literature*, 18 [1973], 93-104 [pp. 100-1]) but “fairness, impartiality, justice” (OED), as in Horace’s “candide judex” (*Epistolae*, in *Qvintvs Horativs Flaccvs*, ed. Heinsius, p. 189 [I, iv, 1] [PASSMANN AND VIENKEN II, 905-6]), in the Preface to the first edition of Clarendon’s *History of the Rebellion* (ed. W. Dunn Macray, 6 vols [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969 {1888}], I, xviii), or the Prefaces to the second and third editions of Wotton’s *Reflections upon Ancient and Modern Learning*: “I am willing to think, that those who shall not agree to what I say, will grant that I have represented the Opinions of other Men with Impartiality and Candour” (pp. xxi, xix). In addition to their first using it “pleadingly and ingratiatingly to gain temporary favour for their pieces,” satirists would later employ the word “threateningly and hypocritically as a verbal shield to protect themselves” (Mary Claire Randolph, “‘Candour’ in XVIIIth-Century Satire,” *The Review of English Studies*, 20 [1944], 45-62 [p. 61]).

After which, he will forfeit his Life, if any one Opinion can be fairly deduced from that Book, which is contrary to Religion or Morality] Swift is here asserting himself against Wotton (Jean-Paul Forster, “Swift and Wotton: The Unintended Mousetrap,” *Swift Studies*, 7 [1992], 23-35 [pp. 25-28]), who in the *Observations* fulminated against the *Tale* as a “ludicrous Allegory ... [in which] God and Religion, Truth and Moral Honesty, Learning and Industry are made a May-Game,” going so far as to denounce it as “one of the Prophanest Banters upon the Religion of *Jesus Christ* ... that ever yet appeared” (Wotton, *Reflections upon Ancient and Modern Learning* [1705], pp. 520, 534; see also p. 530).

p. 2, ll. 28-31 *Why should any Clergyman of our Church be angry to see the Follies of Fanaticism and Superstition exposed, tho’ in the most ridiculous*

Manner? since that is perhaps the most probable way to cure them, or at least to hinder them from farther spreading]

tho] In *The Tatler*, no 230, much of which was later expanded in his letter to Lord Oxford, published in May 1712 as *A Proposal for Correcting, Improving, and Ascertaining the English Tongue*, Swift lists this elision as one example among many of “the continual Corruption” of the English tongue (*The Tatler*, ed. Bond, III, 190-96 and n7), and he was taken to task by the Earl of Shaftesbury who charged him with being prone “to say one thing in public and to do the opposite in his own practice” (Clive T. Probyn, “Jonathan Swift, the Earl of Shaftesbury, and the Monosyllables,” *Swift Studies*, 22 [2007], 97-101 [p. 98]). See also Hermann J. Real, “The Dean and the Lord Chancellor: or, Swift Saving his Bacon,” *Britannien und Europa: Studien zur Literatur-, Geistes- und Kulturgeschichte. Festschrift für Jürgen Klein*, ed. Michael Szczekalla (Frankfurt on Main: Peter Lang, 2010), pp. 95-111 (102-109). In Swift’s view, Elizabethan English “represented the high point of modern English” (Ann Cline Kelly, *Swift and the English Language* [Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1988], pp. 12-13 and *passim*).

in the most ridiculous Manner? since that is perhaps the most probable way to cure them] Augustan satirists would sometimes use ‘ridicule’ synonymously with ‘satire’ and ‘raillery,’ tending “mostly to come somewhere between the two,” as sharper and more mordant than ‘raillery’ but less severe than ‘satire.’ Besides, ‘ridicule’ was considered “to concern itself with those insignificant failings which provoke amusement instead of dislike or detestation” (Elkin, *The Augustan Defence of Satire*, pp. 19-20, 146-66). Ostensibly, this view suggests greater rapport with ‘smiling’ than with ‘savage’ satire, preferring as it seems to do the teasing, good-natured laughter of Horace to the angry, passionately declaiming indignation of Juvenal. Swift most famously subscribed to this assessment in his defence of Gay’s *Beggar’s Opera* in May 1728: “[*Humour*] is certainly the best Ingredient towards that kind of Satyr, which is most useful, and gives the least Offence; which instead of lashing, Laughs Men out of their Follies, and Vices, and is the Character which gives *Horace* the Preference to *Juvenal*” (Jonathan Swift and Thomas Sheridan, *The Intelligencer*, ed. James Woolley [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992], pp. 62, 66).

By 1700, this preference for Horace was the result of a controversy about “the comparative merits” of the Roman satirists which had exercised classical

scholars and critics since the beginning of the seventeenth century and in which ‘effect’ proved to be the decisive criterion for establishing the hierarchy: Horatian satire was thought to reform more effectively (W. B. Carnochan, *Lemuel Gulliver’s Mirror for Man* [Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1968], pp. 17-51; Harold Weber, “‘Comic Humour and Tragic Spirit’: The Augustan Distinction between Horace and Juvenal,” *Classical and Modern Literature*, 1 [1981], 275-89); an argument the Apologist apparently echoes: ridicule, he claims, most probably ‘cures’ “*the Follies of Fanaticism and Superstition.*” For the medical metaphor likening the satirist to a therapist, see Mary Claire Randolph, “The Medical Concept in English Renaissance Satiric Theory,” *Studies in Philology*, 38 (1941), 125-57; Alvin Kernan, *The Cankered Muse: Satire of the English Renaissance* (New Haven: Yale University Press 1959), pp. 25-26.

But with Swift, things are more complicated than they appear to be. For one thing, being grave and serious vices, the “*Follies of Fanaticism and Superstition*” are nothing to be laughed at and, thus, hardly constitute matter for a satire in the Horatian mood and manner. For another, the Apologist, or Swift, never offers an argument *why* ‘ridicule’ beyond its advantage of being superior to declamatory rhetoric should be more effective. The old Dean gave the answer to this question in one of his most celebrated poems, *An Epistle to a Lady*, a poem written in 1728 and dedicated to Lady Anne Acheson, his hostess during several visits to Market Hill (James Woolley, “Swift’s ‘Skinnibonia’: A New Poem from Lady Acheson’s Manuscript,” *Reading Swift* [2008], pp. 309-42). Invoking the authority and example of Horace, who posited that “jesting oft cuts hard knots more forcefully and effectively than gravity [ridiculum acri / fortius et melius magnas plerumque secat res” (*Satyrae*, in *Qvintvs Horativs Flaccvs*, ed. Heinsius, p. 149 [I, x, 14-15] [PASSMANN AND VIENKEN II, 905-6]), he subscribes to the commonplace dictum about the priority of Horatian satire: “This I must insist on. For, as / It is well observ’d by HORACE, / Ridicule has greater Pow’r / To reform the World, than Sour.” As a consequence, Swift declares his “Method of Reforming” to be “by Laughing, not by Storming.” This declaration summarizes the foregoing explanation for the Dean’s refusal to write verses on Lady Anne “in the Heroick Stile,” and it introduces an ingredient entirely absent from the customary pleas for Horatian satire: “From the Planet of my Birth, / I encounter Vice with Mirth. / Wicked Ministers of State / I can easier scorn than hate: / And

I find it answers right: / Scorn *torments* them more than Spight” (*Poems*, ed. Williams, II, 628-38, ll. 197-200, 229-30, 141-46 [our emphasis]). In Swift’s view, satire has a chance of being ‘efficient’ if it vexes and upsets, pains and hurts, pillorying, ostracizing, and humiliating its victims in public (see also Running Commentary, *The Battle of the Books*, 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/battleofthebooks/>], p. 32, ll. 1-3). In pretending to prefer Horace to Juvenal, Swift is engaging in masquerade; in fact, he is more ‘Juvenalian’ than ‘Horatian’ (Carnochan, *Lemuel Gulliver’s Mirror for Man*, p. 30).

p. 2, ll. 32-33 *Besides, tho’ it was not intended for their Perusal; it rallies nothing but what they preach against*] “Not intended for [the] Perusal” of Anglican clergymen inasmuch as the *Tale* affects *not* to target the corruptions of the Church of England, celebrating it “*as the most perfect of all others in Discipline and Doctrine*” (p. 3, ll. 2-3). Even so, why an attack on the Sects, on “*the Follies of Fanaticism and Superstition*,” should not have been intended for the eyes of Anglican clergymen remains the Apologist’s secret.

pp. 2-3, ll. 33-1 *It contains nothing to provoke them by the least Scurillity upon their Persons or their Functions*]

Scurillity] From Latin *scurrilitas*, French *scurrilité*, “grossness of reproach, loudness of jocularly; scandalous language” (JOHNSON II, s.v.; BAILEY, s.v.).

upon their Persons] A clear case of self-exposition by disavowal: a plethora of perfunctory protestations by contemporary satirists against *ad hominem* attacks notwithstanding, most satire of the late seventeenth and eighteenth-centuries aims “at *discernible historic[al] particulars*” (Edward W. Rosenheim, Jr, *Swift and the Satirist’s Art* [Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1963], pp. 1-34 [p. 31]). Like Rochester, Dryden, and Pope, to mention only a few practitioners of the art, Swift thought personal reference in satire not only desirable but actually inevitable (Elkin, *The Augustan Defence of Satire*, pp. 118-45; see also Arthur Melville Clark, “The Art of Satire and the Satiric Spectrum,” *Studies in Literary Modes* [Edinburgh and London: Oliver and Boyd 1946], p. 38; and Johannes N. Schmidt, “Der Wirklichkeitsbezug in der Satire,” *Satire:*

Swift and Pope [Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1977], pp. 70-78). At the end of his career, the number of Swift's victims, historically authentic personages, professions, communities, and institutions was legion (Hermann J. Real, "(Hermann J. Real, "A Dish plentifully stor'd': Jonathan Swift and the Evaluation of Satire," *Reading Swift* [1993], pp. 45-58 [49-50]).

p. 3

p. 3, ll. 1-3 *It Celebrates the Church of England as the most perfect of all others in Discipline and Doctrine*] Not, as has been claimed, a "patently absurd" statement (John Traugott, "A Tale of a Tub," *The Character of Swift's Satire: A Revised Focus*, ed. Claude Rawson [Newark: University of Delaware Press, London and Toronto: Associated University Presses, 1983], pp. 83-126 [100]), but a backhanded compliment. "*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 furnished "*numerous and gross Corruptions in Religion*" as "*Matter for a Satyr*" (p. 2, ll. 2-4). It is for this reason that Martin, the representative of the Church of England (*Prose Works*, I, 84), is a 'weak' character; a fact that has, however, led to the extraordinary conclusion that "Swift would have accomplished his aim best by leaving Martin out" (Ehrenpreis, *Mr Swift*, pp. 188-89). Rather, the opposite is the case. Swift *made* Martin's character weak because Martin had a role to play in the satiric programme he set out to write in the *Tale*. Being expected to personify, or imply, "a virtue which [Swift] desired to recommend" (Ehrenpreis, *Mr Swift*, p. 188), Martin is a failure; he does not represent *any* conspicuous virtue. He simply disappears from the *Tale*, not because as an "exemplar of compromise and sanity" he no longer belonged to Swift's "satirical aims" (Michael DePorte, "Swift and the License of Satire," *Satire in the 18th Century*, ed. J. D. Browning [New York and London: Garland Publishing, 1983], pp. 53-69 [57]), but because as the "extremely flegmatick and sedate" fellow he has grown into after his initial zeal has begun to flag (*Prose Works*, I, 87, 85), he is not up to the job, the continued Reformation of the Church of England. As a result, "positive norms, of any sort, are out of place" in the *Tale* (Claude Rawson, "The Character of Swift's Satire: Reflections on Swift, Johnson, and Human Restlessness," *The Character of Swift's Satire: A Revised Focus*, ed. Claude

Rawson [Newark: University of Delaware Press, and London and Toronto: Associated University Presses, 1983], pp. 21-82 [65]). The claim, therefore, that Swift “was clearly protesting his orthodoxy ... not playing the critic” (Pinkus, *Swift’s Vision of Evil, I: “A Tale of a Tub,”* p. 27) misses the point. Not only did “that great and famous *Rupture*” (*Prose Works*, I, 74 and n*) 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 no remarkable effect on the Established Church. At best, Martin constitutes a norm, or rather ‘norm,’ *in relation to* the corruptions of Catholicism and Puritanism, thus converting the *Tale* as a whole into that allegedly non-existent paradox of a norm-less satire.

The Apologist was not alone in this critical assessment: “Though Protestants have some Errors,” William Chillingworth grumbled in *The Religion of Protestants: A Safe Way to Salvation*, “yet ... they are neither so great as [those of the Catholic church], nor impos’d with such tyranny, nor maintained with such obstinacy” (5th ed. [London: M. C., 1684], p. 216 [PASSMANN AND VIENKEN I, 401-2]), and Gilbert Burnet, in the Preface to the second part of *The History of the Reformation of the Church of England*, which Swift read in 1697/8 (REAL [1978], pp. 129, 131), came to the conclusion that “our Reformation is not yet arrived at that full perfection, that is to be desired” (2nd ed., 2 vols [London: by T. H. for Richard Chiswell, 1681], II, sig. c1v). The Church of England, then, is not the, or a, norm. Even if the Apologist’s claim to have “celebrated” the Church of England may have been a manoeuvre to deflect flak from the *Tale*’s early critics, including a severe detractor like Wotton (*Observations upon the “Tale of a Tub”*, in *Reflections upon Ancient and Modern Learning* [1705], p. 523), his defence also utilized the arguments of the most orthodox adherents of the Anglican Church. It is the ‘particular,’ identifiable corruptions of his own Church, then, not any “universalizing tendencies” or “broader assaults on Christianity” allegedly “intuited” by readers since Wotton (Sarah Ellenzweig, *The Fringes of Belief: English Literature, Ancient Heresy, and the Politics of Freethinking, 1660-1760* [Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 2008], p. 85) that Swift embraced in the *Tale*’s satirical attacks, too.

p. 3, ll. 3-4 *it advances no Opinion they reject, nor condemns any they receive*
See the gloss on “*After which, he will forfeit his Life*” (p. 2, l. 25).

p. 3, ll. 4-6 *If the Clergy's Resentments lay upon their Hands, in my humble Opinion, they might have found more proper Objects to employ them on]*

lay upon their Hands] “Resting upon one as a charge, burden, or responsibility, or as a thing to be dealt with or attended to” (OED).

p. 3, l. 6 *Nondum tibi defuit Hostis]* “So far, you have never lacked a foe.” All three editions of Lucan’s *Pharsalia: sive, De bello civili* in Swift’s library present the same text (see, for example, the edition by Thomas Farnaby [Amsterdam: Jan Blaeu, 1665], p. 12 [I, 23] [PASSMANN AND VIENKEN II, 1107-8]).

p. 3, ll. 6-8 *I mean those heavy, illiterate Scriblers, prostitute in their Reputations, vicious in their Lives, and ruin'd in their Fortunes]* Swift here, as well as in the *Tale's* Preface (*Prose Works*, I, 24), echoes Dryden’s lament, in the *Discourse concerning the Original and Progress of Satire* of 1693, on the growth of writing as a profession, summarized in the topographical metaphor of Grub Street, “the multitude of Scriblers, who daily pester the World with their insufferable Stuff” (*The Poems of John Dryden*, ed. Kinsley, II, 605); a feeling soon to be shared by many contemporaries (Pat Rogers, *Grub Street: Studies in a Subculture* [London: Methuen, 1972], particularly pp. 176-85, 235-48, and *passim*; Brean S. Hammond, *Professional Imaginative Writing in England, 1670-1740: “Hackney for Bread”* [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997], pp. 31-33, and *passim*).

The rise of Grub Street is a late, problematic after-effect occasioned by the invention of printing. On the one hand, there was nothing, a vast shoal of eulogists proclaimed (see *Various Thoughts, Moral and Diverting*, ed. Hermann J. Real, with the assistance of Kirsten Juhas, Dirk F. Passmann, and Sandra Simon [Online.Swift/Ehrenpreis Centre for Swift Studies, Münster, November 2011] [<http://www.anglistik.uni-muenster.de/Swift/online.swift/works/variousthoughts/>], note on aphorism 18), that compared to “the wonderfull invention, vtility and dignitie of printing” (John Amos Comenius, *A Patterne of Vniversall Knowledge* [London: T. H., 1651], p. 31), and no doubt either that “by this *excellent Invention ... Knowledge* is advantageously *spread* and *improved*” (Joseph Glanvill, *Plus Ultra* [1668] [Hildesheim and New York: Georg Olms, 1979], pp. 78-79). On the other hand, the vaunted beneficial effects were open to scepticism. After all, the Reformation had meant schism and that first and “famous *Rupture*” (*Prose*

Works, I, 74 and n*) had engendered more schisms, the printing press “([*Lucifer's*] *villanous* Engine”) fanning and spreading the fire of religious controversy all the while: “Printing, his most pernicious Instrument: / Wild Controversie then, which long had slept, / Into the Press from ruin'd Cloysters leapt” (Sir John Denham, “The Progress of Learning,” *Poems and Translations*, 5th ed. [London: Jacob Tonson, 1709], p. 171); a view also voiced by Andrew Marvell, whose *Rehearsal Transpros'd* was in Swift's library: “O *Printing!* How hast thou disturb'd the Peace of Mankind! That Lead, when moulded into Bullets, is not so mortal as when founded into Letters!” (*The Rehearsal Transpros'd*, ed. D. I. B. Smith [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971], pp. 4-5 [PASSMANN AND VIENKEN II, 1207-9]).

In the Apology, Swift sides with the critics of the printing press in two respects:

first, the ubiquity of Grub Street proved that the advent of the printed book had but resulted in the (re)production of mass and the proliferation of matter. “The invention of printing has not ... multiplied books, but only the copies of them,” Temple grumbled in his “Essay upon the Ancient and Modern Learning” (*Sir William Temple's Essays “Upon Ancient and Modern Learning” und “Of Poetry”*, ed. Kämper, pp. 2, 135 [ad 2.58-60]; Daniel Eilon, “Swift Burning the Library of Babel,” *The Modern Language Review*, 80 [1985], 269-82 [pp. 269-71]; Marcus Walsh, “The Superfoetation of Literature: Attitudes to the Printed Book in the Eighteenth-Century,” *British Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies*, 15 [1992], 151-61). Indeed, profusion of matter not only surrounds the *Tale*; it also composes it.

Second, printing had not abolished ignorance; on the contrary, illiteracy remained as epidemic as it had been endemic (Hermann J. Real, “A Taste of Composition Rare: The *Tale's* Matter and Void,” *Reading Swift* [1998], pp. 73-90 [84-90]).

Of course, Swift's most effective strategy of ‘exposing’ the new class of ill-educated, mercenary scribblers was to choose a Hack as the teller of the *Tale*. By this strategy, a representative of Grub Street is made to ‘act out’ his character and thinking, his manners and tics: “Der Satiriker [nimmt] sein Objekt buchstäblich beim Wort und läßt es für sich selbst sprechen” (Johannes N. Schmidt, “Der Satiriker und die Sprache: Jonathan Swift and Karl Kraus,” *Großbritannien und Deutschland: europäische Aspekte der politisch-kulturellen Beziehungen beider*

Länder in Geschichte und Gegenwart, ed. Ortwin Kuhn [München: Wilhelm Goldmann, 1974], pp. 477-86 [478]). In other words, satirical victims are convicted on the testimony of their own evidence: they take themselves to court, stage their own trial and bring in their own verdicts of guilty (Real, “‘A Dish plentifully stor’d’: Jonathan Swift and the Evaluation of Satire,” *Reading Swift* [1993], pp. 45-58 [56]).

p. 3, ll. 9-12 *who to the shame of good Sense as well as Piety are greedily read, meerly upon the Strength of bold, false, impious Assertions, mixt with unmannerly Reflections upon the Priesthood, and openly intended against all Religion*] Swift was to raise a similar charge in *The Sentiments of a Church-of-England Man* of 1708: “You shall observe nothing more frequent in [the Scribblers’] weekly Papers, than a way of affecting to confound the Terms of *Clergy* and *High-Church*, of applying both indifferently, and then loading the latter with all the Calumny they can invent” (*Prose Works*, II, 8).

p. 3, ll. 12-14 *in short, full of such Principles as are kindly received, because they are levell’d to remove those Terrors that Religion tells Men will be the Consequence of immoral Lives*] In seventeenth-century eschatology, God’s rule over the universe climaxes in a final intervention which involves a judgement before the advent of a new heaven. This conviction accounts for what was one of the most urgent issues in the debate, reward and punishment, or rather, the *precise* character of reward and punishment. Man was by nature “*an Accountable Creature*,” as the Dean of St Paul’s, William Sherlock, endeavoured to ‘prove,’ both “by the Principles of Reason” and “by Revelation,” in his *Practical Discourse concerning a Future Judgment*, first published in 1692 (here quoted from the 5th ed. [London: W. Rogers, 1699], pp. 3-4), and the majority of biblical commentators concurred. In their view, the Day of the Lord was the day of divine retribution. Whereas “the Righteous shall be rewarded with eternal Happiness,” John Tillotson, Archbishop of Canterbury, ruled in a sermon on the famous verse in St Matthew (25:46), the reprobate would be sentenced to “everlasting Punishment” (*The Works of the Most Reverend Dr John Tillotson*, 3rd ed. [London: B. Aylmer and W. Rogers, 1701], pp. 361-72 [PASSMANN AND VIENKEN III, 1858-60]). Indeed, throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, the torments of Hell, both physical and spiritual, were painted in such

lurid and glaring colours that the faithful were almost frightened into Heaven (C. A. Patrides, “Renaissance and Modern Views on Hell,” *Harvard Theological Review*, 57 [1964], 217-36; D. P. Walker, *The Decline of Hell: Seventeenth-Century Discussions of Eternal Torment* [London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1964], *passim*).

p. 3, ll. 15-16 *Nothing like which is to be met with in this Discourse, tho’ some of them are pleas’d so freely to censure it*] See p. 1, ll. 6-7.

p. 3, ll. 16-19 *And I wish, there were no other Instance of what I have too frequently observed, that many of that Reverend Body are not always very nice in distinguishing between their Enemies and their Friends*]

nice] “scrupulously exact” (JOHNSON, II, s.v.)

p. 3, ll. 20-22 *Had the Author’s Intentions met with a more candid Interpretation from some whom out of Respect he forbears to name*] Like any good parodist and satirist, Swift was an ‘intentionalist’ (even if at times Swift’s intention may have been not to be understood). His favourite modes and genres, satire and parody as a means of satire, are intentional ‘speech acts’ (Dirk F. Passmann and Hermann J. Real, “*Fiat Nox: A Tale of a Tub* and the Biblical Account of Genesis under Erasure,” *The Enlightenment by Night: Essays on After-Dark Culture in the Long Eighteenth Century*, eds Serge Soupel, Kevin L. Cope, and Alexander Pettit [New York: AMS, 2010], pp. 431-49). Indeed, Swift’s career as a satirist is dotted with mock-petitions and mock-pastorals, mock-georgics and mock-heroics, mock-encomia and mock-elegies, mock-predictions, mock-proposals, and mock-travelogues (Leon Guilhamet, *Satire and the Transformation of Genre* [Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1987], pp. 126-27), all of which resonate with the dissonant echoes of familiar pre-texts, their structures and themes, images and motifs. Established generic conventions are ‘regularly’ evoked only to be sabotaged: “All parody refunctions pre-existing text(s) and / or discourse(s), so it can be said that these verbal structures are called to the readers’ minds and then placed under erasure” (Robert Phiddian, *Swift’s Parody* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995], p. 13).

However, Swift believed not only in authorial intention as a creative impulse but also as the critical instrument needed to recognize it, reproduce it, and thus to

establish what he would have regarded as hermeneutic validity. Later in the Apology, he repeatedly accuses his critics of forcing “*Interpretations which never once entered into the Writer’s Head,*” also protesting to be innocent of interpretations he never meant (p. 8, ll. 6-7; see also *Prose Works*, I, 51 and n†).

candid] See the note on “Candor” (p. 2, l. 24).

p. 3, ll. 22-27 *he might have been encouraged to an Examination of Books written by some of those Authors above-described, whose Errors, Ignorance, Dullness and Villany, he thinks he could have detected and exposed in such a Manner, that the Persons who are most conceived to be infected by them, would soon lay them aside and be ashamed*] “In a guilt culture if a man makes public his sin within the church or an appropriate public institution, the torment of his conscience will be allayed. In a shame culture, if his wrongdoing becomes known, he will be criticized, shamed, rejected. One of the most powerful of all forms of public disapproval is ridicule ... Few horrors are more to be dreaded by members of a shame culture than to be publicly laughed at” (Elliott, *The Power of Satire: Magic, Ritual, Art*, pp. 67-68, and *passim*). A contemporaneous, if admittedly later, expression of this idea occurs in Pope’s letter to Dr Arbuthnot of July 1734 (*Imitations of Horace*, ed. John Butt, 2nd ed. [London: Methuen, and New Haven: Yale University Press, 1961], pp. 324-25 and n).

p. 3, ll. 27-30 *But he has now given over those Thoughts, since the weightiest Men in the weightiest Stations are pleased to think it a more dangerous Point to laugh at those Corruptions in Religion, which they themselves must disapprove*] “Alluding to Dr. *Sharp* the archbishop of *York*’s representation of the author” (HAWKESWORTH I, viin‡). The legend that the *Tale* angered Archbishop Sharp so much that he became “mainly responsible for Swift’s failure to secure a bishopric” was circulated in several sources throughout the eighteenth century (A. Tindal Hart, *The Life and Times of John Sharp, Archbishop of York* [London: SPCK, 1949], pp. 102-4), finding its most famous expression in Johnson’s “Life of Swift” (*The Lives of the Most Eminent English Poets*, ed. Roger Lonsdale, 4 vols [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2006], III, 192-93). Although the story has been contested, Swift certainly believed it himself, as becomes clear from his poem “The Author upon Himself”: “*York* is from *Lambeth* sent, to show the Queen /

A dang'rous Treatise writ against the Spleen" (*Poems*, ed. Williams, I, 193-95, ll. 47-48).

p. 3-4, ll. 32-3 *He thinks it no fair Proceeding, that any Person should offer determinately to fix a name upon the Author of this Discourse, who hath all along concealed himself from most of his nearest Friends*] A common practice with Swift. As late as 1735, George Faulkner, Swift's Dublin publisher, wrote in his Preface to the first collected edition of the *Works*: "We are assured [*the Dean*] never directly owned to his nearest Friends any Writings which generally passed for his" (4 vols [Dublin: George Faulkner, 1735], I, sig. a3r-v). Earlier, in *Some Remarks upon a Pamphlet Entitl'd, "A Letter to the Seven Lords"* of 1711, Swift openly chuckled that his "Antagonists are most of them *so*, in a literal Sense; breathe *real* Vengeance, and extend their Threats to [his] Person, if they knew where to find it" (*Prose Works*, III, 187). Swift's motives for self-concealment were never clear and varied from case to case, ranging from modesty and self-promotion to mischievousness and fear (John Mullan, *Anonymity: A Secret History of English Literature* [Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2007], pp. 9-40, and *passim*). Whichever the case, Swift's practice differed from that of the despicable Joseph August du Cros, who, in his *Lettre de Monsieur du Cros* (1693), to which Swift responded with his first prose work, *An Answer to a Scurrilous Pamphlet*, did exactly what Swift made the Apologist criticize, fixing a name upon an author's work (*Swift, Temple, and the du Cros Affair*, Part I, introd. David L.T. Woolley, The Augustan Reprint Society, nos 239-240 [Los Angeles: William Andrews Clark Memorial Library, 1986], p. 16; pencilled marginal note in George Mayhew's copy of GUTHKELCH AND NICHOL SMITH [1920], p. 6, now at the Ehrenpreis Centre [EC 8336]).

p. 4

p. 4, ll. 3-7 *Yet several have gone a farther Step, and pronounced another Book to have been the Work of the same Hand with this; which the Author directly affirms to be a thorough mistake, he having yet never so much as read that Discourse*] As a marginal gloss indicates, the reference is to the Earl of Shaftesbury's *A Letter concerning Enthusiasm to My Lord ***** [Somers]* (London: J. Morphew, 1708), published in July. In a letter to Ambrose Philips of

14 September 1708, Swift reports that “All [his] Friends [would have him] to be the author,” but he rejected the attribution firmly: “But mine it is not” (*Correspondence*, ed. Woolley, I, 207 and n5; see also I, 218 and 230n10). Even so, some of Swift’s readers have felt that “he most certainly had [read the *Letter*]” (Probyn, “Jonathan Swift, the Earl of Shaftesbury, and the Monosyllable,” p. 98; Robert M. Adams, “The Mood of the Church and *A Tale of a Tub*,” *England in the Restoration and Early Eighteenth Century: Essays on Culture and Society*, ed. H. T. Swedenberg, Jr [Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press, 1972], pp. 71-99 [89-90]; Philmus, “Andrew Marvell, Samuel Parker, and *A Tale of a Tub*,” pp. 71-98 [73-74]). Although none of Shaftesbury’s works was in Swift’s library at any stage, in the same letter, he describes *A Letter concerning Enthusiasm* as “very well writt.” Ostensibly, Swift’s name was mentioned in the public debate only because a friend of Lord Somers “had threatened to publish the *Letter concerning Enthusiasm* as a work of Jonathan Swift” (Robert Voitle, *The Third Earl of Shaftesbury, 1671-1713* [Baton Rouge and London: Louisiana State University Press, 1984], p. 309).

thorough] “The repeated occurrence of such words in the *Tale*” has been explained as a device “used by Swift to heighten his Modern’s pedantic style” (Frederik N. Smith, *Language and Reality in Swift’s “A Tale of a Tub”* [Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1979], pp. 163-64). While that may be true elsewhere, it does not apply to the Apologist who is not conspicuously a Modern. Rather, it may be regarded as a subconscious stylistic mannerism, which was already criticized by John Oldmixon (*Reflections on Dr. Swift’s Letter to the Earl of Oxford, about the English Tongue* [London: A. Baldwin, 1712], p. 20).

p. 4, ll. 7-8 *a plain Instance how little Truth, there often is in general Surmises, or in Conjectures drawn from a Similitude of Style, or way of thinking*] “The *New Philosophers*, as they are commonly called, avoid making general Conclusions, till they have collected a great Number of Experiments or Observations upon the Thing in hand” (Wotton, *Reflections upon Ancient and Modern Learning* [1697], p. 365 [PASSMANN AND VIENKEN III, 1976]).

p. 4, ll. 10-13 *Had the Author writ a Book to expose the Abuses in Law, or in Physick, he believes the Learned Professors in either Faculty, would have been so far from resenting it, as to have given him Thanks for his Pains*] The triad of

“*Divinity, Law, [and] Physick*” is of long standing and occurs regularly in Swift (*The Tatler* [no 230], ed. Bond, III, 191), being rooted in the assumption that these three professions in good working order guarantee the well-being of the commonwealth. While the lawyer was considered to be responsible for the good health of the body politic, and the physician for that of the body of individuals, the clergyman takes care of the welfare of the soul (Christopher Hill, *Change and Continuity in Seventeenth-Century England*, 2nd ed. [New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1991], pp. 159-63). The triad continued to attract Swift’s attention, as, for example, in *The Beasts’ Confession to the Priest* (*Poems*, ed. Williams, II, 599-608 [ll. 79-92, 103-12, 113-40]; see also *Prose Works*, XI, 248-49 [IV, v, 11-17; vi, 4-7]).

p. 4, ll. 13-14 *especially if he had made an honourable Reservation for the true Practice of either Science*] A reference to the ‘norm(s)’ of satire: in self-defence, satirists have customarily projected themselves not only as destroyers of folly and vice, in Part A of their satires, but also as promoters of reason and virtue, in Part B, thus establishing a pattern of blame and praise (Howard D. Weinbrot, *The Formal Strain: Studies in Augustan Imitation and Satire* [Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1969], pp. 59-75). The roles most frequently emphasized are those of physician-anatomist and teacher-moralist. As physician-anatomist, it is the satirist’s business not only to destroy the disease but also to administer the therapy (Randolph, “The Medical Concept in English Renaissance Satiric Theory,” pp. 125-57); as teacher-moralist, it is his duty not only to reprimand but also to recommend. Dryden posited in his *Discourse concerning Satire*: “The Poet is bound, and that *ex Officio*, to give his Reader some one Precept of Moral Virtue; and to caution him against some one particular Vice or Folly” (*The Poems of John Dryden*, ed. Kinsley, II, 662; Mary Claire Randolph, “The Structural Design of the Formal Verse Satire,” *Philological Quarterly*, 21 [1942], 368-84; see also the modification by Peter J. Schakel, “Dryden’s *Discourse* and ‘Bi-Partite Structure’ in the Design of Formal Verse Satire,” *English Language Notes*, 21, no 4 [1984], 33-41).

p. 4, ll. 14-16 *But Religion they tell us ought not to be ridiculed, and they tell us Truth, yet surely the Corruptions in it may*] Religion is among the things enumerated by Bacon “which ought to be priviledged from [Jest],” following the

old maxim, “*Non est bonum ludere cum sanctis* [It is not appropriate to fool around with holy things]” (*The Essayes or Counsell, Civill and Morall*, ed. Kiernan, pp. 104, 238 [PASSMANN AND VIENKEN I, 125-27]; TILLEY E242). Like Archbishop Tillotson, who dedicated a whole sermon to “The Folly of Scoffing at Religion” (*The Works*, pp. 34-42 [PASSMANN AND VIENKEN III, 1858-60]; Ehrenpreis’s copy of GUTHKELCH AND NICHOL SMITH, p. 7 [EC 431]), Swift held this conviction throughout his life. “And although some things are too Serious, Solemn, or Sacred to be turned into Ridicule,” he wrote in his defence of Gay’s *Beggar’s Opera* in May 1728, “yet the Abuses of them are certainly not, since it is allowed that Corruption in *Religion, Politicks, and Law*, may be proper *Topicks* for this kind of [Horatian] Satyr” (Jonathan Swift and Thomas Sheridan, *The Intelligencer*, ed. Woolley, pp. 62, 66-67); another argument that no ‘Apology’ for the *Tale* is needed if this assumption is accepted.

p. 4, ll. 16-18 *we are taught by the tritest Maxim in the World, that Religion being the best of Things, its Corruptions are likely to be the worst*] Proverbial, *Corruptio optimi pessima*, “The corruption of the best is the worst” (TILLEY C668, ODEP, p. 145); also referred to, among others, by Milton (*Paradise Lost*, ed. Alastair Fowler [London and New York: Longman, 1971], p. 203 [IV, 203-4]), Sir John Denham (*The Progress of Learning*, in *The Poetical Works*, ed. Theodore Howard Banks, 2nd ed. [Hamden, Connecticut: Archon Books, 1969], p. 119, l. 76), and Thomas Swift in his sermon, *Noah’s Dove: An Earnest Exhortation to Peace*, as the maxim validating the historical insight that “Religion being perverted turns into Rebellion, and Faith into Faction” ([London: Bernard Lintott and A. Baldwin, 1710], p. 9). See also Frank H. Ellis, “Notes on *A Tale of a Tub*,” *Swift Studies*, 1 (1986), 9-14 (p. 9).

p. 4, ll. 19-20 *There is one Thing which the judicious Reader cannot but have observed*] ‘Judicious’ is Swift’s favourite epithet when addressing his readers (see pp. 10, l. 8; 12, l. 28; *Prose Works*, I, 94).

p. 4, ll. 20-21 *that some of those Passages in this Discourse, which appear most liable to Objection are what they call Parodies*] The terminological history of ‘parody’, and its siblings ‘(high and low) burlesque,’ ‘mock-epic,’ ‘travesty,’ and ‘pastiche,’ manifests the same seemingly interminable hassles as that of satire

(Hermann J. Real, “An Introduction to Satire,” *Teaching Satire: Dryden to Pope*, ed. Hermann J. Real [Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1992], pp. 7-19 [9-10]), exacerbated by the fact that eighteenth-century usage at times differs widely from modern practice (Richard Terry, “The Semantics of ‘Parody’ in the Eighteenth Century,” *Durham University Journal*, 85 [1993], 67-74). What seems to be common to all definitions of ‘parody’ is that it relies, and draws, on anterior texts. Thus, ‘parody’ is inter-textual, or ‘parasitic.’ In invoking, *and* transforming, its models, their structures and styles, themes and motifs, imagery, accents, and voice, by mimicry, distortion, and hyperbole, ‘parody’ establishes a discrepancy between content and form, “an incongruity between style and subject” constituting a violation of rhetorical decorum (Richmond P. Bond, *English Burlesque Poetry, 1700-1750* [New York: Russell & Russell, 1964], pp. 3-17) – with either of two ends: to provoke laughter or to hold the victim up to ridicule. As a critical, at times even aggressive vehicle, ‘parody’ may be a *means* in the hands of satirists with which ‘to explode’ other writers and their texts (Simon Dentith, *Parody, The New Critical Idiom* [London and New York: Routledge, 2000], pp. 1-38). See also p. 4, ll. 22-23, 24-27.

p. 4, ll. 22-23 *where the Author personates the Style and Manner of other Writers, whom he has a mind to expose*

personates] A word whose “development is [closely] bound up with Swiftian usage” (Richard Terry, “Swift’s Use of ‘Personate’ to Indicate Parody,” *Notes and Queries*, 239 [1994], 196-98 [p. 197]); here, “to assume the person or character of (another person), *esp.* for fraudulent purposes; to pretend to be; to act the part of” (OED). Similarly, JOHNSON defines ‘personate’ as “to represent by a fictitious or assumed character, so as to pass for the person represented” (II, s.v.).

p. 4, ll. 23-24 *I shall produce one Instance, it is in the 51st Page*] See p. □ (Online.Swift, forthcoming).

p. 4, ll. 24-27 *Dryden, L’Estrange, and some others I shall not name, are here levelled at, who having spent their Lives in Faction, and Apostacies, and all manner of Vice, pretended to be Sufferers for Loyalty and Religion*

Dryden] Speculation has been rampant on Swift’s motives for Dryden’s humiliation, both in *A Tale of a Tub* and *The Battle of the Books* (see Running

Commentary, *The Battle of the Books*, 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/battleofthebooks/>], p. 46, l. 29). In the *Tale*, Swift poked fun at Dryden's sumptuous "large Folio" edition of *The Works of Virgil in English* (published in June 1697; Hugh Macdonald, *John Dryden: A Bibliography of Early Editions and of Drydeniana* [London: Dawson, 1966], pp. 56-58) and his dedicating various parts of his translation to "a Multiplicity of God-fathers" (*Prose Works*, I, 43), that is, various distinguished members of the aristocracy (Dustin Griffin, *Literary Patronage in England, 1650-1800* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996], pp. 70-98); in the *Battle*, as the German philosopher Karl Julius Weber noted, Dryden even became "the main target of Swift's mockery [der Hauptgegenstand seines Spottes]" (*Das Lächerliche: Arten und Formen*, ed. Karl Martin Schiller [Leipzig: F. W. Hendel, 1926], p. 78). So far, all explanations have ended with Swift's personal resentment towards Dryden, although it is unclear how this resentment may be accounted for. Predictably, one 'school' has opted for Swift's anger at Dryden's supposed dictum on young Jonathan's Pindaric efforts, "Cousin Swift, you will never be a poet," the most familiar version of which is in Johnson's "Life of Swift" (*The Lives of the Most Eminent English Poets*, ed. Lonsdale, III, 191, 433; W. H. Dilworth, *The Life of Dr. Jonathan Swift* [London: G. Wright, 1758], pp. 26-27; SCOTT XI, 16n), but it is dubious whether Dryden ever said that (Robert M. Philmus, "Dryden's 'Cousin Swift' Re-Examined," *Swift Studies*, 18 [2003], 99-103). By contrast, another 'school' has pointed towards Swift's purported hostility against Dryden's literary positions (Maurice Johnson, "A Literary Chestnut: Dryden's 'Cousin Swift,'" *PMLA*, 67 [1952], 1024-34), while a third group has decided on a mixture of both, personal malevolence combined with literary antagonism (David Novarr, "Swift's Relation with Dryden, and Gulliver's *Annus Mirabilis*," *English Studies*, 47 [1966], 341-54).

L'Estrange] Sir Roger L'Estrange (1616-1704), "Cavalier, poet, musician, surveyor, magistrate, Projector, Journalist, Government spy and apologist, Royal Commissioner, Prince of Pamphleteers and Translators, and in all capacities by force or violence ... outstanding, hated by the many, loved by the very few" (George Kitchin, *Sir Roger L'Estrange: A Contribution to the History of the Press in the Seventeenth Century* [London: Kegan Paul, 1913], p. 374; *Biographia*

Britannica, V, 2921-27). What would particularly have antagonized L'Estrange to Swift was his "unexhausted copiousness in writing" against the Clergy, which made the Clergy, as Bishop Burnet noted in the *History of his Own Time*, "apprehend that their ruin was designed" ([London: Thomas Ward, 1724], I, 461). In his marginal gloss on this passage in Burnet's *History*, Swift noted: "A superficial meddling coxcomb" (*Prose Works*, V, 279). L'Estrange was known for his venality, being, as Oliver Goldsmith noted, "the first writer who regularly enlisted himself under the banners of a party for pay" (*Collected Works*, ed. Arthur Friedman, 4 vols [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1966], I, 499-500); a reputation which Swift may have guessed from Marvell (*The Rehearsal Transpros'd*, ed. Smith, pp. 22-23 [PASSMANN AND VIENKEN II, 1207-9]). In the *Battle*, L'Estrange is depicted as the leader of a "disorderly Rout" of depraved and predatory *calones* (*The Battle of the Books*, 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/battleofthebooks/>], p. 42, l. 21).

In a footnote appended to the *Tale's* fifth edition of 1710, Swift mocks L'Estrange's self-pity – "If I can bring it to a Perfection before I die, shall reckon I have well employ'd the poor Remains of an unfortunate Life" – by the sarcastic comment: "*Here the Author seems to personate L'Estrange, Dryden, and some others, who after having past their Lives in Vices, Faction and Falshood, have the Impudence to talk of Merit and Innocence and Sufferings*" (*Prose Works*, I, 42n†).

in Faction] Dryden was a noted controversialist almost throughout his life, being engaged in paper wars with, among others, Sir Richard Blackmore, Bishop Gilbert Burnet, Sir Robert Howard, and Elkanah Settle, not to mention the most notorious of them all, his wrangle with Thomas Shadwell, and the physical assault on him, the "Rose Alley" attack (James M. Osborn, *John Dryden: Some Biographical Facts and Problems*, 2nd ed. [Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 1965], pp. 33-36, 171-83, and *passim*). For Swift and his political friends, party 'faction' always had pejorative undertones, frequently flying as it did in the face of reason (*Correspondence*, ed. Woolley, II, 244; III, 731).

and Apostacies] Dryden finally broke with the Church of England presumably in the summer and early autumn of 1685, after an extended period of self-questioning going over to the Church of Rome. This conversion earned him a

full measure of “public contumely” (in addition to Osborn, *John Dryden: Some Biographical Facts and Problems*, pp. 104-6, see Charles E. Ward, *The Life of John Dryden* [Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1961], pp. 210-21).

all manner of Vice] Possibly, a thrust at Dryden’s affair with the actress Ann Reeves, which was public knowledge at the time, “although to the credit of both it must be acknowledged that amidst the loose living of the age Dryden was apparently constant in his affections” (Osborn, *John Dryden: Some Biographical Facts and Problems*, pp. 175-76). It is unknown whether Swift knew of Jeremy Collier’s more sweeping attack who, in *A Short View of the Immorality and Profaneness of the English Stage*, accused Dryden of profanity, lewdness, and blasphemy (3rd ed. [London: S. Keble, *et al.*, 1698], pp. 9, 13, and *passim*).

p. 4, ll. 27-29 *So Dryden tells us in one of his Prefaces of his Merits and Suffering, thanks God that he possesses his Soul in Patience*] “But being encourag’d only with fair Words, by King *Charles II*, my little Sallary ill paid, and no prospect of a future Subsistance, I was then Discourag’d in the beginning of my Attempt; and now Age has overtaken me; and Want, a more insufferable Evil, through the Change of the Times, has wholly disenabl’d me,” Dryden complained in the *Discourse concerning Satire*, continuing a little later: “I speak of my Morals, which have been sufficiently aspers’d: That only sort of Reputation ought to be dear to every honest Man, and is to me. But let the World witness for me, that I have been often wanting to my self in that particular; I have seldom answer’d any scurrilous Lampoon: when it was in my power to have expos’d my Enemies: And being naturally vindicative, have suffer’d in silence; and possess’d my Soul in quiet” (*The Poems of John Dryden*, ed. Kinsley, II, 617, 646; GUTHKELCH AND NICHOL SMITH, p. 7n3).

p. 4, l. 30 *L’Estrange often uses the like Style*] “Examples of such language will be found in L’Estrange’s later writings, as in the Preface to the collected numbers of *The Observator*” (GUTHKELCH AND NICHOL SMITH, p. 7n4; see also Geoff Kemp, “The Works of Roger L’Estrange: An Annotated Bibliography,” *Roger L’Estrange and the Making of Restoration Culture*, eds Anne Dunan-Page and Beth Lynch, Aldershot, Hampshire: Ashgate, 2008, pp. 181-223). A striking instance of a “bathetic recital of past sufferings” is this one: “I have been *Baited*

with *Thousands* upon *Thousands* of *Libells*. I have created Enemies that do me the *Honour* to *Hate* me, perhaps, next to the *King Himself ...* and the *Royal Family*. Their *Scandals* are *Blown Over*: Their *Malice, Defeated*, and whenever my *Hour* comes, I am ready to deliver up my *Soul*, with the Conscience of an *Honest Man*" (quoted from Rosenheim, Jr, *Swift and the Satirist's Art*, pp. 83-85).

p. 4, ll. 30-32 *and I believe the Reader may find more Persons to give that Passage an Application*] Unidentified.

pp. 4-5, ll. 32-1 *But this is enough to direct those who may have over-look'd the Authors Intention*] See the gloss on p. 3, ll. 20-22.

p. 5

p. 5, ll. 2-3 *There are three or four other Passages which prejudiced or ignorant Readers have drawn by great Force to hint at ill Meanings*] See the gloss on p. 1, ll. 6-7.

p. 5, ll. 4-8 *as if they glanced at some Tenets in Religion, in answer to all which, the Author solemnly protests he is entirely Innocent, and never had it once in his Thoughts that any thing he said would in the least be capable of such Interpretations, which he will engage to deduce full as fairly from the most innocent Book in the World*] See the notes on p. 2, ll. 2-4 and ll. 28-29.

the most innocent Book in the World] Readers are perhaps all too easily led to (mis)take this phrase for a rhetorical hyperbole but the Apologist's argumentative strategy suggests that he may intend to evoke the Bible, 'innocent' here meaning "not injurious; harm-less" (from Latin *innocent*, "un-hurtful") rather than "free from guilt" (OED).

p. 5, ll. 9-11 *And it will be obvious to every Reader, that this was not any part of his Scheme or Design, the Abuses he notes being such as all Church of England Men agree in*] The reference is implicitly to abuses such as the belief in transubstantiation and purgatory, the practice of auricular confession and indulgences as well as the insistence on papal infallibility and oral tradition, among countless others, all satirized in the *Tale* proper (Passmann and Real, "*Fiat Nox*:"

A Tale of a Tub and the Biblical Account of Genesis under Erasure,” p. 443-46) and all duly rejected by the Westminster Assembly of Divines, whose discussions resulted in the *Confession of Faith*, including the larger and lesser catechisms of the Protestant churches, on which the Assembly had publicly agreed after lengthy deliberations following its summons by Parliament in 1644. Swift owned a copy (PASSMANN AND VIENKEN I, 450-51).

p. 5, ll. 11-13 *nor was it proper for his Subject to meddle with other Points, than such as have been perpetually controverted since the Reformation*] The points Swift may be having in mind here are not made explicit, but it seems safe to assume that he was thinking of issues that became contested during the proliferating schisms of the Protestant ‘churches’ in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, some of which were itemized in Section XI of *A Tale of a Tub* and the *Discourse concerning the Mechanical Operation of the Spirit* (*Prose Works*, I, 120-31; 186-88). More particularly, Swift put in pictures the Sects’ doctrines of inward light and predestination, their iconoclastic liturgy and eschatological revelations as well as their licentious moral conduct and tendency to political rebelliousness.

controverted] “contested, disputed; made an object of controversial interpretation” (OED), as in Hobbes’s “controverted Interpretation” (*Leviathan* [London: Andrew Crooke, 1651], p. 331 [III, xliii]).

p. 5, ll. 14-15 *To instance only in that Passage about the three wooden Machines mentioned in the Introduction*] “The Wisdom of our Ancestors being highly sensible, has, to encourage all aspiring Adventurers, thought fit to erect three wooden Machines, for the Use of those Orators who desire to talk much without Interruption. These are, the *Pulpit*, the *Ladder*, and the *Stage-Itinerant*” (*Prose Works*, I, 34).

p. 5, ll. 15-16 *In the Original Manuscript there was a description of a Fourth*] “It is difficult to form a guess what the fourth machine may have been, by which the quaternion was completed, and the author saved from the accusation of intending to ridicule one of the most solemn parts of our creed” (SCOTT, XI, 17n). Both Ehrenpreis and ELLIS hazard ingenious guesses: “Podium of the House of Commons” and “Presumably the throne,” respectively (Ehrenpreis’s copy of

GUTHKELCH AND NICHOL SMITH, p. 8 [EC 431]; p. 228). Mayhew, likewise, presumes “a political platform” (GUTHKELCH AND NICHOL SMITH [1920], p. 8 [EC 8336]).

p. 5, ll. 16-17 *which those who had the Papers in their Power, blotted out*] See also p. 2, ll. 14-16.

p. 5, ll. 17-18 *as having something in it of Satyr, that I suppose they thought was too particular*] See pp. 2-3, ll. 33-1.

p. 5, ll. 18-21 *and therefore they were forced to change it to the Number Three, from whence some have endeavour'd to squeeze out a dangerous Meaning that was never thought on*] “The number of these Sons born thus at one Birth, looks askint at the TRINITY, and one of the Books in our Author’s Catalogue in the Off-page over-against the Title, is a Panegyric upon the Number THREE, which Word is the only one that is put in Capitals in that whole Page” (Wotton, *Observations upon the “Tale of a Tub”, in Reflections upon Ancient and Modern Learning* [1705], p. 521). By suggesting that the author of the *Tale* was here “[looking] askint at the TRINITY,” Wotton insinuated that he was not, or no longer, a Church of England man. “Faith in the Holy Trinity” was the first Article in the *Exposition of the Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England*: “There is but one living and true God ... and in the unity of this godhead there be three persons of one substance, power and eternity, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost” (quoted from Gilbert Burnet’s *Exposition*, 2nd ed. [London: by R. Roberts for Ri. Chiswell, 1700], pp. 17-42 [17]). Although he granted that “the Doctrine of the *Trinity* [was] still a great *Mystery*, and ... incomprehensible by Human Reason,” the Archbishop of Canterbury, John Tillotson, whose *Sermons and Discourses* were in Swift’s library, showed himself convinced “that there are good Arguments for the belief ... in the Doctrine of the *Trinity*,” before enlarging at length on “The Unity of the Divine Nature and the B. Trinity” (*The Works of the Most Reverend Dr John Tillotson*, pp. 572, 316, 567-80 [PASSMANN AND VIENKEN III, 1858-60]). Nevertheless, in the 1690s, Trinitarianism came under attack from Socinian and ‘Mahometan’ Unitarians, who rejected the Divinity of Christ in favour of the unipersonality of God (Passmann, “The Dean and the Turk: Jonathan Swift, ‘Mahometanism,’ and Religious Controversy before the

Discourse concerning the Mechanical Operation of the Spirit,” pp. 129-32). Given the utter orthodoxy of Swift’s views on the Trinity (Louis A. Landa, “Swift, the Mysteries, and Deism,” *Essays in Eighteenth-Century English Literature* [Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1980], pp. 89-106; *Prose Works*, IX, 107), Swift would have been stung by Wotton’s indictment.

p. 5, ll. 21-23 *And indeed the Conceit was half spoiled by changing the Numbers; that of Four being much more Cabalistic*] Four is the perfect number of the Cabala and the number of temporal things (seasons, winds, parts of the earth) (CURTIUS, p. 503). Sir Thomas Browne noted that in “the letters of the name of God ... in the Greeke, Arabian, Persian, Hebrew, and Ægyptian, consisteth of that number [foure]” (*Pseudodoxia Epidemica*, ed. Robin Robbins, 2 vols [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981], I, 335; II, 931; see also Robert Boyle, *The Works*, ed. Thomas Birch, 6 vols [Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1965-66 {1772}], V, 131), indicating that in antiquity the names of the supreme deity consisted of four letters: Zeus [Jove], Alla [Alha], YHWH and Isis. In the *Spectator* of 13 November 1711, Addison poked fun at this cabalistical interpretation of letters, calling Ten “the Compleat Number”: “One, Two, Three, and Four put together make up the Number Ten; and that Ten is all,” concluding on the comment: “But these are not Mysteries for ordinary Readers to be let into. A Man must have spent many Years in hard Study before he can arrive at the Knowledge of them” (*The Spectator*, ed. Donald F. Bond, 5 vols [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965], II, 358-61 [361]).

p. 5, ll. 23-24 *and therefore better exposing the pretended Virtue of Numbers, a Superstition there intended to be ridicul’d*] Numerology is being ridiculed at some length in the *Tale* (*Prose Works*, I, 35).

p. 5, ll. 25-26 *there generally runs an Irony through the Thread of the whole Book*] In his *Verses on the Death of Dr Swift*, written in 1731 but not published before 1739, the old Dean proudly, *and* perhaps self-ironically, projected himself as the English satirist who “was born to introduce [irony],” and who “Refin’d it first, and shew’d its Use” (*Poems*, ed. Williams, II, 555, ll. 55-58; see also *Correspondence*, ed. Woolley, III, 326). In 1739, Roger Bull, dedicated his translation of Friedrich Dedekind’s *Ludus satyricus de morum simplicitate ...*

vulgo dictus Grobianus, of which Swift owned the 1631 Leiden edition, “To the Rev. Dr. *Jonathan Swift*, Dean of St. *Patrick’s*, DUBLIN; Who first Introduc’d into these Kingdoms, of GREAT BRITAIN and IRELAND, AN *Ironical Manner of WRITING*, To the Discouragement of Vice, Ill-manners, and Folly; And the Promotion of Virtue, Good-manners, and Good-sense” (*Grobianus: or, The Compleat Booby* [London: T. Cooper, 1739], sig. A2r [PASSMANN AND VIENKEN I, 510-11]). If one accepts the claim, the *Tale* will have to be regarded as Swift’s first ‘ironical’ treatise. But then, it is not to be ruled out that “the remark itself is an ironic understatement” (Ronald Paulson, *Theme and Structure in Swift’s “Tale of a Tub”* [New Haven: Yale University Press, 1960], p. 28).

p. 5, ll. 26-28 *which the Men of Tast will observe and distinguish, and which will render some Objections that have been made, very weak and insignificant*] As a trope which passes “the ordinary limits of common vtterance, and be occupied of purpose to deceiue the eare and also the minde, drawing it from plainnesse and simplicitie to a certaine doubleness,” Puttenham, following Quintilian, explains (“The Arte of English Poesie” [1589], *Elizabethan Critical Essays*, ed. G. Gregory Smith, 2 vols [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1964 {1904}], II, 160, 169; Quintilian, *Institutio oratoria*, VIII, vi, 54), ‘irony’ is a figure of indeterminacy, which in the seventeenth and eighteenth-centuries would signify either a mode of speech “*saying the contrary, or opposite, of what one means*,” or “*saying something other than one means*” (Norman Knox, *The Word Irony and its Context, 1500-1755* [Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press, 1961], pp. 30-37, and *passim*). In either case, the definition entails, first, that irony is for the cognoscenti (“*Men of Tast*”); and, second, since it is impossible to ascertain what proposition irony stands for, it is equally impossible to refute what it stands for (“*which will render some Objections ... weak and insignificant*”).

p. 5, ll. 29-31 *This Apology being chiefly intended for the Satisfaction of future Readers, it may be thought unnecessary to take any notice of such Treatises as have been writ against this ensuing Discourse*] See the note on “*IF good and ill Nature equally operated upon Mankind*” (p. 1, ll. 2-3).

p. 5, l. 32 *which are already sunk into waste Paper and Oblivion*] Similarly, in “THE Epistle Dedicatory, TO His Royal Highness PRINCE POSTERITY,” Swift

compares the books of the Moderns to “Unhappy Infants, many of them barbarously destroyed, before they have so much as learnt their *Mother-Tongue* to beg for Pity” (*Prose Works*, I, 20).

waste Paper] In *Verses on the Death of Dr. Swift* (1731) Swift imagines his own books to be misused as waste paper by pastry cooks (*Poems*, ed. Williams, II, 563, ll. 259-60).

pp. 5-6, ll. 32-2 *after the usual Fate of common Answerers to Books, which are allowed to have any Merit*] See the note on “*When Dr. Eachard wrote his Book ... he were ever answered at all*” (p. 6, ll. 5-8).

p. 6

p. 6, ll. 2-4 *They are indeed like Annuals that grow about a young Tree, and seem to vye with it for a Summer, but fall and die with the Leaves in Autumn, and are never heard of any more*]

Annuals] “An annual plant; one that lives only for a year (perpetuating itself by seed, so that there is an annual succession of new plants)” (OED).

p. 6, ll. 5-8 *When Dr. Eachard writ his Book about the Contempt of the Clergy, numbers of those Answerers immediately started up, whose Memory if he had not kept alive by his Replies, it would now be utterly unknown that he were ever answered at all*] The reference is to John Eachard, whose *The Grounds & Occasions of the Contempt of the Clergy and Religion Enquired into* (London: by W. Godbid for N. Brooke, 1670) not only “appear’d in the World [with wonderful Applause]” ([Thomas Newcomb], *Bibliotheca: A Poem, Occasion’d by the Sight of a Modern Library* [London: Printed in the Year, 1712], sig. A4r-v) but also elicited a number of replies, such as the anonymous *Vindication of the Clergy from the Contempt Imposed upon them* (London: by Andrew Clark for Henry Brome, 1672), and *An Answer to a Letter of Enquiry into the Grounds and Occasions of the Contempt of the Clergy* (London: for Nath. Ranew and J. Ro., 1671), sometimes attributed to Bishop John Bramhall, to which Eachard responded in a second letter, *Some Observations upon the Answer to an Enquiry into the Grounds & Occasions of the Contempt of the Clergy* (London: N. Brooke, 1671; see also Robert C. Elliott, “Swift and Dr Eachard,” *PMLA*, 69

(1954), pp. 1250-57; Paulson, *Theme and Structure in Swift's "Tale of a Tub"*, pp. 37-39).

whose Memory if he had not kept alive by his Replies, it would now be utterly unknown] The name “of the vilest scribbler,” Swift declared in his 1693 poem “To Mr Congreve,” “*must not within my lines be shewn, / Lest here it live, when perish'd with his own.*” To this “resolution Swift ever after adhered,” John Nichols explains in a note on the poem; for “of the infinite multitude of libellers who personally attacked him, there is not the name mentioned of any one of them throughout his works; and thus, together with their writings, have they been consigned to eternal oblivion” (*Poems*, ed. Williams, I, 48, ll. 167-68). Similarly, at the end of his travels, an auto-intoxicated Gulliver stages himself as “an Author perfectly blameless,” so that “the Tribes of Answerers, Considerers, Observers, Reflecters, Detecters, Remarkers, will never be able to find Matter for exercising their Talents” (*Prose Works*, XI, 293 [IV, xii, 5]).

p. 6, ll. 8-10 *There is indeed an Exception, when any great Genius thinks it worth his while to expose a foolish Piece*] Swift warned Pope in a letter of 1725 to “Take care the bad poets do not outwit you, as they have served the good ones in every Age, whom they have provoked to transmit their Names to posterity. Maevius [the Roman poetaster] is as well known as Virgil, and Gildon [despised deist philosopher] will be as well known as you if his name gets into your Verses” (*Correspondence*, ed. Woolley, II, 623-24). Unlike dispassionateness and indifference, criticism confers the same attention on the unworthy as on the worthy because it cares.

p. 6, ll. 10-11 *so we still read Marvel's Answer to Parker with Pleasure, tho' the Book it answers be sunk long ago*] In 1669, Samuel Parker (1640-88), a young Anglican clergyman who was about to rise rapidly in the Church, becoming Bishop of Oxford during the reign of King James II, published *A Discourse of Ecclesiastical Politie: Wherein the Authority of the Civil Magistrate over the Consciences of Subjects in Matters of Religion is Asserted*. As the subtitle already made clear, Parker was a theologian with decidedly Erastian leanings, who pleaded for the supremacy of the state in religious affairs, arguing that “the beliefs of men are so wayward and various that it is necessary for the peace and good government of the nation that the governor have absolute power in matters of

religion” (Marvell, *The Rehearsal Transpros’d*, ed. Smith, pp. xi-xii). Such a standpoint amounted to the rejection of toleration in religious matters as well as vociferous criticism of the Dissenters, presented “with insolence and contempt ... that enraged them beyond measure” (HAWKESWORTH, p. xiin†) In 1672, Andrew Marvell (1621-78), who by the time had secured for himself a reputation as a satirist and foe to tyranny, responded with *The Rehearsal Transpros’d* (London: by A. B. for John Calvin and Theodore Beza, 1672), which, as Bishop Burnet in the *History of his Own Time* was to describe it, had “all the men of wit (or, as the French phrase it, all the *Laughers*) on his side” (Burnet, *History of his Own Time*, I, 260; *Prose Works*, V, 273). In 1673, Parker retaliated with *A Reproof to the Rehearsal Transpros’d*, which Marvell countered with the second part of *The Rehearsal Transpros’d* in the same year (London: Nathaniel Ponder, 1673).

Given that Marvell’s work is permeated by wit, irony, and scurrility, it is no surprise that Swift scholars should have tended to emphasize Marvell’s impact on the *Tale*, the differences between the two men over theological doctrine notwithstanding (see, in addition to Paulson, *Theme and Structure in Swift’s “Tale of a Tub”*, pp. 39-45, and Philmus, “Andrew Marvell, Samuel Parker, and *A Tale of a Tub*,” pp. 71-98, Pierre Legouis, “Marvell et Swift,” *Revue Anglo-Américaine*, 1 [1924], 240-42; Anselment, “*A Tale of a Tub*: Swift and the ‘Men of Tast,’” pp. 265-82, and, most recently, Michael McKeon, “Swift’s Debt to Marvell: Parody, Figuration, Religion, and Print Culture,” *Reading Swift* [2013], pp. 147-56). However, these studies are sometimes marred by an unawareness of the fact that Swift was presumably not familiar with all facets of the controversy; although a copy of the first part of *The Rehearsal Transpros’d* was on his library shelves, he did not own the second part, and it is not clear whether Swift had read it by 1709 (PASSMANN AND VIENKEN II, 1207-8).

p. 6, ll. 11-13 *so the Earl of Orrery’s Remarks will be read with Delight, when the Dissertation he exposes will neither be sought nor found*] The first and second editions of Boyle’s *Dr Bentley’s Dissertations on the Epistles of Phalaris and the Fables of Aesop Examin’d* came out in the same year (London: Tho. Bennet, 1698), a third in 1699 (Bartholomew and Clark, *Richard Bentley*, pp. 29 and 32 [*97, *98, *107]). Although the name of Charles Boyle appeared as the author on the title page, the *Examination* is the collective effort of a group of Christ Church wits, who under the leadership of Francis Atterbury, Boyle’s tutor, came to the

young student's rescue in the wake of Bentley's withering attack (Historical Introduction, *The Battle of the Books*, 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/battleofthebooks/>], pp. 12-16). The evidence is provided in a letter by Atterbury to Boyle: "Some time and trouble this matter cost me. In laying the design of the book, in writing above half of it, in reviewing a good part of the rest, in transcribing the whole, and attending the press, half a year of my life went away" (*The Miscellaneous Works of Bishop Atterbury*, ed. John Nichols, 5 vols [London: John Nichols, 1789-98], I, 46). Apart from Atterbury, Anthony Alsop, William King, later an Advocate of Doctors' Commons in London, George Smalridge, and the two brothers Freind, John and Robert, joined the fray (William Warburton, *Letters from a Late Eminent Prelate to One of his Friends*, 2nd ed. [London, 1809], p. 11; *The Original Works of William King*, 3 vols [London, 1776], I, xiiiⁿ; Colin J. Horne, "The Phalaris Controversy: King versus Bentley," *The Review of English Studies*, 22 [1946], 289-303).

The reason why Swift juxtaposed 'Boyle's' *Examination* with Marvell's *Rehearsal Transpros'd*, one of the *Tale's* readers has suggested, has to be sought in the two writers' common concern, "the man without taste." While for Boyle it is Bentley who "epitomizes all that Temple opposed," for Marvell it is Parker who by his "breach of decorum [and] violation of propriety" was the prototypical Modern all bent on asserting his "self-sufficiency" (Anselment, "A Tale of a Tub: Swift and the 'Men of Tast,'" pp. 268-72; and the same author's "*Betwixt Jest and Earnest': Marprelate, Milton, Marvell, Swift & the Decorum of Religious Ridicule*," pp. 128, 133-34).

p. 6, ll. 13-15 *but these are no Enterprises for common Hands, nor to be hoped for above once or twice in an Age*] Swift reiterated this idea in his letter to Pope of 20 September 1723: "I have often endeavoured to establish a Friendship among all Men of Genius, and would fain have it done. They are seldom above three or four Cotemporaries and if they could be united would drive the world before them" (*Correspondence*, ed. Woolley, II, 469), and subsequently in *On Poetry: A Rapsody* of 1733 (*Jonathan Swift's "On Poetry: A Rapsody." A Critical Edition*

with a Historical Introduction and Commentary, ed. Melanie Maria Just [Frankfurt on Main: Peter Lang, 2004], pp. 13, 64-65 [ad l. 6]).

p. 6, ll. 15-18 *Men would be more cautious of losing their Time in such an Undertaking, if they did but consider, that to answer a Book effectually, requires more Pains and Skill, more Wit, Learning, and Judgment than were employ'd in the Writing it*] Empirical evidence is found in Atterbury's letter to his young protégé, Charles Boyle: "Some time and trouble this matter cost me. In laying the design of the book, in writing above half of it, in reviewing a good part of the rest, in transcribing the whole, and attending the press, half a year of my life went away" (*The Miscellaneous Works of Bishop Atterbury*, ed. Nichols, I, 46).

p. 6, ll. 19-21 *And the Author assures those Gentlemen who have given themselves that Trouble with him, that his Discourse is the Product of the Study, the Observation, and the Invention of several Years*] In fact, of almost a decade (see p. 1, ll. 15-18; see also Textual Introduction, pp. GG).

p. 6, l. 22 *that he often blotted out much more than he left*] Repeated in the *Discourse concerning the Mechanical Operation of the Spirit* (Online.Swift, forthcoming).

p. 6, ll. 22-24 *if his Papers had not been a long time out of his Possession, they must have still undergone more severe Corrections*] See the note on p. 2, ll. 14-16.

p. 6, ll. 24-26 *and do they think such a Building is to be battered with Dirt-Pellets however envenom'd the Mouths be that discharge them*]

such a Building] Works of literature and the arts have been frequently described in terms of architectural metaphors since Vitruvius' *De architectura*. The analogies became popular in Renaissance literary and aesthetic theory and spread from there into neoclassical criticism. A source particularly inspiring for Swift may have been Jonson's *Discoveries* (Bernfried Nugel, "*The Just Design*": *Studien zu architektonischen Vorstellungsweisen in der neoklassischen Literaturtheorie am Beispiel Englands* [Berlin und New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1980], pp. 63-104, 118-47, and *passim*).

Dirt-Pellets ... envenom'd the Mouths] Whereas “Dirt-Pellets” is a word-formation by Swift (OED) on the analogy of various existing combinations (Smith, *Language and Reality in Swift's “A Tale of a Tub”*, p. 151), the whole idea seems proverbial: “There is no VENOM to that of the tongue” (TILLEY V29).

p. 6, ll. 26-29 *He hath seen the Productions but of two Answerers, One of which first appear'd as from an unknown hand, but since avowed by a Person, who upon some Occasions hath discover'd no ill Vein of Humor*] The reference is to William King's *Some Remarks on “The Tale of a Tub” ... By the Author of the Journey to London* (London: A. Baldwin, 1704). By March 1708/9, Swift had forgiven King, an Oxford graduate from Christ Church and united with him in enmity towards Richard Bentley for this “excrementitious” attack (see note on p. 6, ll. 11-13). When “[reprinting] all his Works together,” King “pointedly omitted the pamphlet” from his *Miscellanies in Prose and Verse*, published in March 1709 and presented to Swift two days later (*Correspondence*, ed. Woolley, I, 239 and n7; PASSMANN AND VIENKEN II, 1009-10; Colin J. Horne, “Dr. William King's *Miscellanies in Prose and Verse*,” *The Library*, 4th ser., 25 [1945], 37-45). Two years later, Swift had a hand in Dr King's appointment as Gazetteer (*Correspondence*, ed. Woolley, I, 204n4, 411 and n7).

pp. 6-7, ll. 31-1 *But there were other Reasons obvious enough for his Miscarriage in this; he writ against the Conviction of his Talent*] According to the advertisement, Swift's 1732 poem *The Beasts' Confession to the Priest* is “grounded upon the universal Folly in Mankind of mistaking their Talents” (*Poems*, ed. Williams, II, 601).

p. 7

p. 7, ll. 1-4 *and enter'd upon one of the wrongest Attempts in Nature, to turn into ridicule by a Weeks Labour, a Work which had cost so much time, and met with so much Success in ridiculing others*] Swift was engaged in writing the *Tale* for the better part of a whole decade (see the gloss on “*The greatest Part of that Book was finished above thirteen Years since*,” p. 1, ll. 15-16).

p. 7, ll. 4-5 *the manner how he has handled his Subject*] “This we cannot recover at present, it being so absolutely forgotten, the oldest booksellers in trade remember nothing of it” (HAWKESWORTH, p. xivn‡).

p. 7, ll. 5-7 *I have now forgot, having just look’d it over when it first came out, as others did, meerly for the sake of the Title*] Like the illiterate virtuoso-persona of the *Discourse concerning the Mechanical Operation of the Spirit*, who does not read books but merely “peruses *Titles*” (*Prose Works*, I, 171).

p. 7, l. 8 *The other Answer is from a Person of graver Character*] William Wotton (13 August 1666-13 February 1727, Rector of Middleton Keynes, now shortened to Milton Keynes, Buckinghamshire, from 1693 till his death, a parish presented to him by Daniel Finch, second Earl of Nottingham, whose chaplain he was (Marie-Luise Spieckermann, *William Wottons “Reflections upon Ancient and Modern Learning” in Kontext der englischen “Querelle des anciens et des modernes”* [Frankfurt am Main and Bern: Peter Lang, 1981], pp. 3-17). The first edition of Wotton’s *Reflections upon Ancient and Modern Learning* (London: by J. Leake for Peter Buck, 1694), published on 2 July 1694, responded to Temple’s “An Essay upon the Ancient and Modern Learning” (*Miscellanea: The Second Part* [London: by T. M. for Ri. and Ra. Simpson, 1690], pp. 1-72), but did not yet contain Bentley’s first *Dissertation upon the Epistles of Phalaris*, which was added to the second edition of 1697 and published on 15 July (Bartholomew and Clark, *Richard Bentley*, pp. 27-28 [*94]). The Apologist here refers to *A Defense of the Reflections upon Ancient and Modern Learning ... with Observations upon “The Tale of a Tub”*, printed both separately and as part of the third edition of the *Reflections*, which came out in London in 1705 (see p. 1, ll. 6-7).

p. 7, ll. 8-10 *and is made up of half Invective, and half Annotation. In the latter of which he hath generally succeeded well enough*] The ultimate insult in as much as in Wotton’s *Observations*, added to the third edition of the *Reflections of Ancient and Modern Learning* of 1705, selected notes are signed *W. Wotton*: “Thus *Wotton* appears busied to illustrate a work, which he laboured to condemn, and adds force to a satire pointed against himself: as captives were bound to the chariot-wheel of the victor, and compelled to increase the pomp of his triumph, whom they had in vain attempted to defeat” (HAWKESWORTH I, xivn‡; quoted by

SCOTT XI, 21n*; LAMOINE, p. 96n24). See also the gloss on “*The Author is informed*” (p. 14, ll. 8-11).

p. 7, ll. 10-13 *And the Project at that time was not amiss, to draw in Readers to his Pamphlet, several having appear'd desirous that there might be some Explication of the more difficult Passages*] Repeated in the Bookseller's invitation to the reader “*to furnish [him] with a Key, in order to explain the more difficult Parts*” (*Prose Works*, I, 17).

p. 7, ll. 13-16 *Neither can he be altogether blamed for offering at the Invective Part, because it is agreed on all hands that the Author had given him sufficient Provocation*] If there is any evidence for this assertion, it has not been forthcoming.

offering at] “attacking, or replying to” (*A Tale of a Tub*, ed. Sale, p. 157).

p. 7, ll. 16-19 *The great Objection is against his manner of treating it, very unsuitable to one of his Function. It was determined by a fair Majority, that this Answerer had in a way not to be pardon'd, drawn his Pen against a certain great Man then alive*] The reference is to Sir William Temple, who had died on 27 January 1699 (Ehrenpreis, *Mr Swift*, p. 257). After 1698, when ‘Boyle’s’ *Examination* was published, a controversy about a question of historical facticity, the spuriousness of the epistles of Phalaris, turned into an issue of moral character. Although all contributors, the Christ Church wits, had laboured hard in coming to their young scholar’s rescue, endeavouring to foil the daunting Bentley “upon his own *Dunghil*,” as Tom Brown put it (*Familiar and Courtly Letters*, 3rd ed. [London: Sam Briscoe and J. Nutt, 1701], p. 134), they also stigmatized Bentley on a ground on which he was more vulnerable, that of character and class. In fact, the whole of the *Examination* is studded with denunciations of Bentley’s moral and social ‘eminence’ (*Dr Bentley’s Dissertations on the Epistles of Phalaris ... Examin’d*, pp. 11, 17, 24, 50, 91-92, 127-28, 202, 222-27). “The college put manners before scholarship,” one historian of the squabble has ruled (W. G. Hiscock, *Henry Aldrich of Christ Church, 1648-1710* [Oxford: Holywell Press, 1960], p. 55; see also Anselment, “*A Tale of a Tub: Swift and the ‘Men of Tast*,” pp. 268-69, and, more recently, Howard D. Weinbrot, “‘He Will Kill Me Over and Over Again’: Intellectual Contexts of the Battle of the Books,” *Reading*

Swift [2003], pp. 225-48 [239-47]). Ostensibly, it was not considered to be in accordance with good manners to contradict, let alone refute, a social superior, no matter how misguided that superior's views were, the "Itch of opposing Great Names upon very slight or no Grounds [being] a Chief and Distinguishing Mark of Pedantry" (*Dr Bentley's Dissertations on the Epistles of Phalaris ... Examin'd*, pp. 157 and 97). George Smalridge, soon to be appointed Dean of Christ Church, reacted in a representative statement recorded by John Nichols: "This at least I am confident of, that all persons of quality and good breeding will declare against [Bentley], when it shall appear how clownishly, and unlike either a gentleman or a scholar, he has treated Mr. Boyle and Sir William Temple, who have something at least of both" (*Illustrations of the Literary History of the Eighteenth Century*, 8 vols [New York: AMS Press, 1969 {1817-58}], III, 268-69; see also William King's 'deposition' sent to Bennet, the bookseller, in *A Short Account of Dr Bentley's Humanity and Justice* [London: Thomas Bennet, 1699], pp. 134-35, and Atterbury's *A Short Review of the Controversy between Mr Boyle and Dr Bentley* [London: A. Baldwin, 1701], pp. 36-37).

At the same time, the *Tale's* annotators have pointed out, "the charge is questionable" (GUTHKELCH AND NICHOL SMITH, p. 11n2). Unlike Bentley, whose tone was supercilious and jeering throughout (see Running Commentary, *The Battle of the Books*, 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/battleofthebooks/>], p. 49, l. 21), his friend Wotton proved well mannered and discriminating in tone, emphasizing his endeavour "to act the Part of a Mediator, and to give to every Side its just due" as well as to represent "the Opinions of other Men with Impartiality and Candour" (Preface [1697], p. xxi; see also pp. 10-11, 39, 143, 264, and *passim*). Even his antagonists would later acknowledge that Wotton's tone was "modest and decent," and that he spoke "generally with respect of those he differ[ed] from" (*Dr Bentley's Dissertations on the Epistles of Phalaris ... Examin'd*, p. 24).

drawn his Pen] A martial metaphor also used in the *Battle of the Books* (Online.Swift, p. 35, l. 14). See also WALSH, p. 323, and for its more general dissemination in seventeenth- and eighteenth-century poetry, see Kirsten Juhas, "*Ile to My Self, and to My Muse Be True*": *Strategies of Self-Authorization in*

Eighteenth-Century Women Poetry (Frankfurt on Main: Peter Lang, 2008), pp. 31-50.

p. 7, ll. 19-21 *and universally revered for every good Quality that could possibly enter into the Composition of the most accomplish'd Person*] Shortly after Temple's death, Swift inscribed "the Character" of Sir William as it appeared to him inside a copy of the London Bible printed by Robert Barker in 1601, which may have been a present from his patron (PASSMANN AND VIENKEN I, 206-7): "He was a Person of the greatest Wisdom, Justice, Liberality, Politeness, Eloquence, of his Age or Nation; the truest Lover of his Country, and one that deserved more from it by his eminent publick services, than any Man before or since: Besides his great deserving from the Commonwealth of Learning; having been universally esteemed the most accomplisht writer of his time" (nineteenth-century transcript in the National Library of Scotland, MS 881, fols 58, 70; printed by Scott, *The Works of Jonathan Swift*, I, 43; see also George P. Mayhew, "Jonathan Swift's 'On the burning of Whitehall in 1697' Re-examined," *Harvard Library Bulletin*, 19 [1971], 399-411 [p. 404n7]; Hermann J. Real and Heinz J. Vienken, "'A Pretty Mixture': Books from Swift's Library at Abbotsford House," *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester*, 67 [1984], pp. 522-43 [523-26]). "Extravagant" though this eulogy may sound to modern ears (Ehrenpreis, *Mr Swift*, p. 257), there is no evidence that Swift's Bible was "free of access to everyone" at Moor Park, and that, consequently, it was intended for more than Swift's eyes, more particularly, for those of Lady Giffard (Elias, *Swift at Moor Park*, pp. 100-1). The conclusion is bound to be that Swift was writing for himself only, and that there is no reason to suppose that he was not sincere in writing what he did. Irrespective of what Swift privately thought of his patron, however, the Christ Church wits agreed, also paying Sir William the compliment of being "*the most Accomplish'd Writer of the Age*" and describing his writings as held "in very great Esteem amongst all those who had a true relish for Sound Sense, and Noble Thoughts, express'd with all the Beauty and Force of proper and significant Language" ('Boyle,' *Dr Bentley's Dissertations on the Epistles of Phalaris and the Fables of Aesop Examin'd*, sig. A4r; p. 200; see also WALSH, p. 324).

p. 7, ll. 21-23 *it was observed, how he was pleased and affected to have that noble Writer call'd his Adversary]* Evidence for this claim has not been forthcoming so far.

p. 7, ll. 23-25 *and it was a Point of Satyr well directed, for I have been told, Sir W. T. was sufficiently mortify'd at the Term]* If Sir W[illiam] T[emple] was mortified by the term, he would have been too proud to let on about it in public or in writing. As is known from “A Fragment written upon the Subject of An^t. & Mod. Learning,” the draft of a Preface for “Some Thoughts upon Reviewing the Essay of *Antient and Modern Learning*” (*Miscellanea: The Third Part* [London: Benjamin Tooke, 1701], pp. 201-87), which survives in Swift’s hand (THE ROTHSCHILD LIBRARY II, 609-10 [2253]), Sir William was reluctant to re-enter the fray. He eventually was persuaded to draft the “Thoughts” in reply to the second edition of Wotton’s *Reflections upon Ancient and Modern Learning*, published in July 1697 (see the Preface to Temple’s *Miscellanea: The Third Part*, sig. A2v). In a similar manner, Temple refused to engage with Bentley’s *Dissertation upon the Epistles of Phalaris*, which accompanied Wotton’s *Reflections* of 1697. As he told an anonymous correspondent, he had “no mind to Enter the List, with such a Mean, Dull, Unmannerly PEDANT” ([William King], *A Short Account of Dr Bentley’s Humanity and Justice*, pp. 139-40).

p. 7, ll. 25-28 *All the Men of Wit and Politeness were immediately up in Arms, through Indignation, which prevailed over their Contempt, by the Consequences they apprehended from such an Example]* See p. 7, ll. 16-19.

p. 7, ll. 28-29 *and it grew to be Porsenna’s Case; Idem trecenti juravimus]* The quotation is from the *Epitome* of the Roman historiographer Publius Annaeus Florus, who was obligatory reading for schoolboys (*Prose Works*, VIII, 37). Swift owned several editions (PASSMANN AND VIENKEN I, 635-36), one of which he read no less than three times at Moor Park in 1697/8 (REAL [1978], pp. 128-29). Chapter X of the First Book describes “The Etruscan War against the King Porsenna [Bellum Etruscum cum Rege Porsenna],” to which the quotation refers. Swift is alluding to the heroism of Gaius Mucius Scaevola, the legendary Roman, who, when Lars Porsenna, King of Clusium, was besieging Rome at the end of the sixth century BC, made his way to the enemy camp and attempted to kill the king.

He was taken captive and threatened with death. To show his indifference, Mucius placed his hand in a blazing fire, saying: “Know from what sort of a man you have escaped; three hundred of us have sworn to attempt the same deed” ([Amsterdam: Elzevir, 1664], pp. 10-11 [PASSMANN AND VIENKEN I, 636-37]).

However, Florus’ *Epitome* is not the only source to be considered here. The same story is narrated in the same colourful detail by Livy, Valerius Maximus (*Dictorum factorumque memorabilium libri IX* [Amsterdam: Jan Jansson, 1647], pp. 120-21 [III, iii, 1]), Dionysius of Halicarnassus (*Dionysii Halicarnassensis antiquitatum Romanorum libri quotquot supersunt*, ed. John Hudson, 2 vols [in one] [Oxford: Sheldonian Theatre, 1704], I, 286-88 [V, xxviii-xxix] [PASSMANN AND VIENKEN III, 1887-90; I, 533-34]), and Laurence Eachard (*The Roman History: From the Building of the City to the Perfect Settlement of the Empire*, 4th ed. [London: by T. Hodgkin for M. Gillyflower, et al., 1699], pp. 67-68 [PASSMANN AND VIENKEN I, 553]), but only Florus mentions the solemn oath as quoted by Swift. While Livy makes Mucius say: “*longus post me ordo est idem petentium decus* [The line of those seeking the same honour after me is long]” (*Titi Livii historiarum libri*, ed. D[aniel] Heinsius, 3 vols [Leiden: Elzevir, 1634], I, 99 [II, 12, 9] [PASSMANN AND VIENKEN II, 1090]), Dionysius records: “*Trecenti Romani juvenes, omnes ejusdem ætatis ... in tuum caput, rex, conjuravimus* [Three hundred young men of Rome, all of the same age, have committed themselves by oath, o King, against thy life]” (I, 287). Eachard translates: “*Three hundred Romans in the Camp [are] now waiting for [your] Life*” (p. 68).

p. 7, ll. 29-32 *In short, things were ripe for a general Insurrection, till my Lord Orrery had a little laid the Spirit, and settled the Ferment. But his Lordship being principally engaged with another Antagonist* Charles Boyle succeeded his elder brother Lionel as Earl of Orrery in August 1703 (G. E. C., X, 178-80). In the eyes of the ‘public,’ it was him not Boyle’s antagonist Bentley who came out victorious in the controversy about the authenticity of Phalaris’ *Epistles*. Tom Brown happily denounced Bentley as “a stiff haughty *Grammarians*” and “*Arrogant Pedant*,” whom “all the *Polite Judges* in Europe were pleased to see worsted and foiled by a *Young Gentleman*” (*Familiar and Courtly Letters*, pp. 133-34). He was vigorously supported by the Christ Church wits in their response to Bentley (‘Boyle,’ *Dr Bentley’s Dissertations on the Epistles of Phalaris and the Fables of Aesop*

Examin'd, pp. 199-200), as well as the anonymous pamphleteer, presumably King, of *A Short Account of Dr Bentley's Humanity and Justice* (pp. 1-4, and *passim*), the anonymous author of *A Letter to the Reverend Dr Bentley, upon the Controversy betwixt Him and Mr Boyle* ([London: J. Nutt, 1699], pp. 21-22), Solomon Whately, "An Answer to a Late Book Written against the Learned and Reverend Dr Bentley (1699)" (*Classical Journal*, 9 [1814], 174), Samuel Garth, *The Dispensary*, in *Poems on Affairs of State: Augustan Satirical Verse, 1660-1714*, ed. Frank H. Ellis ([New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1970], VI, 108, ll. 73-74), William King, *Dialogues of the Dead* ([London: A. Baldwin, 1699], p. 45), and Abel Boyer, *Letters of Wit, Politicks, and Morality* ([London: J. Hartley, 1701], pp. 218-19). See also *The Battle of the Books*, Online.Swift, p. 3, ll. 12-13.

p. 7, ll. 32-34 *it was thought necessary in order to quiet the Minds of Men, that this Opposer should receive a Reprimand, which partly occasioned that Discourse of the Battle of the Books*] See Historical Introduction, *The Battle of the Books*, Online.Swift, pp. 9-14.

pp. 7-8, ll. 34-2 *and the Author was farther at the Pains to insert one or two Remarks on him in the Body of the Book*] Such as the ironical praise of Bentley, England's most eminent classical scholar, as "that Worthy *Modern*" (*Prose Works*, I, 78).

p. 8

p. 8, ll. 3-5 *This Answerer has been pleased to find Fault with about a dozen Passages, which the Author will not be at the Trouble of defending*]

p. 8, ll. 5-7 *farther than by assuring the Reader, that for the greater Part the Reflector is entirely mistaken, and forces Interpretations which never once entered into the Writer's Head*] See p. 3, ll. 20-22.

Reflector] Spelling variant of 'reflector', "A person who holds or expresses ill-formed opinions, judgements, etc., esp. in order to criticize or denigrate" (OED); a word-formation popular with Sir William Temple: "There are no where so many Disputers upon Religion, so many Reasoners upon Government, so

many Refiners in Politicks ... so many Pretenders to Business and State-Impliments, greater Porers upon Books, nor Plodders after Wealth” (*Sir William Temples Essays “Upon Ancient and Modern Learning” und “Of Poetry”*: eine historisch-kritische Ausgabe mit Einleitung und Kommentar, ed. Kämper, pp. 74, 75).

p. 8, ll. 7-8 *nor will he is sure into that of any Reader of Tast and Candor*] See the note on p. 2, l. 24.

p. 8, ll. 9-11 *for which he desires to plead the Excuse offered already, of his Youth, and Frankness of Speech*] See p. 1, 17-18.

p. 8, ll. 11-12 *and his Papers being out of his Power at the Time they were published*] See the note on p. 2, ll. 14-16.

p. 8, ll. 13-14 *But this Answerer insists, and says, what he chiefly dislikes, is the Design*]

p. 8, ll. 14-17 *I believe there is not a Person in England who can understand that Book, that ever imagined it to have been any thing else, but to expose the Abuses and Corruptions in Learning and Religion*] See p. 2, ll. 2-4.

p. 8, ll. 18-21 *But it would be good to know what Design this Reflector was serving, when he concludes his Pamphlet with a Caution to Readers to beware of thinking the Authors Wit was entirely his own*] “Before I leave this Author, be he who he will, I shall observe, Sir, that his *Wit* is *not his own*, in many places” (Wotton, *Observations upon “The Tale of a Tub”*, p. 540).

p. 8, ll. 21 *surely this must have had some Allay of Personal Animosity*] “Augustan satirists frequently accused one another, or were accused by their critics, of writing from bad motives,” such as malice, envy, or misanthropy (Elkin, *The Augustan Defence of Satire*, pp. 90-117 [90]).

p. 8, ll. 23-28 *and it indeed touches the Author in a very tender Point, who insists upon it, that through the whole Book he has not borrowed a single Hint from any*

Writer in the World; and he thought, of all Criticisms, that would never have been one, He conceived it was never disputed to be an Original, whatever Faults it might have] “To steal a Hint was never known, / But what he writ was all his own” (*Poems*, ed. Williams, II, 565, ll. 317-18), the perhaps most frequently quoted couplet from *Verses on the Death of Dr Swift*, which, however, constitutes a lie enacted being as it was pilfered from Sir John Denham’s “On Mr. Abraham Cowley: His Death and Burial amongst the Ancient Poets”: “To him no Author was unknown, / Yet what he wrote was all his own” (*Poems and Translations*, 5th ed. [London: Jacob Tonson, 1709], p. 86, ll. 29-30). In other words, Swift was original in claiming plagiarism to be original. In Faulkner’s Advertisement to the Works of 1735, the Prince of Dublin publishers repeated the claim: “The Author never was known either in Verse or Prose to borrow any Thought, Simile, Epithet, or particular Manner of Style; but whatever he writ, whether good, bad, or indifferent, is an Original in itself” (*Prose Works*, XIII, 184).

In discussing this line from the Apology in his “Life of Swift,” Johnson first observes what perhaps is obvious, that Swift’s claim was “not literally true,” but then continues: “Perhaps no writer can easily be found that has borrowed so little, or that in all his excellences and all his defects has so well maintained his claim to be considered as original” (*The Lives of the Most Eminent English Poets*, ed. Lonsdale, III, 214, 462). See also Running Commentary, *A Tritical Essay upon the Faculties of the Mind*, ed. Hermann J. Real, with the assistance of Kirsten Juhas, Dirk F. Passmann, and Sandra Simon (Online.Swift/Ehrenpreis Centre for Swift Studies, Münster, November 2011) [<http://www.anglistik.uni-muenster.de/Swift/online.swift/works/triticalessay/>], p. 2, l. 3.

p. 8, ll. 28-29 *However this Answerer produces three Instances to prove this Author’s Wit is not his own in many Places]* Enumerated in rapid succession by Wotton (*Observations upon “The Tale of a Tub”*, p. 540), and dealt with by the Apologist in order.

p. 8, ll. 29-31 *The first is, that the Names of Peter, Martin and Jack are borrowed from a Letter of the late Duke of Buckingham]* The Apologist alludes to George Villiers, second Duke of Buckingham (1628-87), whose letter “To Mr. Clifford, on his Humane-Reason” was first published by Tom Brown in his edition of *The Works of his Grace George, Late Duke of Buckingham* (2 vols [London, 1704],

II, 67). See Benjamin Boyce, *Tom Brown of Facetious Memory: Grub Street in the Age of Dryden* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1939), p. 202 (56).

p. 9

p. 9, ll. 2-6 *at the same time protesting solemnly that he never once heard of that Letter, except in this Passage of the Answerer: So that the Names were not borrowed as he affirms, tho' they should happen to be the same which however is odd enough, and what he hardly believes*] For once, Swift's claim, in 1709, never to have "heard of that Letter" is entirely credible: *A Tale of a Tub* is known to have originated, at least in its essential parts including the names in the latter half of the 1690s (GUTHKELCH AND NICHOL SMITH, pp. xliii-xlvii), so that its author cannot have profited from a work which was published as late as 1704 and which is not known to have circulated in manuscript (see pp. 8-9, ll. 29-32, 11-12).

p. 9, ll. 6-7 *that of Jack, being not quite so obvious as the other two*] While the names of Peter and Martin could hardly have been applied to any other church, or churches, than the ones they are declared to stand for, Jack is a more difficult case since, in the *Tale*, he represents not only John Calvin and Calvinism but also various national sects more or less loosely affiliated with, or descended from it, such as the (Dutch and German) Anabaptists, the French Huguenots, and the radical Presbyterians of Scotland (*Prose Works*, I, 84, 88-89).

p. 9, ll. 7-9 *The second Instance to shew the Author's Wit is not his own, is Peter's Banter ... upon Transubstantiation*] Again, the Apologist jeeringly mimics his antagonist: "Peter's Banter upon Transubstantiation" is a verbatim quotation from Wotton's *Observations upon "The Tale of a Tub"* (p. 540).

Banter] "Banter," a word of unknown etymology, meaning "ridicule; raillery," "a pleasant way of prating, which seems in earnest, but is in jest," and apparently "picked up from the vulgar cant of the period by the men about town" (OED; B. E., *A New Dictionary of the Canting Crew*, p. 13; Knox, *The Word Irony and its Context, 1500-1755*, pp. 208-21). In no 230 of *The Tatler*, Swift classes it with other fashionable words he abhorred, as Locke had done (*An Essay concerning Human Understanding*, ed. Peter H. Nidditch [Oxford: Clarendon

Press, 1975], p. 478 [III, ix, 7]), “invented by some *pretty Fellows*, such as *Banter*, *Bamboozle*, *Country Put*, and *Kidney*,” and “now struggling for the Vogue,” adding: “I have done my utmost for some Years past, to stop the Progress of *Mob* and *Banter*; but have been plainly born down by Numbers, and betrayed by those who promised to assist me” (*The Tatler*, ed. Bond, III, 190-96 [p. 194]). According to the Christ Church wits who responded to Bentley’s *Dissertation upon the Epistles of Phalaris*, added to the second edition of Wotton’s *Reflections upon Ancient and Modern Learning* of July 1697, under the leadership of Atterbury, ‘Banter’ was a word “not very suitable to the Character of a Man in Holy Orders” (‘Boyle,’ *Dr Bentley’s Dissertations on the Epistles of Phalaris and the Fables of Æsop Examined*, p. 285; see also Smith, *Language and Reality in Swift’s “A Tale of a Tub”*, pp. 55-56). Not least, bantering was a hallmark of the Trinity College commencements, the official degree-awarding ceremony, when one of the students as *terrae filius*, or licensed jester, “was called upon to deliver a mocking, parodic speech” on the assembled dignitaries of the college (Andrew Carpenter, “A School for a Satirist: Swift’s Exposure to the War of Words in Dublin in the 1680s,” *Reading Swift* [2003], pp. 161-75 [170-71]; see also the manuscript note by Mayhew in GUTHKELCH AND NICHOL SMITH [1920], p. 13).

Transubstantiation] The Roman Catholic doctrine of “transubstantiation,” “the conversion in the Eucharist of the whole substance of the bread into the body and of the wine into the blood of Christ, only the appearances [and other ‘accidents’] of bread and wine remaining” (OED). According to Bishop Gilbert Burnet’s *Exposition of the Thirty-Nine Articles*, transubstantiation, “next to the Infallibility of the Church,” is the “dearest piece of the Doctrine of the Church of Rome” (p. 355), by which the Catholic Church distinguishes itself most markedly from all other national churches. See the gloss on “*here is excellent good Mutton*” (*A Tale of a Tub*, Online.Swift, forthcoming), and, for Swift’s criticism of transubstantiation in the *Tale* and elsewhere, Hermann J. Real, “*Ab Ovo*: Swift’s Small-Endians and Big-Endians and Transubstantiation,” *Leeds Studies in English: Essays in Honour of Oliver Pickering*, eds Janet Burton, William Marx, and Veronica O’Mara, n.s. 41 (2010), 216-30.

p. 9, l. 8 (*as he calls it in his Alsatia Phrase*) ‘Alsatia,’ named after Alsace, the long disputed territory between France and Germany, signified the precincts of

the former Whitefriars Monastery, which was granted the privileges of a liberty by Queen Elizabeth after having become a hotbed of crime in the latter half of the sixteenth century. As a liberty, Alsatia was a “notorious place of refuge and retirement for persons wishing to avoid bailiffs and creditors” (WEINREB AND HIBBERT, pp. 20-21; WHEATLEY AND CUNNINGHAM I, 41-42), a selection of whom Thomas Shadwell introduced in the *dramatis personae* of his celebrated play *The Squire of Alsatia* of 1688 (Theodor Dopheide, “*Satyr the true Medicine*”: *die Komödien Thomas Shadwells* [Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1991], pp. 145-54, and *passim*).

p. 9, ll. 9-11 *which is taken from the same Duke’s Conference with an Irish Priest, where a Cork is turned into a Horse*] The ‘Conference’ appears to have been first printed in Tom Brown’s 1704 edition of Buckingham’s *Works* (II, 33-57), the issue referred to here (GUTHKELCH AND NICHOL SMITH, p. 14n1). In it, Buckingham is waited on by a Catholic priest, Father Fitzgerald, intent to convert him. Buckingham pretends that a cork is a horse, only to be rebuffed by the priest. The parallel seems close to Peter’s conversation with his brothers about a crust of bread in the *Tale*, but then the Apologist affirms only to have seen the book “*about ten Years after [it] was writ, and a Year or two after it was published*” (p. 9, ll. 11-12).

p. 9, ll. 13-14 *Nay, the Answerer overthrows this himself; for he allows the Tale was writ in 1697*] “It is probable that it was writ in the Year 1697, when it is said to have been written” (Wotton, *Observations upon “The Tale of a Tub”*, pp. 539-40).

p. 9, ll. 14-15 *and I think that Pamphlet was not printed in many Years after*] In 1704 (see p. 8, ll. 29-31).

p. 9, ll. 15-16 *It was necessary, that Corruption should have some Allegory as well as the rest*] See the note on “Allegory of the Coats” (p. 2, ll. 7-9).

p. 9, ll. 16-19 *and the Author invented the properest he could, without enquiring what other People had writ, and the commonest Reader will find, there is not the least Resemblance between the two Stories*] The claim is just (see p. 9, ll. 9-11).

p. 9, ll. 19-22 *The third Instance is in these Words*: I have been assured, that the Battle in St. James's Library, is *mutatis mutandis*, taken out of a *French Book*, entituled, *Combat des livres*, if I misremember not] This echoes a malicious remark by Wotton in which he charged Swift with plagiarism, in the 1670s and 1680s “mud that is being thrown by many writers at their rivals” (Hammond, *Professional Imaginative Writing in England, 1670-1740*, pp. 21, 83-104): “And I have been assured that the *Battel in St. James's Library* is *Mutatis Mutandis* taken out of a *French Book*, entituled, *Combat des Livres*, if I misremember not” (*Observations upon “The Tale of a Tub”*, p. 540). Wotton was referring to the prose *Histoire poétique de la guerre nouvellement déclarée entre les Anciens et les Modernes* by a French diplomat, François de Callières (1645-1717), which had been published anonymously in Paris and Amsterdam a few years earlier (1687-88). Even though Wotton admitted to relying on nothing but hearsay (“I have been assured”) and a faulty memory (“if I misremember not”), posterity has opted to side with him (Donald M. Berwick, *The Reputation of Jonathan Swift, 1781-1882* [Philadelphia, 1941], pp. 35, 69). In 1770, *The Gentleman's Magazine* (40 [1770], 159) repeated the charge, and in his “Life of Swift,” the authoritative Johnson concurred: “*The Battle of the Books* is so like the *Combat de Livres* ... that the improbability of such a coincidence of thoughts without communication is not, in my opinion, balanced by the anonymous protestation prefixed, in which all knowledge of the French book is peremptorily disowned” (*The Lives of the Most Eminent English Poets*, ed. Lonsdale, III, 193, 435). It is, however, quite unlikely that Wotton and Johnson had seen “the book they called in evidence with such airy dogmatism” (Harold Williams, “Swift's Early Biographers,” *Pope and his Contemporaries: Essays Presented to George Sherburn*, eds James L. Clifford and Louis A. Landa [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1949], pp. 114-28 [124-25]). Nonetheless, a majority of later critics all followed Wotton and the Great Cham and all failed to bolster it with evidence (Richard Gosche, “Jonathan Swift,” *Jahrbuch für Litteraturgeschichte*, 1 [1865], 138-74 [p. 151]; Henry Craik, *The Life of Jonathan Swift*, 2 vols, 2nd ed. [London and New York: Macmillan, 1894], I, 90-91; Otto Diede, *Der Streit der Alten und Modernen in der englischen Literaturgeschichte des XVI. und XVII. Jahrhunderts* [Greifswald: Hans Adler, 1912], pp. 133-34; Gilbert Highet, *The Anatomy of Satire* [Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, and London: Oxford University Press, 1962], pp. 109,

262-64n49). This is also true of the last to have endorsed the charge of plagiarism (Joseph M. Levine, *The Battle of the Books: History and Literature in the Augustan Age* [Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1991], pp. 129-32).

mutatis mutandis] *Mutatis mutandis*, “With the appropriate changes being made,” is “a convenient term when two or more things are being compared and the writer wants to avoid the accusation that they do not have much in common,” but it is “one of those phrases only to be used if you are sure of your ground” (Philip Gooden, *Faux Pas? A No-Nonsense Guide to Words and Phrases from Other Languages* [London: A & C Black, 2005], pp. 143-44). The fact that it was repeated twice (pp. 9-10, ll. 31, 5) shows Swift’s anger and indignation. The phrase had earlier been used by Marvell (*The Rehearsal Transpros’d*, ed. Smith, p. 101 [PASSMANN AND VIENKEN II, 1207-9]).

p. 9, ll. 28-30 *I know nothing more contemptible in a Writer than the Character of a Plagiary; which he here fixes at a venture, and this, not for a Passage, but a whole Discourse*] Swift’s attitude towards plagiarism is only known from this forthright and vociferous condemnation of it, but there is at least some more implicit evidence. Realizing that the subject was a touchy point for the Dean, Lord Bathurst teasingly threatened Swift in September 1730: “I receive so much Pleasure in reading y^r letters ... But if yⁿ grow obstinate & won’t answer me I’ll plague yⁿ & Pester yⁿ & doe all I can to Vex yⁿ. I’ll take y^r works to Pieces & show yⁿ that it is all borrow’d or stole, have not yⁿ stole the sweetness of y^r Numbers from Dryden & Waller, have not yⁿ borrow’d thoughts from Virgil & Horace ... & in y^r Prose writings, w^{ch} they make such a Noise ab^t, they are only some little improvements upon the Humour yⁿ have stole from Miguel de Cervantes & Rabelais” (*Correspondence*, ed. Woolley, III, 323).

p. 9, ll. 31-32 *The Author is as much in the dark about this as the Answerer*] See p. 9, ll. 19-22.

p. 9, ll. 32-34 *and will imitate him by an Affirmation at Random; that if there be a word of Truth in this Reflection, he is a paultry, imitating Pedant*]

he] The reference is not quite clear: Swift, not Wotton, is intended.

Pedant] In Swift’s view, ‘Pedantry,’ the domineering and intolerant arrogance of imposing one’s own views on others, which he later defined as “the

too frequent or unseasonable obtruding our own Knowledge in common Discourse, and placing too great a Value upon it” (*Prose Works*, IV, 90 and 215), is always indicative of bad behaviour, “of Rudeness, Ill-nature, Incivility,” as Swift summarized in his “Ode to the Honourable Sir William Temple” (*Poems*, ed. Williams, I, 27, ll. 25-26). In this view, he was anticipated by Pierre Charron, who defined the pedant as “not only different from, and contrary to a Wise Man ... but [as] a Fellow that hath the Impudence to oppose and make Head against him” and that “sawcily challenges him to Combat, and talks magisterially and dogmatically” (*Of Wisdom ... Made English by George Stanhope*, 2 vols [London: M. Gillyflower, *et al.*, 1697], I, sig. b1r-v; pp. 359-60 [PASSMANN AND VIENKEN I, 395]), and followed by Steele in *The Tatler* (ed. Bond, II, 414-18 [no 165]; see also Samuel Butler, *Characters*, ed. Charles W. Daves [Cleveland and London: The Press of Case Western Reserve University, 1970], pp. 187-88). According to ‘Boyle’s’ *Examination*, “PEDANTRY is a Word of a very various and mix’d meaning, and therefore hard to be Defin’d.” Nevertheless, ‘Boyle’ proposed a definition which could not be more striking in its precision: “The first and surest Mark of a *Pedant* is, to write without observing the receiv’d Rules of Civility, and Common Decency ... For Pedantry in the Pen, is what Clownishness is in Conversation; it is *Written Ill-breeding*” (*Dr Bentley’s Dissertations on the Epistles of Phalaris ... Examin’d*, pp. 93, 157, and *passim*; see also Ehrenpreis, *Mr Swift*, pp. 206-7).

pp. 9-10, ll. 34-1 *and the Answerer is a Person of Wit, Manners and Truth*] The explanation is implied in the previous note (p. 9, ll. 32-34).

p. 10

p. 10, ll. 1-5 *He takes his Boldness, from never having seen any such Treatise in his Life nor heard of it before; and he is sure it is impossible for two Writers of different Times and Countries to agree in their Thoughts after such a Manner, that two continued Discourses shall be the same only mutatis mutandis*] For a variety of reasons, Swift’s claim has to be regarded as just: for one, de Callières’s *Histoire poétique* was never in Swift’s library at any time. For another, there is no evidence, neither direct nor indirect, in any of his works that Swift read it at any stage before 1697/8, the *Battle*’s years of composition. Finally, and most

importantly, there is not a single ‘parallel,’ no matter whether image or motif, theme or episode, which is *unique* to both the *Battle* and this ‘source’ and which would argue for a dependency on Swift’s part. See Historical Introduction, *The Battle of the Books*, Online.Swift, pp. 17-24.

p. 10, ll. 6-7 *Neither will he insist upon the mistake of the Title, but let the Answerer and his Friend produce any Book they please]*

upon the mistake of the Title] A slur on Wotton’s unreliable memory, which failed him when trying to identify *Combat des Livres* with de Callières’s *Histoire poétique* (p. 9, l. 22).

the Answerer and his Friend] William Wotton and his friend, the eminent classical scholar Dr Richard Bentley. While the first edition of Wotton’s *Reflections upon Ancient and Modern Learning* of 2 July 1694 (London: by J. Leake for Peter Buck, 1694) did not yet contain Bentley’s *Dissertation upon the Epistles of Phalaris*, this was added to the second edition of 1697, published on 15 July (Bartholomew and Clark, *Richard Bentley*, pp. 27-28 [*94]). In tandem, Wotton and Bentley inflicted a devastating public humiliation upon Swift’s patron, Sir William Temple, and together they form in the *Battle*, Swift’s retaliation, the “pair of Friends” fighting in the camp of the Moderns (see the note on “Farewel, beloved, loving Pair,” *Battle of the Books*, Online.Swift, p. 52, ll. 27-28).

p. 10, ll. 7-9 *he defies them to shew one single Particular, where the judicious Reader will affirm he has been obliged for the smallest Hint]* See p. 9, ll. 32-34.

p. 10, ll. 9-13 *giving only Allowance for the accidental encoutring of a single Thought, which he knows may sometimes happen; tho’ he has never yet found it in that Discourse, nor has heard it objected by any body else]* See Historical Introduction, *The Battle of the Books*, Online.Swift, pp. 17-24.

p. 10, ll. 14-17 *So that if ever any design was unfortunately executed, it must be that of this Answerer, who when he would have it observed that the Author’s Wit is not his own, is able to produce but three Instances, two of them meer Trifles, and all three manifestly false]* A triumphant conclusion.

p. 10, ll. 18-22 *If this be the way these Gentlemen deal with the World in those Criticisms, where we have not Leisure to defeat them, their Readers had need be cautious how they rely upon their Credit; and whether this Proceeding can be reconciled to Humanity or Truth, let those who think it worth their while, determine]* In theme and syntactical structure, reminiscent of Jesus' question to Pilate: "For if they do these things in a green tree, what shall be done in the dry?" (St Luke 23:31).

Humanity] The well-known 'hallmark' of Richard Bentley (Running Commentary, *Battle of the Books*, Online.Swift, p. 36, ll. 35-36).

p. 10, ll. 23-25 *It is agreed, this Answerer would have succeeded much better, if he had stuck wholly to his Business as a Commentator upon the Tale of a Tub]* See the note on p. 1, ll. 1-2.

p. 10, ll. 25-27 *wherein it cannot be deny'd that he hath been of some Service to the Publick, and has given very fair Conjectures towards clearing up some difficult Passages]* In "The Bookseller to the Reader" of 1704, whose "style and content point clearly to Swift"(GUTHKELCH AND NICHOL SMITH, p. 28n1), the Bookseller, perhaps tongue-in-cheekishly, admitted the need for a key to the *Tale*: "If any Gentleman will please to furnish me with a Key, in order to explain the more difficult Parts, I shall very gratefully acknowledge the Favour, and print it by it self" (*Prose Works*, I, 17). In the spring of 1710, Edmund Curll 'obliged' with his *A Complete Key to the Tale of a Tub* (see the note on p. 14, ll. 20-22). Benjamin Tooke, the publisher of the *Tale's* fifth edition, sent Swift a copy of this pamphlet some time in June 1710, acknowledged by Swift in his response of 29 June 1710 (*Correspondence*, ed. Woolley, I, 282 and n2; see also 285n4).

p. 10, ll. 27-33 *it is the frequent Error of those Men (otherwise very commendable for their Labors) to make Excursions beyond their Talent and their Office, by pretending to point out the Beauties and the Faults; which is no part of their Trade, which they always fail in, which the World never expected from them, nor gave them any thanks for endeavouring at]* Swift's 1732 poem, *The Beasts' Confession to the Priest*, is subtitled: *On Observing how Most Men Mistake their Own Talents*, a thesis elaborated in the subsequent Preface and Advertisement, and illustrated at length in the various vignettes of the poem itself

(*Poems*, ed. Williams, II, 599-608). Shortly before, after having severely lectured Knightley Chetwode on his “graceless” and “self-indulgent” demeanour (Ehrenpreis, *Dean Swift*, pp. 59-62), Swift concluded on this abrasively pointed remark: “It is an uncontrolled truth, that no man ever made an ill figure who understood his own talents, nor a good one who mistook them” (*Correspondence*, ed. Woolley, III, 390). In the Apology, Swift may have been thinking of this maxim as formulated by the ‘ancient’ Horace, “Quam scit vterque, libens, censebo, exerceat artem [I will advise that each contentedly practises the trade he understands]” (*Epistolae*, in *Quintvs Horativs Flaccvs*, ed. Heinsius, p. 201 [I, xiv, 44] [PASSMANN AND VIENKEN II, 905-6]), ironically quoted by the Moderns against themselves: “The first piece that I will venture to give the Dr is, that he would know his own talent; and resolve for the future not to venture upon any way of writing that Nature never design’d him for” (‘Boyle,’ *Dr Bentley’s Dissertations on the Epistles of Phalaris and the Fables of Aesop Examined*, p. 285).

p. 10-11, ll. 33-2 The Part of Min-ellius, *or Farnaby would have fallen in with his Genius, and might have been serviceable to many Readers who cannot enter into the abstruser Parts of that Discourse*] “Low commentators, who wrote notes upon classick authors for the use of schoolboys” (HAWKESWORTH, p. xxin^z). This judgement does less than justice to these two scholars, however.

Min-ellius] Jan Minell (c.1625-83) was a Rotterdam schoolmaster and classical scholar, widely known for his editions of Latin poets and historians. Swift owned Minell’s Amsterdam edition of C. Sallustius Crispus of 1658 as well as the 1676 Cambridge edition of the *Comoediae sex* by Publius Terentius Afer (PASSMANN AND VIENKEN II, 1260; III, 1635, 1812).

Farnaby] Thomas Farnaby (c.1575-1647) was “the most noted schoolmaster of his time,” whose “school was so much frequented, that more churchmen and statesmen issued thence, than from any school taught by one man in England.” Swift owned two of Farnaby’s many editions of the Greek and Roman classics, the Amsterdam edition of Marcus Annaeus Lucanus, *Pharsalia: sive, De bello civili* of 1665, as well as Lucius and Marcus Annaeus Seneca, *Tragoediae*, also published in Amsterdam in 1665 (*Athenae Oxonienses*, III, cols 213-16; PASSMANN AND VIENKEN I, 601; II, 1107; III, 1665).

p. 11

p. 11, ll. 2 *but Optat ephippia bos piger*] Somewhat freely translated in the following sentence: “*The dull, unwieldy, ill-shaped Ox would needs put on the Furniture of a Horse.*” Both editions of Horace in Swift’s library published before 1709 present the same reading (see, for example, *Epistolae*, in *Qvintvs Horativs Flaccvs*, ed. Heinsius, p. 201 [I, xiv, 43] [PASSMANN AND VIENKEN II, 905-6]).

p. 11, ll. 2-3 *The dull, unwieldy, ill-shaped Ox would needs put on the Furniture of a Horse*]

Furniture] “The harness, housings, trappings, etc. of a horse or other draught animal” (OED).

p. 11, ll. 7-8 *It is another Pattern of this Answerer’s fair dealing, to give us Hints that the Author is dead*] “The Author, I believe, is dead” (Wotton, *Observations upon “The Tale of a Tub”*, p. 539). This is a meaningful statement only if one assumes that Wotton mistook Temple, who had died on 27 January 1699 (Ehrenpreis, *Mr Swift*, p. 257), for the author of the *Tale*. In line with his habit to draw freely on rumour and hearsay (p. 9, ll. 19-22), Wotton had written in the *Observations* that “a Brother of Dr. *Swift*’s is publicly reported to have been the Editor at least, if not the Author [of *A Tale of a Tub*]” (p. 519; ELLIS, p. 229). While there is evidence attributing the *Tale* publicly to Jonathan’s cousin, Thomas, in 1705 (see Textual History, *A Tale of a Tub*, Online.Swift, forthcoming), there is none claiming him to have been its Editor. To that extent, Wotton’s ‘evidence’ is simply unknown. But whoever took Thomas for the *Tale*’s editor would conclude Sir William to have been its author.

p. 11, ll. 9-12 *to which can be only returned, that he is absolutely mistaken in all his Conjectures; and surely Conjectures are at best too light a Pretence to allow a Man to assign a Name in Publick*]

p. 11, ll. 12-15 *He condemns a Book, and consequently the Author, of whom he is utterly ignorant, yet at the same time fixes in Print, what he thinks a disadvantageous Character upon those who never deserved it*] See the note on “*The third Instance is in these Words*” (p. 9, ll. 19-22).

p. 11, ll. 15-16 *A Man who receives a Buffet in the Dark may be allowed to be vexed*] If this is a proverb, we have failed to identify it.

p. 11, ll. 16-18 *but it is an odd kind of Revenge to go to Cuffs in broad day with the first he meets with, and lay the last Nights Injury at his Door*]

p. 11, ll. 18-19 *And thus much for this discreet, candid, pious, and ingenious Answerer*] Just as the Christ Church wits were at pains to stigmatize Bentley not on the grounds of scholarship and knowledge but on those of character and class (see the note on p. 7, ll. 16-19), the Apologist ironically calls Wotton's moral character in question.

p. 11, ll. 20-23 *How the Author came to be without his Papers, is a Story not proper to be told, and of very little use, being a private Fact of which the Reader would believe as little or as much as he thought good*] See p. 2, ll. 14-16.

p. 11, ll. 23-24 *He had however a blotted Copy by him, which he intended to have writ over, with many Alterations*] The Apologist refers to at least three, possibly four or even five manuscripts of the *Tale* (Andrew Carpenter, "A Tale of a Tub as an Irish Text," *Swift Studies*, 20 [2005], 30-40 [pp. 36-37]). The "blotted Copy" here mentioned may be identical with "the Authors Original copy" (p. 11, l. 32), or holograph, marked by "many Alterations," authorial revisions of all sorts, such as re-drafts, erasures, deletions, emendations, and additions. If so, this would very much constitute work in progress, the author's ('foul') working papers, presumably a transcript made of, and distinct from, the ('fair') "original copy," either in the author's or a copyist's hand. Neither of these two seems to have circulated. The third manuscript in existence, *and* in circulation, was "a copy of some part of [the *Tale*]" lent to Swift's "little Parson-cousin," Thomas, which Thomas apparently showed to others (see the note on p. 14, ll. 22-24) and on which his claim to joint authorship rests. Being only a transcript of "some part," most probably the religious allegory, this copy is neither identical with "the Copy to the Bookseller" (p. 14, l. 29) nor with "the surreptitious Copy" from which the *Tale* was allegedly printed (p. 11, l. 26). Finally, "the Copy to the Bookseller" may be identical with "the surreptitious Copy," but even if it is, it is most unlikely to

have been “*the Authors Original copy*,” or holograph, no matter what state this was in. If it is legitimate to extrapolate from Swift’s practice when preparing the publication of *Gulliver’s Travels* (David Woolley, “The Stemma of *Gulliver’s Travels*: A Second Note,” *Swift Studies*, 17 [2002], 75-87 [pp. 77-78]), “*the Copy to the Bookseller*” was a transcript of the holograph and was presumably destroyed after publication.

p. 11, ll. 24-26 *and this the Publishers were well aware of having put it into the Booksellers Preface, that they apprehended a surreptitious Copy, which was to be altered, &c]* See the note on “*I have been lately alarm’d with Intelligence of a surreptitious Copy, which a certain great Wit had new polish’d and refin’d*” (*A Tale of a Tub*, Online.Swift. forthcoming).

the Publishers] See the *Tale’s* “The Bookseller to the Reader” (*Prose Works*, I, 17), said to have been written by “*the Publishers*” but in fact by Swift (GUTHKELCH AND NICHOL SMITH, p. 28n1). The word is here used in the obsolete sense of “editors” (OED) as in Sir William Temple’s *Miscellanea: The Third Part* (London: Benjamin Tooke, 1701), described on its title page as “Published by *Jonathan Swift*” and prefaced by his “The Publisher to the Reader” (sigs A2r-A3v; WALSH, p. 325).

surreptitious] *Surreptitious*, “issued without authority, ‘pirated’” (OED). Authors were well aware of the danger of (often faulty) pirated editions. “I have been perswaded to overcome all the just repugnances of my own *modesty*, and to produce these *Poems* to the light and view of the World,” Abraham Cowley, for instance, writes in the Preface to his *Poems*, “not as a thing that I approved of in it self, but as a lesser evil, which I chose rather than to stay till it were done for me by some body else, either surreptitiously before, or avowedly after my death” (*Poems* [London: Humphrey Moseley, 1656], sig. (a)2r [PASSMANN AND VIENKEN I, 475-76]). Likewise, in *The Epistle Dedicatory to Some Motives and Incentives to the Love of God* (1659), Robert Boyle told his sister, the Countess of Warwick, that he “thought it less inconvenient to venture [his] own abroad, than to run the hazard of a surreptitious edition” (*The Works*, ed. Birch, I, 244; see also David Featly, *An Appendix to the Fishers Net* [London: Robert Milbourne, 1624], sig. Q2r-v [PASSMANN AND VIENKEN I, 604-5]; Edmund Waller, *Poems, &c. Written upon Several Occasions and to Several Persons* [London: Henry Herringman, 1664], sig. [A1r]; Harold Love, *Scribal Publication*

in *Seventeenth-Century England* [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993], pp. 35-54, and *passim*).

On the other hand, it is never easy to decide when Swift is serious or parodying a commonplace of seventeenth-century book production (Harald Stang, *Einleitung-Fußnote-Kommentar: fingierte Formen wissenschaftlicher Darstellung als Gestaltungselemente moderner Erzählkunst* [Bielefeld: Aisthesis, 1992], pp. 23-28), familiar to him from several authors in his library. “*IT is neither to satisfie the importunity of friends,*” Bishop Edward Stillingfleet scoffed in his Preface to *Origines sacræ*, “*nor to prevent false copies (which and such like excuses I know are expected in usual Prefaces) that I have adventured abroad this following Treatise*” ([London: H. Mortlock, 1675], sig. b2r [PASSMANN AND VIENKEN III, 1752-54]). In the Preface to his *Songs and Other Poems*, Alexander Brome had already compiled a mock-list of self-justifications most common in the book trade: “*gratification of Friends; importunity, prevention of spurious impressions,*” all “*exact formula’s to express the bashfulness of the Author*” ([London: Henry Brome, 1661], sig. A2v). However, if Swift *was* serious, publication of the *Tale* happened “*without his Knowledge,*” as asserted by the *Tale’s* Bookseller in his 1704 address to the reader. See also the note on “to comply with the urgent *Importunity of my Friends,*” *The Battle of the Books*, Online.Swift, p. 36, ll. 33-34 and “after much Importunity from my Friends” (*A Tale of a Tub* [*Prose Works*, I, 40]).

p. 11, ll. 27-30 *This though not regarded by Readers, was a real Truth, only the surreptitious Copy was rather that which was printed, and they made all hast they could, which indeed was needless; the Author not being at all prepar’d* Mulling over a rationale for the *Tale’s* seemingly incoherent, amorphous structure, one of Swift’s readers has recently suggested to take this statement seriously. The implications are that the 1704 *editio princeps* was “never intended to be printed as [it] stands”; that the three parts of the volume were “separates, either written or rewritten by Swift in 1697 and 1698,” and on various occasions, too, “parodying and mimicking those who were most frustrating [him]”; and that, like many texts of the times, these “were circulated, in manuscript, in a coterie,” the intended readership, yet by no means “finished or polished,” with the result that John Nutt “obtained all three from the unnamed source and went ahead and printed them”

(Carpenter, “*A Tale of a Tub* as an Irish Text,” pp. 34-40). See also the gloss on “*The Gentleman who gave the Copy to the Bookseller*” (p. 14, ll. 28-29).

p. 11, ll. 30-31 *but he has been told, the Bookseller was in much Pain, having given a good Sum of Money for the Copy*

Bookseller] In the period from about 1675 to 1750, “the one word ‘bookseller’ served to cover any one who engaged in any one, or any combination, of the three activities ... which we designate as wholesale and retail bookselling and publishing.” Thus, in Swift’s day, *booksellers* could mean *publishers* in the modern sense, those who “having the legal right of reproduction, cause books to be printed and distributed for sale” (Michael Treadwell, “London Trade Publishers, 1675-1750,” *The Library*, 6th ser., 4 [1982], 101-34), as well as *printers*, as this advertisement demonstrates: “The Undertakers of this Journal, resolving to make it as Compleat as possible, intend at the End of each succeeding Month to add the Titles of all Books whatsoever publish’d in *England* ... The *Booksellers* are therefore desir’d to send in the Titles of what Books they Print, as soon as publish’d, to any of the Undertakers” (*History of the Works of the Learned*, 2 [1700], 394). In George Farquhar’s *The Constant Couple*, Clincher Sr thinks of an agreement “with a Bookseller about Printing an Account of [his] Journey through *France* to *Italy*” (*The Complete Works*, ed. Charles Stonehill, 2 vols [New York: Gordian Press, 1967], I, 144).

pp. 11-12, ll. 32-2 *In the Authors Original Copy there were not so many Chasms as appear in the Book; and why some of them were left he knows not*] Swift’s annotators are not agreed in their views on the function of the *lacunae*. It is good advice, first, not to generalize but to analyse, and judge, Swift’s *discursus interruptus* from case to case; and, second, to note that Swift, in two footnotes added to the *Tale*’s fifth edition, poked fun at the eagerness of annotators to explain while offering a spectrum of possible solutions himself and thus generating, like any writer of paradoxes, a new one. See also Historical Introduction, *A Tale of a Tub*, Online.Swift, forthcoming.

p. 12

p. 12, ll. 2-4 *had the Publication been trusted to him, he should have made several Corrections of Passages against which nothing hath been ever objected*] A case of ‘correctors corrected’: the Apologist pokes fun at the inability of his critics to see through shortcomings visible to himself.

p. 12, ll. 4-7 *He should likewise have altered a few of those that seem with any Reason to be excepted against, but to deal freely, the greatest Number he should have left untouch’d, as never suspecting it possible any wrong Interpretations could be made of them*] As the previous line, a teasing assertion of the author’s control of the text.

p. 12, ll. 8-9 *The Author observes, at the End of the Book there is a Discourse called A Fragment*] “A Discourse concerning the Mechanical Operation of the Spirit. In a Letter to a Friend” is subtitled “A Fragment.”

p. 12, ll. 9-10 *which he more wondered to see in Print than all the rest*] Presumably, because it was not (yet) up to standard (see Textual Introduction, *A Discourse concerning the Mechanical Operation of the Spirit*, Online.Swift, forthcoming).

p. 12, ll. 10-15 *Having been a most imperfect Sketch with the Addition of a few loose Hints, which he once lent a Gentleman who had designed a Discourse of somewhat the same Subject; he never thought of it afterwards, and it was a sufficient Surprize to see it pieced up together, wholly out of the Method and Scheme he had intended*] See Textual Introduction, *A Discourse concerning the Mechanical Operation of the Spirit*, Online.Swift, forthcoming.

p. 12, ll. 15-17 *for it was the Ground-work of a much larger Discourse, and he was sorry to observe the Materials so foolishly employ’d*] Sections I and II of the *Discourse* were originally planned as parts of the *Tale* (see Textual Introduction, *A Discourse concerning the Mechanical Operation of the Spirit*, Online.Swift, forthcoming).

p. 12, ll. 18-20 *There is one farther Objection made by those who have answer’d this Book, as well as by some others, that Peter is frequently made to repeat Oaths*

and Curses] “The Second [aim] is to show how great a Proficient he is, at Hectoring and Bullying, at Ranting and Roaring, and especially at Cursing and Swearing,” King showed himself incensed, concluding: “He makes his Persons of all Characters full of their Oaths and Imprecations” (*Some Remarks on “The Tale of a Tub”*, p. 9). The objection is warranted: “*and G— confound you both eternally, if you offer to believe otherwise*”; “he called them *damn’d Sons of Whores, Rogues, Traytors*, and the rest of the vile Names he could muster up”; and “He and his Gang, after several Millions of Scurrilities and Curses, not very important here to repeat, by main Force, very fairly kicks them both out of Doors” (*Prose Works*, I, 73, 75, 76). Swift’s use of “curse” is ambiguous: first, it means malediction, and, second, excommunication (OED). See also p. 12, ll. 20-21.

Peter’s conduct is all the more reprehensible as he is offending against St Matthew 5:34-35, in which, as Archbishop Tillotson explained in his sermon on “The Lawfulness and Obligation of Oaths,” “Our Saviour seems altogether to forbid swearing,” making “the breach of this Law a damning sin” (*The Works of the Most Reverend Dr John Tillotson*, pp. 242-43 [PASSMANN AND VIENKEN III, 1858-60]). In his “Practical Catechism,” first published in 1645, which was in Swift’s library, the eminent biblical scholar Henry Hammond concurred, declaring no less vociferously that “one universal rule” to be deduced from St Matthew was “that to swear in ordinary communication, or discourse, or conversation, is utterly unlawful” (*The Works*, 2nd ed., 4 vols [London: R. Royston, 1684-89], I, 49-50, 185 [PASSMANN AND VIENKEN II, 789-93]).

p. 12, ll. 20-21 *Every Reader observes it was necessary to know that Peter did Swear and Curse*] If the assumption is correct that “*the Popish Folly of cursing People to Hell*” alludes to the Catholic practice of excommunication, Peter’s swearing is a means of characterization. To that extent, it is indeed “*necessary*” to be aware of it.

p. 12, ll. 22-24 *The Oaths are not printed out, but only supposed, and the Idea of an Oath is not immoral, like the Idea of a Prophane or Immodest Speech*] An inversion of the biblical maxim according to which sin originates in the mind (St Matthew 5:28); in this case, in the mind of its producer: “[*Poesie*] is not the *Picture* of the *Poet*, but of *things* and *persons* imagined by him,” Cowley assured

his readers in the Preface to *Poems*, echoing Catullus (*Catulli liber*, in *Catulli, Tibulli, et Propertii opera* [Cambridge: Jacob Tonson, 1702], p. 18 [XVII, 5-6]), and continuing: “He may be in his own practice and disposition a *Philosopher*, nay a *Stoick*, and yet speak sometimes with the softness of an amorous *Sappho*” (sigs a4v-b1r [PASSMANN AND VIENKEN I, 369, 475]). Milton followed suit in *De doctrina Christiana*: “Strictly speaking no word or thing is obscene. The obscenity is in the dirty mind of the man who perverts words or things out of the prurience or to get a laugh” (*Complete Prose Works of John Milton*, ed. Maurice Kelley [New Haven: Yale University Press, and London: Oxford University Press, 1973], p. 770).

p. 12, ll. 24-25 *A Man may laugh at the Popish Folly of cursing People to Hell, and imagine them swearing, without any crime*] In general, the practice of cursing derives from the belief in word magic, “the appeal to a supernatural power to inflict harm ... on a specific person” (Geoffrey Hughes, *An Encyclopedia of Swearing* [Armonk, New York, and London: M. E. Sharpe, 2006], pp. 114-15; see also pp. 454-58; Elliott, *The Power of Satire: Magic, Ritual, Art*, pp. 8-9, 93-94, and *passim*), and, to that extent, it is not a folly ‘distinguishing’ papal practice only.

However, in the light of incidents narrated in the *Tale* (*Prose Works*, I, 76), Swift may be alluding here to the Catholic practice of excommunicating members for dissenting conduct, frequently formulated in violent language. The two most specific cases in point are of course the Pope’s bulls against Henry VIII and Queen Elizabeth, about which Swift would have gathered all the information he needed from either Father Sarpi’s *History of the Council of Trent* (pp. 81-82) or Bishop Burnet’s *History of the Reformation of the Church of England* (I, 245-48; II, 327, 418), both of which he read at Moor Park in 1697/8 (REAL [1978], pp. 129, 131). At the same time, bulls were issued as a general means of coercion. For example, when considering the “Bull for Reforming the Clergy,” which authorized Cardinal Wolsey “to dispence with all the Laws of the Church for one whole year after the date of the Bull,” Burnet comments: “The power that was lodged in him by this Bull was not more invidious, than the words in which it was conceived were offensive” (I, 19).

p. 12, ll. 25-28 *but lewd Words, or dangerous Opinions though printed by halves, fill the Readers Mind with ill Idea's; and of these the Author cannot be accused*] A surprisingly early use of a reader-response argument which some years later was put forward by both critics and writers to ward off reservations about 'dangerous' passages and by which readers were constituted as co-producers of meaning. "If the Reader [made] a wrong Use of the Figures," Defoe, for one, in all innocence justified the "Scenes of Crime" in *Roxana* in 1724, "the Wickedness [was] his own" (*Roxana, the Fortunate Mistress*, ed. Jane Jack [London, Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 1969], p. 2). And two years earlier, again abdicating his hermeneutic authority, Defoe recommended "the History of a wicked Life," *Moll Flanders*, to readers "who [knew] how to Read it, and how to make the good Uses of it" (*The Fortunes and Misfortunes of the Famous Moll Flanders*, ed. G. A. Starr [London and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1976], p. 2). Theoretically, this ground had been prepared by Addison's "Essays on the Pleasures of the Imagination" (*The Spectator*, ed. Bond, III, 535-82 [nos 411-21], particularly pp. 535-39, 558-61 [nos 411, 416]).

p. 12, ll. 28-30 *For the judicious Reader will find that the severest Stroaks of Satyr in his Book are levelled against the modern Custom of Employing Wit upon those Topicks*] A commonplace critique of the 'impure' poetry and drama for which literature in the age of Charles II was notorious. According to Edmund Waller, neglect of "Chast moral Writing" could not be recompensed by any amount of wit ("Upon the Earl of Roscommon's Translation of Horace, *De Arte Poetica*," in *Poems, &c. Written upon Several Occasions and to Several Persons*, 8th ed. [London: Jacob Tonson, 1711], p. 329, ll. 17-18), and he was supported in this campaign against indecency by Cowley, who took "*Obscenity and Prophaneness*" to be "two unpardonable vices" (Preface to *Poems*, sig. b1r [PASSMANN AND VIENKEN I, 475]), John Sheffield, Earl of Mulgrave, who condemned the taste for "Bawdry barefac'd" as a "poor pretence to Wit" ("An Essay upon Poetry" [1682], *Critical Essays of the Seventeenth Century*, ed. J. E. Spingarn, 3 vols [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1957 {1908}], II, 288, ll. 22-31), and the Earl of Roscommon, Wentworth Dillon, whose "Essay on Translated Verse" (1684) Swift is likely to have known: "*Immodest words* admit of no defence, / For want of *Decency* is want of *Sense*" (*Critical Essays of the*

Seventeenth Century, ed. Spingarn, II, 300, ll. 23-24; Karian, “Edmund Curll and the Circulation of Swift’s Writings,” pp. 108-9).

pp. 12-13, ll. 30-2 *of which there is a remarkable Instance in the 153d. Page, as well as in several others, tho’ perhaps once or twice exprest in too free a manner, excusable only for the Reasons already alledged*] The page reference is to the fifth edition of 1710 (see the gloss on “paumed his damned Crust upon us for Mutton,” *Online.Swift*, forthcoming).

p. 13

p. 13, ll. 2-4 *Some Overtures have been made by a third Hand to the Bookseller for the Author’s altering those Passages which he thought might require it*]

p. 13, ll. 4-6 *But it seems the Bookseller will not hear of any such Thing, being apprehensive it might spoil the Sale of the Book*]

p. 13, ll. 8-9 *as Wit is the noblest and most useful Gift of humane Nature*] Wit, frequently modified by mutually exclusive epithets, such a true or false, great or little, lively and stale, glaring or obscene, and others, is a protean term, impossible to define and to demarcate from its competitors, indeed, “as boundless as the Wind,” as Swift described it himself (*Poems*, ed. Williams, I, 215, l. 15). Wit may be applied to the ever-varying faculties and qualities of persons as well as to the properties and attributes of works, to features of the language as well as to the relationship of a work’s parts to its whole. As a concept in faculty psychology, Wit is synonymous with imagination, invention, or fancy, at times even with judgement; in works, Wit is associated with the force and fire of the composition, usually too free and fertile to be confined, but also with the strange, exotic, and the novel; and in language, it can signify both the felicitous and the infelicitous phrase, image, or pun. Paradoxically, Wit is not only the natural ally of morality but also “a threat to decency,” walking as it does “regularly with irreligion and vice” and, “in its highest exaltation, border[ing] on madness” (Edward Niles Hooker, “Pope on Wit: *The Essay on Criticism*,” *Eighteenth-Century English Literature: Modern Essays in Criticism*, ed. James L. Clifford [New York: Oxford University Press, 1959], pp. 42-61 [46]; William Empson, “Wit in the *Essay on*

Criticism,” *Essential Articles for the Study of Alexander Pope*, ed. Maynard Mack [Hamden, Connecticut: Archon Books, 1964], pp. 189-216; C. S. Lewis, *Studies in Words*, 2nd ed. [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967], pp. 86-110 [92]; Alexander Pope, *Pastoral Poetry and An Essay on Criticism*, eds E. Audra and Aubrey Williams [London: Methuen, and New Haven: Yale University Press, 1969 {1961}], pp. 209-19; *Sir William Temple's Essays “Upon Ancient and Modern Learning” und “Of Poetry”: eine historisch-kritische Ausgabe mit Einleitung und Kommentar*, ed. Kämper, pp. 49, 253-54 [ad 49.297-312]; D. Judson Milburn, *The Age of Wit, 1650-1750* [New York and London: Collier-Macmillan, 1966], pp. 36-152, and *passim*). Last but not least, Wit denotes propriety, the ‘proper’ relationship between thoughts, words, and subject, as in Dryden’s celebrated if misguided definition of Wit (*The Tatler*, no 62, ed. Bond, I, 428-29 and n5). A contemporary document displaying the whole dazzling semantic spectrum is William Wycherley’s Preface to his edition of *Miscellany Poems*, of which Swift had a copy in his library ([London: C. Brome, *et al.*, 1704], pp. iii-xxxiv [PASSMANN AND VIENKEN III, 1979-81]). The upshot is bound to be that there is no general, all-embracing meaning, but that meanings will have to be decided from case to case.

humane] human

p. 13, l. 9 *so Humor is the most agreeable*] To Swift, Humour, like Wit, was indefinable: “What Humor is, not all the Tribe / Of Logick-mongers can describe,” he told Delany in 1718. Only one effect of it was certain: “it [gave] Delight.” Touching readers, and audiences, by its natural and instinctive rather than acquired and artificial singularity and peculiarity, Humour is both a *desiderandum* and a *desideratum* of literary compositions: “Humor is odd, grotesque, and wild, / Onely by Affectation spoild, / Tis never by Invention got, / Men have it when they know it not” (*Poems*, ed. Williams, I, 215-16, ll. 19-20, 24-28). This description points towards a very traditional conception of Humour. Notwithstanding Sir William Temple, and many others who agreed with him that Humour was “a Vein Natural perhaps to [this] Countrey” (*Sir William Temple's Essays “Upon Ancient and Modern Learning” und “Of Poetry”: eine historisch-kritische Ausgabe mit Einleitung und Kommentar*, ed. Kämper, pp. 72, 314-15 [ad 72.1132-34]; Stuart M. Tave, *The Amiable Humorist: A Study in the Comic Theory and Criticism of the Eighteenth and Early Nineteenth Centuries* [Chicago:

The University of Chicago Press, 1960], pp. 94-100), notions of Humour were firmly anchored not only in English but also European seventeenth-century intellectual history (*Critical Essays of the Seventeenth Century*, ed. Spingarn, I, lviii-lxiii; Edward Niles Hooker, "Humour in the Age of Pope," *The Huntington Library Quarterly*, 11 [1948], 361-85). By the time of Swift, Humour was still used in its early medical sense. Depending on which of the four constitutive elements prevailed in men, it signified the individual disposition, whether sanguine, phlegmatic, choleric, or melancholic, in general. In the course of the seventeenth century, Jonson and Dryden, among many others, extended this meaning to include "(eccentric, or extravagant) singularity of character" (*Every Man out of his Humour*, in *Ben Jonson*, eds Herford and Simpson, III, 432, ll. 105-9 [PASSMANN AND VIENKEN II, 980-82]; *An Essay of Dramatick Poesie*, in *The Works of John Dryden: Prose, 1668-1691*, eds Samuel Holt Monk, et al. [Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press, 1971], pp. 58-61). Temple, too, subscribed to this meaning in "Of Poetry." Humour, Sir William emphasized, was a representation of anomalous but natural oddities, of "Dispositions and Customs less common, yet ... not less natural" (*Sir William Temples Essays "Upon Ancient and Modern Learning" und "Of Poetry": eine historisch-kritische Ausgabe mit Einleitung und Kommentar*, ed. Kämper, pp. 72, 315-16 [ad 72.1141-44]), and it is this aspect to which Swift harks back in his description of Humour as peculiar and natural to individuals and, as a consequence, as amusing and harmless, and that he may have had in mind when penning the Apology some ten years earlier (*The Intelligencer*, ed. Woolley, pp. 59-60). Of course, any attempt, such as this, to reduce the *Tale* to an assemblage of humorous ingredients clashes with Swift's self-declared aim to satirize "*the numerous and gross Corruptions in Religion and Learning*" (p. 2, ll. 2-3), subjects, to be sure, which were not provocative of mirth but of scorn and contempt, and which called for treatment by satire and ridicule. Again, the Apologist is trying to muddy the waters. Admittedly, in this attempt, he was able to profit from the hopeless evasiveness of the vocabulary (see also Wolfgang Schmidt-Hidding, *Europäische Schlüsselwörter: wortvergleichende und wortgeschichtliche Studien, I: Humor und Witz* [München: Max Hueber, 1963], pp. 92-105).

p. 13, ll. 9-11 *and where these two enter far into the Composition of any Work, they will render it always acceptable to the World*] Swift assigned distinctive

characteristics to Wit and Humour – surprise to Wit, perhaps of its appeal to the head, and delight to Humour, perhaps of its more immediate appeal to simple, untutored Nature – but it becomes never clear whether the one is inferior to the other, and his statements on the issue over the years are self-contradictory (Tave, *The Amiable Humorist*, pp. 113-18). At the same time, what Swift had to say about the *combined* role of Wit and Humour in conversation is likely to apply to written work as well. “Our Conversation to refine,” he ruled in “To Mr Delany,” among other poems, “True Humor must with Wit combine,” a thought later resumed in *On Poetry: A Rapsody* (*Poems*, ed. Williams, I, 216, ll. 29-30; II, 649, l. 284).

p. 13, ll. 11-14 *Now, the great Part of those who have no Share or Tast of either, but by their Pride, Pedantry and Ill Manners, lay themselves bare to the Lashes of Both, think the Blow is weak, because they are insensible*] Another thought anticipated, though varied, in the *Tale*: “For there is not, through all Nature, another so callous and insensible a Member as the *World’s Posteriors*” (*Prose Works*, I, 29). It follows that “those who ridicule the world’s follies ... can hope for only marginal success” (Anselment, “*Betwixt Jest and Earnest?: Marprelate, Milton, Marvell, Swift & the Decorum of Religious Ridicule*,” p. 138).

Pedantry and Ill Manners] See the gloss on “*Pedant*” (p. 9, ll. 32-34).

p. 13, ll. 15-16 *where Wit hath any mixture of Raillery; 'Tis but calling it Banter, and the work is done*]

Raillery] Swift defined what he (and some of his predecessors and contemporaries) understood by ‘raillery,’ both in poetry and prose, in his poem, “To Mr Delany” (*Poems*, ed. Williams, I, 214-19, ll. 29-40), dated October 1718/9. There, he describes ‘raillery’ as “a mode of irony, used not to satirize but to praise,” as an “obliging Ridicule,” that is to say, one which honours while appearing to mock,” also called ‘delicate’ raillery by contemporaries (Charles Peake, *Jonathan Swift and the Art of Raillery* [Gerrards Cross: Colin Smythe, 1986], pp. 6-7; see also Knox, *The Word Irony and its Context, 1500-1755*, pp. 196-200; John Hayman, “Raillery in Restoration Satire,” *The Huntington Library Quarterly*, 31 [1967-68], 107-22 [pp. 110-11]; John M. Bullitt, “Swift’s ‘Rules of Raillery,’” *Harvard English Studies*, 3 [1972], 93-108; David Sheehan, “Swift, Voiture, and the Spectrum of Raillery,” *Papers on Language and Literature*, 14

[1978], 171-88), repeated, with a slight shift of emphasis, from *Hints towards an Essay on Conversation*: “Raillery was to say something that at first appeared a Reproach, or Reflection; but, by some Turn of Wit unexpected and surprising, ended always in a Compliment, and to the Advantage of the Person it was addressed to” (*Prose Works*, IV, 91).

Banter] See p. 9, ll. 7-9.

p. 13, ll. 16-19 *This Polite Word of theirs was first borrowed from the Bullies in White-Fryars, then fell among the Footmen, and at last retired to the Pedants by whom it is applied as properly to the Productions of Wit*

Bullies] In no 230 of *The Tatler*, Swift calls ‘Bully’ one of “the modern Terms of Art” (ed. Bond, III, 195). Originally “a term of endearment and familiarity,” applicable “to either sex: sweetheart, darling,” at Swift’s time, the word was mostly used in the sense of “blustering ‘gallant’” and “swash-buckler,” and, more specifically, as referring to “the ‘gallant’ or protector of a prostitute” (OED; *Poems*, ed. Williams, II, 582, ll. 43-44; GORDON WILLIAMS I, 169-70; B. E., *A New Dictionary of the Canting Crew*, p. 26; and Smith, *Language and Reality in Swift’s “A Tale of a Tub”*, pp. 51, 149). In addition to being social exhibitionists parading a fake flamboyance and flashiness, bullies were most frequently pictured as drunken and quarrelsome, if cowardly, braggarts, always in the mood to make a nuisance of themselves, “awkward, roaring, blustering Rascals” that they were (Thomas Shadwell, *The Scowlers*, in *The Complete Works*, ed. Montague Summers, 5 vols [London: The Fortune Press, 1927], V, 87 [I, i]). “Bullies,” Ned Ward followed suit, were “like dunghill cocks [that] will strut and crow, / But few or none dare stand a sparring blow” (*The London Spy*, ed. Paul Hyland [East Lansing: Colleagues Press, 1993], p. 102). For Jeremy Collier, whose *Essays* Swift was reading at the time he was engaged with the *Tale* and its companion pieces (REAL [1978], pp. 128, 130), their “Lunacy” was simply beyond words: “As for the Courage of *Bullys* and *Town-Sparks*, who are so hardy as to risque Body and Soul, upon a point of pretended Honour, There is no Language can reach their Extravagance” (*Essays upon Several Moral Subjects*, 3rd ed. [London: R. Sare and H. Hindmarsh, 1698], Part II, 34).

White-Fryars] Originally a Carmelite Priory occupied by the Friars of our Lady of Mount Carmel, who wore a white mantle over a brown habit. By Swift’s time, Whitefriars had become a precinct, or liberty, between Fleet Street and the

Thames, which “fraudulent debtors, gamblers, prostitutes, and other outcasts of society made a favourite retreat,” forming “a community of their own, [adopting] the language of pickpockets, [and] openly [resisting] the execution of every legal process.” In *The London Spy*, Ned Ward “bestow[ed] a few lines upon this subject,” in which he excoriated Whitefriars as “the place where knaves their revels kept, [and] where whores and thieves for safety crept” (*The London Spy*, ed. Hyland, p. 123) Although the privilege was abolished by William III in 1697, it took rather a long time to clear Whitefriars of its lawless inhabitants (WHEATLEY AND CUNNINGHAM III, 503-4; WEINREB AND HIBBERT, p. 958; GORDON WILLIAMS III, 1525).

p. 13, ll. 19-20 *as if I should apply it to Sir Isaac Newton’s Mathematicks*] This reference has been called the only “respectful and unquestionable” mention of Sir Isaac Newton in Swift (D. Nichol Smith, “Jonathan Swift: Some Observations,” *Fair Liberty Was All His Cry: A Tercentenary Tribute to Jonathan Swift*, ed. A. Norman Jeffares [London, Melbourne, Toronto: Macmillan, 1967], pp. 1-14 [7-8]). Of humble origins, Newton was knighted on the occasion of Queen Anne’s visit to Cambridge in 1705. The first edition of his *Philosophiæ naturalis principia mathematica*, “one of the glories of the human intellect” presenting the principle of universal gravitation came out in 1687, not only taking the scientific world by storm (I. Bernard Cohen, *Introduction to Newton’s “Principia”* [Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1971], pp. 3, 130-36, 145-61), but also becoming one of the key witnesses for the Moderns in their battle against the Ancients (Wotton, *Reflections upon Ancient and Modern Learning* [1697], pp. 178, 325, 371-72, and *passim*; *Observations upon “The Tale of a Tub”*, pp. 480, 481, 491-92, and *passim*). Swift owned the second edition of 1713, which was prepared for the press by Roger Cotes (PASSMANN AND VIENKEN II, 1314-15).

p. 13, ll. 20-22 *but, if this Bantring as they call it, be so despicable a Thing, whence comes it to pass they have such a perpetual Itch towards it themselves?*] The medical metaphor of ‘Itch’ is reminiscent of Juvenal’s Seventh Satire in which bad writing of any kind is compared to a disease: “tenet insanabile multos / scribendi cacoëthes, & ægro in corde senescit [An incurable writing itch resides in many and grows old in their sick hearts]” (*Saturae*, pp. 57-58 [VII, 51-52] [PASSMANN AND VIENKEN II, 999]; Just, *Jonathan Swift’s “On Poetry: A*

Rhapsody.” *A Critical Edition with a Historical Introduction and Commentary*, pp. 84-85). See also p. 9, ll. 7-9.

p. 13, ll. 23-24 *it is grievous to see him in some of his Writings at every turn going out of his way to be waggish]*

waggish] “Playfully mischievous” (OED), also “Arch, Gamesom, Pleasant” (B. E., *A New Dictionary of the Canting Crew*, p. 190).

p. 13, ll. 24-25 *to tell us of a Cow that prickt up her Tail]* “Besides, there is Reason to believe,” Wotton ironically commented on Temple’s extolling “the Skill of [the] *Ancient Sages* in foretelling Changes of Weather,” that “we have the Result of all the Observations of these Weather-wise Sages in ... *Virgil’s Georgics*, such as those upon the Snuffs of Candles, the Croaking of Frogs, and many others quite as notable as the English Farmer’s *Living Weather-Glass*, his *Red Cow that prick’d up her Tail*, an Infallible Presage of a Coming Shower” (*Reflections upon Ancient and Modern Learning* [1697], pp. 103-4 [PASSMANN AND VIENKEN III, 1976]). Wotton was referring to “*the changes of the Weather, with the Signs in Heaven and Earth that fore-bode them*,” in the First Book of the *Georgics* (see Dryden’s rendering in *The Poems of John Dryden*, ed. Kinsley, II, 932-35, ll. 547-667).

p. 13, ll. 25-26 *in his answer to this Discourse, he says it is all a Farce and a Ladle]* Swift quotes Wotton quoting a “facetious Poet”: “But our *Tale-teller* strikes at the very Root. ’Tis all with him a *Farce*, and all a *Ladle*,” as a very facetious Poet says upon another occasion” (*Observations upon “The Tale of a Tub”*, p. 529). The “very facetious Poet” is Matthew Prior’s imitation of Ovid’s story of Baucis and Philemon from the *Metamorphoses* (ROSS AND WOOLLEY, p. 204; ELLIS, pp. 229-30). The poem is entitled “The Ladle” and was first published a year earlier in *Poetical Miscellanies: The Fifth Part* of 1704 (*The Literary Works of Matthew Prior*, eds H. Bunker Wright and Monroe K. Spears, 2nd ed., 2 vols [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971], I, 202-7; II, 889). On being granted three wishes in recognition of their hospitality by Jove, Baucis asks for “a Ladle for [their] Silver Dish,” only to be rebuffed by her husband: “A Ladle! cries the Man, a Ladle! / ’Odzooks, CORISCA, You have pray’d ill: / What should be Great, You turn to Farce: / I Wish the Ladle in your A— .” After that, the third

wish has to be used to get the ladle out again (ll. 133-40; Sonja Fielitz, *Wit, Passion and Tenderness: Ovids "Metamorphosen" im Wandel der Diskurse in England zwischen 1660 und 1800* [Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2000], pp. 150-55).

p. 13, l. 27 *One may say of these Impedimenta Literarum*] Not "literary padding, filler" (ELLIS, p. 230) but "bag and baggage of literature" (LITTLETON, s.v.).

p. 13, l. 28 *that Wit owes them a Shame*] "To conceive shame, feel ashamed; to accept blame or disgrace as merited; to acknowledge that one is in fault. More fully to take shame to (unto, upon) oneself" (OED).

p. 13, ll. 28-30 *and they cannot take wiser Counsel than to keep out of harms way, or at least not to come till they are sure they are called*] The authors of 'Boyle's' *Examination* had the same advice ready for Bentley: "I would not willingly be behind hand with the Dr in any Instance of Courtesie; and therefore, in return, will ... bestow some Charitable Advice upon him: the rather, because I have reason to believe, that he has very little Advice from any Other Quarter. If he had, he would certainly never have written on this Subject, in the Manner he has done ... And the first piece of Advice that I will venture to give the Dr is, that he would know his own Talent; and resolve for the future not to venture upon any way of writing that Nature never design'd him for" (*Dr Bentley's Dissertations on the Epistles of Phalaris ... Examin'd*, pp. 284-85; GUTHKELCH AND NICHOL SMITH, p. 19n4).

pp. 13-14, ll. 31-1 *with those Allowances above-required, this Book should be read, after which the Author conceives, few things will remain which may not be excused in a young Writer*] See the gloss on "*He was then a young Gentleman much in the World*" (p. 2, ll. 10-12).

p. 14

p. 14, ll. 1-3 *He wrote only to the Men of Wit and Tast, and he thinks he is not mistaken in his Accounts, when he says they have been all of his side*] A claim repeated from the Apology's introductory lines (see the gloss on "*for it is manifest*

by the Reception the following Discourse hath met with” [p. 1, ll. 2-6]), but by Swift’s time already a topos traceable in Horace and the Earl of Rochester, among others (WALSH, p. 327).

p. 14, ll. 5-7 *enough to give him the vanity of telling his Name, wherein the World with all its wise Conjectures, is yet very much in the dark, which Circumstance is no disagreeable Amusement either to the Publick or himself* “Being guessed at might be a writer’s ambition. Provoking curiosity and conjecture – highlighting the very question of authorship – can often be the calculated effect of authorial reticence” (Mullan, *Anonymity*, p. 20). In their joint letter of 7 November 1726 reporting on the reception of *Gulliver’s Travels* to the Dean in Dublin, Gay and Pope played on this very expectation of the public: “About ten days ago a Book was publish’d here of the Travels of one Gulliver, which has been the conversation of the whole town ever since: The whole impression sold in a week; and nothing is more diverting than to hear the different opinions people give of it” (*Correspondence*, ed. Woolley, III, 47).

p. 14, ll. 8-11 *The Author is informed, that the Bookseller has prevailed on several Gentlemen, to write some Explanatory Notes, for the goodness of which he is not to answer, having never seen any of them*] These “explanatory Notes” comprise, first, the “series of marginal notes, all part of the joking and certainly placed there by Swift,” and, second, “a further series of footnotes ... added in the fifth edition of 1710, and also separately printed as a set in *An Apology for the Tale of a Tub: With Explanatory Notes by W[o]tt[o]n, B.D. and Others* (1711), for the convenience of owners of earlier editions,” for which Swift was also responsible and “which offer a ‘commentary’ on the *Tale*” (ROSS AND WOOLLEY, p. 204; *Correspondence*, ed. Woolley, I, 283 and n1). To the extent that the quotations from Wotton’s *Observations* utilize a great deal of material from Wotton’s hostile exegesis (C. J. Rawson, *Gulliver and the Gentle Reader: Studies in Swift and our Time* [London and Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1973], p. 1), they are satirical, turning “the ferocious detractor into a harmless commentator, [and depriving] his critical remarks of their sting and mummi[fy]ing him.” On the other hand, the notes are also misleading at times, thus adding to the puzzle and rendering “the problem of understanding and interpretation more delicate” (Forster, “Swift and Wotton: The Unintended Mousetrap,” pp. 29-33;

see also Frank Palmeri, “The Satiric Footnotes of Swift and Gibbon,” *The Eighteenth Century*, 31 [1990], 245-62 [pp. 251-53]; Stang, *Einleitung-Fußnote-Kommentar: fingierte Formen wissenschaftlicher Darstellung als Gestaltungselemente moderner Erzählkunst*, pp. 38-39; and, most recently, Gregory Lynall and Marcus Walsh, “Edifying by the margin’: Echoing Voices in Swift’s *Tale*”, *Reading Swift* [2013], 157-68). See also “The Bookseller to the Reader”: “*If any Gentleman will please to furnish me with a Key, in order to explain the more difficult Parts, I shall very gratefully acknowledge the Favour, and print it by it self*” (*Prose Works*, I, 17). In this way, the Apologist “turns the reading of the *Tale* into a test for his readers, an exercise of their literary skills” (Brian McCrea, “Surprised by Swift: Entrapment and Escape in *A Tale of a Tub*,” *Papers on Language and Literature* 18 [1982], 234-44 [234]).

p. 14, ll. 11-13 *nor intends it, till they appear in Print, when it is not unlikely he may have the Pleasure to find twenty Meanings, which never enter’d into his Imagination*] See p. 8, ll. 6-7.

p. 14, l. 14 June 3, 1709] In June 1709, Swift was visiting his mother in Leicester. From there, he sent several letters to his publisher, Benjamin Tooke, one of which is likely to have included the manuscript draft of the Apology. As Swift told Tooke on 29 June 1710, he had “had neither health nor humour to finish [it],” possibly because of the effect of his mother’s death (May 1710) at least in the later stages (*Correspondence*, ed. Woolley, I, 282 and m1,4; 285nn2,7). The publication of the *Tale*’s fifth edition, the first to contain the Apology in print, was delayed till late 1710. *Terminus post quem* is 29 September 1710, the date of the return, to London, of Sir Andrew Fountaine, whose pen-and-wash drawings, inserted in his large paper copy of the *Tale*, provided the models for two professional artists, Bernard Lens and John Sturt, to illustrate the fifth edition with engravings (*Correspondence*, ed. Woolley, I, 283n4, 284n2; WALSH, pp. xxxv-xxxvi). How long Lens and Sturt would have needed to produce their engravings and how long imposition, printing, and binding would have taken subsequently is difficult to calculate since nothing is known about the size of the fifth edition. An educated guess for the actual date of publication would perhaps be mid-November 1710. No publication announcement has been located. See also Introduction, pp. 2-4.

p. 14, l. 18 POSTSCRIPT] Eachard, in *Some Observations upon the Answer to an Enquiry into the Grounds and Occasions of the Contempt of the Clergy* (p. 6, ll. 5-8), describes “Postscript” as a “fresh and dapper *Gentleman*” who, more often than not, proves to be a nuisance to struggling readers, theatrically imploring his antagonist, “as you value your own reputation, your estate, your health, life and liberty, and the welfare of your Relations, for the future beware of *Postscripts*” ([London: N. Brooke, 1671], pp. 94-95).

p. 14, l. 20 *Since the writing of this, which was about a Year ago*] As the Apology is dated 3 June 1709, the Postscript was written in the summer of 1710. This is confirmed by the dates of Swift’s correspondence. *Terminus post quem* is Swift’s letter to Tooke of 29 June 1710, written after his return to Dublin from the country, in which Swift promised to send what he called “the thing,” the revised *Apology*, still in manuscript, “as soon as possible.” In the same letter, he also announced his intention to take, at the end, “a little contemptible notice of the thing you sent me,” a reference not only to Curll’s *Complete Key to the Tale of a Tub* of 19 or 20 June 1710 but also to the Postscript (see p. 14, l. 14). The Postscript is most likely to have been part of the type-set Apology, proofs of which Tooke sent to Swift on 10 July 1710 (*Correspondence*, ed. Woolley, I, 282 and n1, 283 and n1; GUTHKELCH AND NICHOL SMITH, pp. xix-xxi).

p. 14, ll. 20-22 *a Prostitute Bookseller hath publish’d a foolish Paper, under the Name of Notes on the Tale of a Tub*] The “*Prostitute Bookseller*” is the London publisher Edmund Curll, whose *A Complete Key to the Tale of a Tub* (TEERINK AND SCOUTEN 1004) came out on 19 or 20 June 1710 (see David Woolley’s annotated edition of the Scholar Press reprint [Menston, Yorkshire, 1970] [Ehrenpreis Centre, EC 8075]), shortly before the *Tale*’s ‘definitive’ fifth edition in late 1710. Benjamin Tooke enclosed it in a letter to Swift sent immediately after the *Key*’s publication and acknowledged by Swift in his response, dated 29 June 1710 (*Correspondence*, ed. Woolley, I, 282 and n2; Paul Baines and Pat Rogers, *Edmund Curll, Bookseller* [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2007], pp. 45-47). The familiar denunciatory epithets notwithstanding, recent research has come to the conclusion that “Curll plays a central role in fostering Swift’s celebrity as an

author and in keeping his name before London readers” (Karian, “Edmund Curll and the Circulation of Swift’s Writings,” p. 100).

p. 14, ll. 22-24 *with some Account of the Author, and with an Insolence which I suppose is punishable by Law, hath presumed to assign certain Names*] “*Thomas Swift* is Grandson to Sir *William D’avenant*, *Jonathan Swift* is Cousin German to *Thomas Swift* both Retainers to Sir *William Temple*. The two Gentlemen as before hinted being the reputed Authors of the *Work*” (Curll, *A Complete Key*, p. 4). A letter that Thomas Swift’s uncle, the political economist Dr Charles Davenant, wrote to his son Henry, then in diplomatic service at Frankfurt, on 22 September 1704, some weeks after the publication of the *Tale*, not only refers to the tradition, apparently upheld in the family, that Thomas had had a hand in the *Tale*’s composition, but also indicates a way how the family rumour could have become public ‘knowledge’: “My Cozen [Thomas] has gaind immortal honor by having had the Principal Hand in a Book lately published called the Tale of a Tub which has made as much noise & is as full of Witt as any Book perhaps that has come out these last hundred Yeares” (*Correspondence*, ed. Woolley, I, 119n2). See also Historical Introduction, *A Tale of a Tub*, and *A Discourse concerning the Mechanical Operation of the Spirit*, Online.Swift, forthcoming.

p. 14, ll. 24-26 *It will be enough for the Author to assure the World, that the Writer of that Paper is utterly wrong in all his Conjectures upon that Affair*] See the Historical Introductions to *A Tale of a Tub* and the *Discourse concerning the Mechanical Operation of the Spirit*, Online.Swift, forthcoming.

p. 14, ll. 26-28 *The Author farther asserts that the whole Work is entirely of one Hand, which every Reader of Judgment will easily discover*] Both a ruse to disguise Swift’s motives in the Apology (see the gloss on p. 1, ll. 1-2) and an assertion contradicted in the *Battle*’s “The Bookseller to the Reader” as well as “The Bookseller’s Advertisement” preceding the *Discourse*: “*Concerning the Author, I am wholly ignorant; neither can I conjecture, whether it be the same with That of the two foregoing Pieces, the Original having been sent me at a different Time, and in a different Hand*” (*Prose Works*, I, 139, 169).

p. 14, ll. 28-29 *The Gentleman who gave the Copy to the Bookseller, being a Friend of the Author*] According to a manuscript note by Edmund Curll in a copy of the *Key* in the British Library (C. 28. b. 11 [6]), “Ralph Noden, Esq; of the Middle Temple” (ROSS AND WOOLLEY, p. 204).

p. 14, ll. 29-31 *and using no other Liberties besides that of expunging certain Passages where now the Chasms appear under the Name of Desiderata*] See pp. 11-12, ll. 32-2.

pp. 14-15, ll. 31-4 *But if any Person will prove his Claim to three Lines in the whole Book, let him step forth and tell his Name and Titles, upon which the Bookseller shall have Orders to prefix them to the next Edition, and the Claimant shall from henceforward be acknowledged the undisputed Author*] “If [that little Parson-cousin of mine] should happen to be in town, and you light upon him,” Jonathan instructed his publisher Benjamin Tooke in June 1710, “I think you ought to tell him gravely, that, if he be the author, he should set his name to the &c; and raily him a little upon it: And tell him, if he can explain some things, you will, if he pleases, set his name to the next edition” (*Correspondence*, ed. Woolley, I, 282).

Claimant] A law term not recorded in seventeenth-century dictionaries and later defined: “He that demands any thing as unjustly detained by another” (JOHNSON I, s.v.; see also Smith, *Language and Reality in Swift’s “A Tale of a Tub”*, p. 149), first recorded for 1747 by OED.