Chapter II

The Theory and Practice of Satire

The First Satire of the Second Book of Horace, Imitated

Chronologically the first of the *Imitations*, Pope's dialogue with Fortescue embodies most of those elements of neoclassical satiric theory that have so far concerned us. It portrays, far more accurately than any of my descriptions can, the features of Horace as Pope's age saw them. The twin facts that it stands near the beginning of Pope's most intensive satiric activity and that it is his first finished poem in the imitative mode only hint of its significance in the canon of his works. It constitutes not only a major literary accomplishment in its own right, but also an important—perhaps the most important we possess—articulation of Pope's satiric position and methods, with consequent implications for a broad area of his poetry. It is a mistake to regard it only as a shield, an excuse, for the supposedly more ambitious *Epistle to Bathurst*: rather, this carefully wrought defense of satire boldly proclaims Pope's literary and moral and political orthodoxy, and forms the firm base upon which the *Bathurst* and Pope's other satires can be built.

I

The *Fortescue* was written within the framework of a well-defined and easily recognizable subgenre of literature, the satirist's apologia. The primary concern of the poem is, of course, satire, and the central effort of the poem is to distinguish what Pope's satire is and does from what it is

[37]
not or should not be. The precise question is whether Pope’s verses constitute satire or libel, as his Advertisement makes clear:

And indeed there is not in the world a greater Error, than that which Fools are so apt to fall into, and Knaves with good reason to incourage, the mistaking a Satyrlist for a Libeller; whereas to a true Satyrlist nothing is so odious as a Libeller, for the same reason as to a man truly Virtuous nothing is so hateful as a Hypocrite.

The problem that confronted Pope was not by any means a new one. Horace, Persius, and Juvenal had established precedents and provided an elaborate ethical and literary background for Pope’s poem by answering just such charges in their own apologias. Pope’s solution to the problem, however, appears to be unique. In the Epistle to Augustus, he characteristically clears satire of all such slurs by defining it as the virtuous mean between the vicious extremes of flattery and libel:

At length, by wholesom dread of statutes bound,
The Poets learn’d to please, and not to wound:
Most warp’d to Flatt’ry’s side; but some, more nice,
Preserv’d the freedom, and forebore the vice.
Hence Satire rose, that just the medium hit,
And heals with Morals what it hurts with Wit.

(256-62)

Satire attacks vice only to redeem the vicious; it virtuously preserves the golden mean between hypocritical flattery and pernicious libel. These ideas are not in themselves complex or abstruse, but they provide the essential keys to the intricate dialectic of Pope’s defense of his calling, his verse, and himself.

From the very outset, the Fortescue makes clear the antitheses that are to absorb most of its energy, and whose resolution is to be its focal point. His verse is too harsh, his verse is too weak; it is libelous, it is utterly innocuous.
There are (I scarce can think it, but am told)
There are to whom my Satire seems too bold,
Scarce to wise Peter complaisant enough,
And something said of Chartres much too rough.
The Lines are weak, another's pleas'd to say,
Lord Fanny spins a thousand such a Day.

(1–6)

This is a significant example of Pope's satiric and rhetorical technique: he undermines the charge of libel in the very act of presenting it by referring to his attacks, in the Epistle to Bathurst, upon Peter Walters and Chartres, two notorious reprobates, of whose public guilt there could be absolutely no doubt.¹ But beyond this, the passage presents what amounts to the "situation" of the Imitation—in rhetorical terms, its narratio and partitio, the statement of the case and its divisions.² Some claim Pope has libeled Walter and Chartres; others claim that his poems are the very same as those of Lord Fanny—the beatus Fannius of Horace's Sat.I.iv. (another defense of satire), whose popular and empty verse contrasts significantly with the fear Horace's satires rouse in the guilty crowd. The words are never used, but the ideas are plain enough: Pope's poetry has been accused simultaneously of both opprobrious extremes, flattery and libel; and it is particularly for this last reason that he must seek "Council learned in the Law" (8).

What his lawyer, Fortescue, tells him is quite practical advice. He urges Pope to flatter rather than satirize:

Better be Cibber, I'll maintain it still,
Than ridicule all Taste, blaspheme Quadrille,
Abuse the City's best good Men in Metre,
And laugh at Peers that put their Trust in Peter,
Ev'n those you touch not, hate you . . .
A hundred smart in Timon and in Balaam:
The fewer still you name, you wound the more;
Bond is but one, but Harpax is a Score.

(37–44)
But his attempt to dissuade Pope from satire merely serves as the stimulus for a long justification of that very thing. In point of fact, Fortescue's remarks have already been undercut by being themselves incorporated into the satiric process. It is always important to remember the physical and moral presence of Horace's poem on the facing page of Pope's editions and the possibilities of cross-reference offered by such an arrangement. In the Horatian original, Trebatius says,

Quanto rectius hoc, quam tristi laedere versu
Pantolabum Scurram, Nomentanumve nepotem?
Cum sibi quisque timet, quanquam est intactus, & odit.

(21-23)

The English version slyly makes Fortescue equate "the City's best good Men" (39), whom he is ostensibly defending, with Horace's despicable "Pantolabum Scurram, Nomentanumve nepotem." The remainder of his remarks constitute in themselves a succinct satire on the age: general satire is even more cutting than particular, because more of the apparently innumerable guilty are hit.³ Thus Pope's defense of satire has been strengthened in advance by the interplay of the Latin and English texts, which have betrayed Fortescue, the voice of practicality and law in the poem, into committing (and simultaneously demonstrating the inevitability of) the same sort of offense that Pope is charged with.

Pope's apology proceeds from this point in a manner parallel to Horace's. He claims that satire is his pleasure, as various vices are the pleasures of Scarsdale and Ridotta, and that

I love to pour out all myself, as plain
As downright Shippen, or as old Montagne.
In them, as certain to be lov'd as seen,
The Soul stood forth, nor kept a Thought within;
In me what Spots (for Spots I have) appear,
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Will prove at least the Medium must be clear.
In this impartial Glass, my Muse intends
Fair to expose myself, my Foes, my Friends;
Publish the present Age, but where my Text
Is Vice too high, reserve it for the next:
My Foes shall wish my Life a longer date,
And ev'ry Friend the less lament my Fate.

(51–62)

Horace has compared himself to Lucilius, who wrote

quo fit ut omnis
Votiva pateat veluti descripta tabella
Vita senis.

(31–33)

The idea that Pope seizes upon and develops is contained in votiva tabella, the comparison of satire to a religious object or act. This is made abundantly clear by Pope's insistence upon his satire as a reflection of his "spotted" soul and upon its value as a mirror of his spiritual state. The use of these images here, far more complex than in the Horatian original, is not the result of a departure from Horace, but is an expansion of his text, the product of the insistent christianization of pagan ideas.

On its most readily apparent level, the passage employs the rather commonplace conception of satire as the glass that exposes to the reader the truth about himself and his times. But the prominent mention of soul, spots, and medium does not accord with this usage, and the reasons for their presence must be sought in another and equally common occurrence of the mirror image. Such a conjunction of ideas is found in a cluster of biblical passages, all making use of the metaphor of the glass. The most famous of these is probably the "For now we see through a glass darkly" of St. Paul, but the most pertinent for Pope's context occurs in Wisdom of Solomon 7:26:
For she [Wisdom] is the brightness of eternal light, and the unspotted mirror of God's majesty, and the image of his goodness.

Biblical exegetes were unanimous in deciding that Wisdom was to be identified with Christ, who was truly the immaculate mirror of God's perfection. They further agreed in distinguishing two other kinds of less perfect mirrors: one, the human mind, made to the image of God but nevertheless not without spots, and the other, creatures, in whom are reflected traces of the Trinity.

The glass to which Pope's context has immediate reference is the human mind, and particularly poetry as a creative work of the mind that mirrors God's own act of creation. The relevance of such an idea to Pope's view of satire can be readily grasped; like Horace, he places satire in the perspective of a religious act, an almost sacramental self-revelation and confession. He goes far beyond the pagan poet, however, by suggesting that in so doing he discharges fully his duty as man, by thus faithfully reflecting the image of God within him and reproducing, in little, God's creation of the universe through the agency of the Word. The classical votiva tabella to which Horace refers depicted episodes in the suppliant's life that showed the active intervention of the gods in his affairs. Its presence on the facing page of Pope's editions and in the minds of his readers would have provided sufficient clue to the religious nature of his own "impartial Glass": satire becomes for him very literally a sacred tablet, the medium through which he reveals the continuing presence of God in his soul. The only thing that the satiric glass will not reflect is "Vice too high" (60); and the reservation of that for later judgment is, like the total satiric theory of which it is a small part, a successful mingling of classical and Christian ideas—in this case, of Cicero's rhetorical advice and the admonitions of Scripture. In this manner, Pope's particular pleasure (the excuse he had given for his penchant for satire) dis-
covers itself as an almost sacred act, in distinct contrast to the vicious pleasures of the foils with whom he opened his defense.

Having in this way established the basically religious character of his craft, Pope goes on to explain precisely what his satire expresses:

My Head and Heart thus flowing thro' my Quill,
Verse-man or Prose-man, term me which you will,
Papist or Protestant, or both between,
Like good Erasmus in an honest Mean,
In Moderation placing all my Glory,
While Tories call me Whig, and Whigs a Tory.

(63-68)

This passage elaborates the character of the man who writes such sacramental satire as Pope has described, and he is strikingly presented as a living exemplar of that ideal of moderation that achieved its most succinct expression in St. Paul. But the doctrine of the mean is here depicted not so much as the median between two extremes as it is the reconciliation of them; the basic unspoken unitive element of the passage is the traditional conception of concordia discors rerum. This harmonization of discordant opposites is accomplished not only in, but by, Pope's writings: head and heart meet in his quill; it is in his compositions that he appears to be, simultaneously, verse-man and prose-man, Papist and Protestant, Whig and Tory. The satiric glass reflects faithfully the state of the author's soul and of his poetic world, and, as a consequence, shares in his concordant nature (itself a reflection of the image of God, in whom all opposites are reconciled). Pope has now shown his satire, which he had already displayed in a clearly religious light, to be in itself an exemplification of apostolic moderation and divine harmony.

This has been implicit in Pope's satiric theory from the very beginning. By the terms of his definition of satire, it
partakes of some of the characteristics of both flattery and
libel—that is, as a mean between the two, it reconciles in
itself elements of both. It takes from flattery honest praise
and its constructive elements; from libel it borrows its
cutting edge and destructive tendency. Fused and recon­
ciled, these disparate factors produce satire, which “heals
with Morals what it hurts with Wit.” Since satire itself is
a concord, a harmonization of opposites, it is with complete
consistency that Pope describes it as the vehicle for the
concordant sentiments of the golden mean.

So also the targets of his satire become the “sad Burthen
of some merry Song” (80). Vice and the vicious are the
inevitable refrain of satire, and, in Pope’s verse in particular,
they are worked into the greater harmony that constitutes
the whole satiric song. The line that states this is itself a
concordia discors, balancing and linking the opposites “sad”
and “merry” in a miniature of the larger universal harmony
of which Pope’s poetic creation is an echo. Because of this,
Pope can claim that the butts of his satire are “Sacred to
Ridicule” (79). They have been incorporated (as vicious
extremes, but incorporated nevertheless) into a poetic uni­
verse that achieves its own harmony by a careful internal
balancing of opposite concepts and themes, and so is an
accurate model of the divine creation. All this is done within
the general context of Horace’s poem,¹⁰ which constantly
supports Pope’s points with the sanctions of classical culture.

After making clear in this manner exactly what his satire
is, Pope demonstrates equally clearly what it is not by
presenting a gallery of libelers:

Slander or Poyson, dread from Delia’s Rage,
Hard Words or Hanging, if your Judge be Page
From furious Sappho scarce a milder Fate,
P-x’d by her Love, or libell’d by her Hate:
Its proper Pow’r to hurt, each Creature feels,
Bulls aim their horns, and Asses lift their heels,
’Tis a Bear’s Talent not to kick, but hug,

[44]
And no man wonders he's not stung by Pug:
So drink with Waters, or with Chartres eat,
They’ll never poison you, they’ll only cheat.

(81–90)

Besides changing the Latin names to more contemporary type-names, Pope has insinuated into his rendering a consideration, not present in the original, of the misuse of language. In Horace, this passage is the final statement of the poet’s resolution to follow his natural bent and write satire. Pope, however, has shifted the emphasis and converted it into a passage uncovering the antithesis of his satire. Its primary concern is announced with its first word, “Slander,” and continues on through “Hard Words” to libel, to culminate in a complete transformation of Horace’s poisoner into a contemporary confidence man. All these things, as Pope’s equation of them with poison, hanging, and the pox demonstrates, are the vile extremes that his satire avoids. They are as well serious abuses of the faculty of language, in glaring contrast to his careful use of it.

These lines are complicated, and their meaning further adumbrated, by a highly significant deviation from the Horatian original, to which Pope calls attention by inserting index guides from the English to the Latin text at the pertinent places. His line 85, “Its proper Pow’r to hurt, each Creature feels,” corresponds only roughly to Horace’s “Ut, quo quisque valet, suspectus terreat, utque/ Imperet hoc natura potens” (50–51); but it translates almost exactly a line of Lucretius that the editor of the Delphine text (which Pope owned) cites in his commentary.

At varios linguæ Sonitus Natura subegit
Mittere, & Utilitas expressit nomina rerum:
Non alia longe ratione, atque ipsa videtur
Protrahere ad gestum Puerorum infantia linguæ,
Cum facit, ut digito, quae sint praesentia, monstrant.
Sentit enim vim quisque suam, quam possit abuti,
Cormua nata prius vitulo quam frontibus extent,
Illis iratus petit, atque insensus inurget.\(^{24}\)

The similarity of Pope's English line to Lucretius' "Sentit enim vim quisque suam, quam possit abuti" will be readily apparent, and the significance of its occurrence in Pope's poem will not be farther off. In Lucretius, the line occurs in the context of his explanation of the growth of civilization and the beginnings of concord and justice among men, and is part of his argument that language arose naturally out of the need of human beings to communicate ideas to each other. Speech is for Lucretius the means by which the bond of society was forged, the indispensable element by which men articulated their desire for peace and justice. Viewed in this light, Pope's Delia, Sappho, and Waters cannot easily be dismissed. Their abuse of language is not simply a breach of decorum, but an irresponsible act that strikes at the foundation of civilized society and threatens to undo the ties that hold it together. It is scarcely accidental that of the characters Pope chooses to present at this point, one makes a mockery of the judicial system, one grotesquely parodies the normal love relationship, and two effectively destroy the basis of contractual business dealings. All four represent a total perversion of the purpose and nature of language, and, consequently, an inversion of its effects. Lucretius' use of \textit{concordia (V.1024)} is crucial here, for what the malevolence of Delia, Page, Sappho, Waters, and Chartres amounts to is an attempt to destroy that harmony that Pope as true poet labors to perpetuate, and to reduce mankind to its original savagery and discord. This is the true nature of libel, and, as Pope is at pains to make clear, it is the exact opposite of real satire.

The values that Pope here and in the mirror passage attaches to language, and especially to poetry, help establish the interchangeability of artistic achievement and morality. By his theory of language and literature, right usage becomes a symbol, a metaphor, for right morals and social...
standards, for personal and political rectitude. In such a world, the dunces, for instance, will inevitably sin against God, man, and art simultaneously; and the poetasters of the *Epistle to Arbuthnot* are inescapably hacks, Hanoverians, and Low-Churchmen. The good poet is the good man and the good citizen, the scribbler, a blasphemer and Whig. Offense in any one area signifies guilt in all others: concord once violated can yield only greater and greater discord. Consequently, it can be no surprise to find Pope concluding his defense of himself as satirist by announcing his intention to continue to "Rhyme and Print" (100). "Rhyme" is metaphor for the poet's vocation, to properly employ language to produce harmony on all levels; "print" is metaphor for the moralist's, to "publish the present Age." Given the character Pope has so far established for his satire and himself, he could do nothing else.

II

Character has been a concern of almost paramount importance in the poem from that point, at least, at which Pope began defending satire as his pleasure and his natural talent. The Imitation has preserved an undercurrent of interest in this problem almost from its beginning, when it was sounded in somewhat muted form in the first Pope-Fortescue interchange:

*F.* I'd write no more.

*P.* Not write? but then I *think*,

And for my Soul I cannot sleep a wink.
I nod in Company, I wake at Night,
Fools rush into my Head, and so I write.

*F.* You could not do a worse thing for your Life.
Why, if the Nights seem tedious—take a Wife;
Or rather truly, if your Point be Rest,
Lettuce and Cowslip Wine; *Probatum est.*

(11-18)

[47]
This section provides a subdivision of the topics of the poem, and introduces the grounds of its third area of discussion, the satirist's character. Pope has already detailed the antithetical charges leveled against his poetry, and now, in response to Fortescue's suggestion that he abandon satire altogether, he replies, in effect, that he must write because of an inner compulsion—"And for my Soul I cannot sleep a wink." Fortescue sets up by his rejoinder a clear dichotomy of values in terms of which Pope will have to vindicate his character and moral stance. "You could not," he tells Pope, "do a worse thing for your Life." As satirist, Pope's conduct is subject to judgment both according to private, moral norms and according to public, social ones. This dilemma has remained secondary as long as the poet was engaged in the act of defending satire itself; as soon as that is accomplished, the question of his character re-emerges and demands consideration.

Fortescue once again introduces it, in his lament over Pope's resolution to continue writing satire, by reverting to terms similar to those of his first warning:

Alas young Man! your Days can ne'r be long,
In Flow'r of Age you perish for a Song!
Plums, and Directors, Shylock and his Wife,
Will club their Testers, now, to take your Life!

(101-4)

The already explained virtuous nature of the song for which Pope risks his life draws a good deal of the sting from Fortescue's objection, but there still remains, at the very least, a residual level of social disapproval of the satirist and his vocation. Pope's retort, in lines 105-42, attempts to reverse this opprobrious judgment by demonstrating both his personal integrity and his public possession of the esteem of worthy judges—that is, to show himself as a moral man and an aid to society rather than a threat.
Pope immediately responds to Fortescue's warning by elaborately defending his virtue in a passage that approaches the oratorical sublime:

What? arm'd for *Virtue* when I point the Pen,
Brand the bold Front of shameless, guilty *Men*,
Dash the proud Gamester in his gilded *Car*,
Bare the mean *Heart* that lurks beneath a Star;
Can there be wanting to defend Her *Cause*,
Lights of the Church, or Guardians of the *Laws*?
Could pension'd *Boileau* lash in honest *Strain*
Flatterers and Bigots ev'n in *Louis' Reign*?
Could Laureate *Dryden* Pimp and Fry'r engage,
Yet neither *Charles* nor *James* be in a *Rage*?
And I not strip the Gilding off a Knave,
Un-plac'd, un-pension'd, no Man's *Heir*, or Slave?
I will, or perish in the gen'rous *Cause*.
Hear this, and tremble! you, who 'scape the *Laws*.
Yes, while I live, no rich or noble knave
Shall walk the World, in credit, to his grave.
TO VIRTUE ONLY AND HER FRIENDS, A FRIEND,
The World beside my *murmur*, or commend.

(105-22)

Horace, of course, has sheltered himself under the authority and example of Lucilius, and Pope parallels this by introducing *Dryden* and *Boileau*, who not only wrote satire unmolested but were actually rewarded by their respective kings. They, like Pope, reprimanded the vicious extremes of behavior, flattery and bigotry—two targets obviously quite significant for a poem concerned with flattery and libel. That Pope is now criticized for the very same thing is shown really to reflect on his age rather than on himself; under a previous (and Stuart) king, satire was honored, but the reign of George II obviously cannot endure such looking into. The precedent of Dryden's satire under a
legitimate monarch betrays the inversion of values and the growth of corruption under what Pope regarded as a German usurper.

The authority of Dryden and Boileau is reinforced by classical examples. There is, first of all, the active presence of Horace and the exemplar he cites, Lucilius. In addition, Pope has managed to bring to bear upon his poem materials from the apologias of both Juvenal and Persius, thus anchoring it firmly in the classical tradition and simultaneously presenting an overwhelming weight of authority to vindicate the integrity and public utility of the satirist. His lines about Dryden and Boileau (111-14) are based upon Persius' description of the satire of Horace and Lucilius, as is also the form and content of the lines following them (115-16). Here is the most relevant portion of Persius' statement in Dryden's translation:

Yet old Lucilius never fear'd the times;
But lash'd the City, and dissected Crimes.
*Mutius* and *Lupus* both by name he brought;
He mouth'd 'em, and betwixt his Grinders caught.

Could he do this, and is my Muse controll'd
By Servile Awe? Born free, and not be bold?

And shortly before this, in lines 105-6, Pope has echoed Dryden's translation of Juvenal's appeal to the precedent of Lucilius:

But when *Lucilius* brandishes his Pen,
And flashes in the face of Guilty Men,
A cold Sweat stands in drops on ev'ry part;
And Rage succeeds to Tears, Revenge to Smart.

The multiplication of authorities that has taken place in this passage is staggering. Horace cites the example of Lucilius; Pope in imitating him has the advantage of his
and Lucilius' precedent, but names Boileau and Dryden, echoing the latter's translations of Juvenal's and Persius' defenses, and particularly drawing upon the contexts in which they refer to their predecessors, Lucilius and Horace. This brings the argument full circle, and silences absolutely those who objected to Pope's satire on moral grounds, since he, in naming "shameless, guilty Men," has done exactly what they did, and accomplished a deed that was formerly recognized as praiseworthy. By so adapting the posture and language of the Roman poets, Pope has manipulated the entire bulk of classical tradition and demonstrated his right to its protection in the very act of claiming it.

Pope's interpolation of these lines from Juvenal and Persius should not be mistaken for merely personal associations based on his own private insights and preoccupations. Besides the obvious fact that the passages deal with the same subject for the same reasons in poems that are all designed to justify their creators' satire, both Juvenal's and Persius' lines had been repeatedly linked with Horace's by the editors and annotators of all three authors. Pope's use of them here then is not to be construed as the esoteric whim of a scholarly poet, but rather as his exploitation of materials that lay well within the bounds of the common knowledge of educated men. They are drawn from the public domain, and Pope could in all probability rely on at least the most alert portion of his audience to recognize their provenance and relevance.

Pope had announced in his prefatory Advertisement both his reasons for writing this defense and his reasons for imitating Horace:

The Occasion of publishing these Imitations was the Clamour raised on some of my Epistles. An answer from Horace was both more full, and of more Dignity, than any I cou'd have made in my own person; and the Example of much greater Freedom in so eminent a Divine as Dr. Donne, seem'd a proof with what Indignation and Contempt a Christian may treat Vice or Folly, in ever so low, or ever so high, a Station.
The very fact that Horace's poem so nearly "hit his case" was in itself a vindication of Pope's legitimate standing as a satirist, and this parallelism he has been cleverly exploiting through the Imitation. Besides this support, his Advertisement (which functions as a sort of topical outline for the poem) points to another exemplar, John Donne, not as an authority of the stature of Horace, but specifically as a precedent for Christian satire. Pope has already established the religious nature of his verse: it is only logical, then, that his enumeration of classical sanctions for his activities should also embrace and be bolstered by a Christian justification for the writing of satire.

 Appropriately enough, this justification has been presented at the very beginning of Pope's argument. The index guides correlate the first line of the "arm'd for Virtue" passage with Horace's

\[
\text{Quid? cum est Lucilius ausus} \\
\text{Primus in hunc operis componere carmina morem,} \\
\]  

(62-63)

which it could not possibly translate. What Pope has actually done is to call into play at this point Horace's earlier pun on \textit{stylus},\textsuperscript{19} which enables him to equivocate between pen and sword and to at least symbolically combine both in one weapon. The significance of this implied metaphor is to be found in the addition of the words "arm'd for Virtue" (105) to the opening of the passage. If the Christian life is a constant warfare against evil, as Renaissance and eighteenth-century divines assured their cures it was, the life of a Christian satirist is even more so. It is entirely consistent with the tenor and content of Pope's poem to recognize here a reference to the apostolic injunction that had for centuries armed the Christian warrior and supplied his arsenal; Paul's exhortation to "put on the whole armor of God" (Ephesians 6:10-17). The final weapon Paul

[52]
catalogues, "the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God," is the one that matches Pope's and fits coherently into his view of satire as a religious act. Horace's *stylus*, like Horace's conception of satire, has become a valid weapon in the Christian's spiritual struggles. Its occurrence at the beginning of this section of Pope's defense casts his entire elaboration of the satirist's mission into the broader context of the Christian's righteous warfare against the father of lies and his earthly minions, who are the legitimate targets of both preachers and a poet concerned to clear himself from false charges of libel. Such standards provide the final stamp of approval necessary to vindicate his personal morality.

Pope's social worth can best be demonstrated by describing his relationships with worthy noblemen who are themselves possessed of notable public virtues. To this end, he carefully selects two names, prominent respectively in peace and war, Bolingbroke and Peterborough. Returning once again to his previous use of the *concordia discors* pattern, he links these two in a passage that presents himself as a thoroughly concordant individual, reconciling extremes in himself and those about him and living in perfect harmony with the great men whose esteem far outweighs the petty cavils of the mob.

Know, all the distant Din that World can keep
Rolls o'er my Grotto, and but sooths my Sleep.
There, my Retreat the best Companions grace,
Chiefs, out of War, and Statesmen, out of Place.
There *St. John* mingles with my friendly Bowl,
The Feast of Reason and the Flow of Soul:
And He, whose Lightning pierc'd th' *Iberian* Lines,
Now, forms my Quincunx, and now ranks my Vines,
Or tames the Genius of the stubborn Plain,
Almost as quickly, as he conquer'd *Spain*.

(123-32)
Once more, the concept of *concordia discors* is the main unitive element. The harmonious linking of soldier and statesman is further extended by the higher harmony of the mixture of active and contemplative lives presented in the picture of the two former officials meeting in a contemplative rural retreat. This is elaborated even into the details of their avocations by the two couplets on Peterborough, which liken and, in effect, merge his peacetime gardening with his wartime soldiering. The vocabulary of the lines devoted to gardening shows clearly by its application of military terms to horticulture the extent of the interpenetration and harmonization. Peterborough “forms” the quincunx, “ranks” the vines, and “tames” the plain. Bolingbroke’s part is to “mingle” mind and spirit with conviviality in “the Feast of Reason and the Flow of Soul.” This latter should also recall Pope’s earlier aspirations to pour himself out in his writings so that his soul might stand forth: we are being subtly reminded that even in relaxation Pope and his companions employ language properly, with intelligence and morality. By locating the scene of this concord in his own grotto and garden, Pope has made it clear that this harmony flows from him, that he is responsible for the good order of this miniature society of statesmen and soldiers. In social matters as in literary, Pope has pictured himself as a source of harmony—appropriately enough, if we consider seriously his earlier allusion to Lucretius. Language was invented to establish concord among men, and Pope displays his own proper use of it in the vignette of his relations with Bolingbroke and Peterborough. By thus emphasizing the constructive, edifying role played by himself and his poetry, he answers the objections brought against the satirist as a disrupter of society.

A larger pattern of harmonized opposites can be traced through these various vindications of the satirist’s calling. In order to defend his private morality in writing satire,
Pope has had recourse to citing classical and scriptural authority for his public actions; and in order to absolve himself from charges of threatening the social order, he has found it expedient to expose his private life to view. In addition, his defense of his personal morality has been accomplished by proving the social utility of his writings, while his demonstration of his social worth could be brought about only by dismissing the extreme opinions of the mob in favor of the more moderate and competent judgment of a few personal friends. He has inextricably intermingled public and private in yet another harmonious fusion, all of it spreading outward in concentric circles from the focal point of satire as itself a reconciliation of opposites and, simultaneously, the glass of Pope's soul reflecting the divine creation. He has made his defense of satire fully embody his own theory of satire. Form and meaning are completely united.

After all this, the final verse paragraph of Pope's defense (133-42) has something of the character of a legal summation. He reminds Fortescue that, despite contrary charges, he has received impressive marks of social approval (133-34); that he is not a malicious libeler (135-36), but rather one who uses language charitably "To help who want, to forward who excel" (137); and, finally, he reminds his lawyer once again of his personal indifference to the real libels of the "Mob" (139-40). His final appeal to his "Council learned in the Laws" (142) has, after the high moral line he has taken, an unmistakable quality of gently mocking irony; 22 "Learned in the Laws" no longer indicates Fortescue's abilities, but his limitations. The phrase has, as it were, fallen back into the Latin word of which it is a literal translation, Iurisconsultus, which all the commentators use to describe Horace's Trebatius, and which signifies no more than "lawyer."

Fortescue's very lawyer-like reply (143-49) returns the poem to the problem from which it set out, the legal charge
of libel. Pope has incorporated Fortescue into the pattern of his satiric thrusts without violating the decorum of the lawyer's persona; his precise, legalistic comment contains in itself an acknowledgement of Pope's innocence (143) and a gibe at a tyrannical king (144-46; that Pope meant George is, of course, beyond doubt). Despite the satire inherent in his remarks, Fortescue still insists that Pope's own "very honest Rhymes" (146) are covered by the laws concerning libel. It is Pope's retort (150-53), the poem's refutatio, that reduces this to a mere legal quibble. Putting aside Horace's pun on mala carmina,23 which side-steps rather than answers the question, he makes a distinction in kind between his writings and "Libels and Satires! lawless Things indeed" (150). Lest there be any doubt about what he is actually doing, Pope's use of the adjective "lawless" recalls the opening of Horace's poem, where one of the charges brought against him is that "ultra legem tendere opus" (1-2); and it is precisely this sort of verse that Pope denies writing. Instead, he composes "grave Epistles, bringing Vice to Light" (151); that is, his verses are not malicious lampoons, but didactic poems whose constructive value compensates for any injury their wit causes.24 Despite his disavowal of the name, it is clear that Pope is here claiming, as he has all through the poem, that he writes true satire. Fortescue's final words bear this out:

The Case is alter'd—you may then proceed.
In such a Cause the Plaintiff will be hiss'd,
My Lords the Judges laugh, and you're dismiss'd.

(154-56)

This is the ideal result of true satire: the plaintiff, the satiric butt, will be hissed from the court amid the curative laughter that satire is supposed to rouse. The legal charge of libel has no relevence because there is a real and demonstrable (and, by this point, fully demonstrated) difference in nature and effect between libel and satire.
In accordance with his conception of satire as the virtuous mean between vicious extremes, Pope’s repudiation of the charge of libel is paralleled by his disavowal of flattery. Fortescue had brought this problem to the fore early in the poem. In the same passage wherein he first raised the dichotomy in values expressed by the poles of “Life” and “Soul,” he concluded by advising Pope to “Write Caesar’s Praise: / You’ll gain at least a Knighthood, or the Bays” (21-22). That is, he asks him to compose such verses as Lord Fanny or Colley Cibber write, and points out that such flattery is the sure road to royal favor. Pope’s reply and the dialogue that ensues are masterpieces of satiric double entendre.

P. What? like Sir Richard, rumbling, rough and fierce.
With Arms, and George, and Brunswick crowd the Verse?
Rend with tremendous Sound your ears asunder,
With Gun, Drum, Trumpet, Blunderbuss & Thunder?
Or nobly wild, with Budgell’s Fire and Force,
Paint Angels trembling round his falling Horse?
F. Then all your Muse’s softer Art display,
Let Carolina smooth the tuneful Lay,
Lull with Amelia’s liquid Name the Nine,
And sweetly flow through all the Royal Line.
P. Alas! few Verses touch their nicer Ear;
They scarce can bear their Laureate twice a year:
And justly Caesar scorns the Poet’s Lays,
It is to History he trusts for Praise.

(23-36)

Blackmore and Budgell are the Georgian versions of Virgil and Pindar, and, as Pope’s index guide makes clear, Horace’s excuse for not writing heroic poetry is literally true of them: their talents are insufficient. The best that the “tremendous Sound” of their verse can do is depict the
melodramatic scene of George's sole military adventure, Oudenarde, during which his horse was killed.

At this point, the ever-present tensions between Pope's English and Horace's Latin poem mesh finely to produce a telling satiric thrust that indicates exactly how great the difference is between George Augustus and Augustus Caesar. In the original, the episode pictured involves a wounded Parthian falling from his horse, and the commentators identify this incident as the slaying of Pacorius, king of the Parthians. Pope's English rendering, by dwelling lovingly on the circumstances of George's mishap, has slyly transformed him into the barbarian king rather than his ideal prototype, Augustus. In point of fact, if we follow the lead provided by Warburton's Scriblerus-like note, we will be forced to see the Stuart Pretender playing the role of the unharmed Caesar to George's stricken barbarian:

The horse on which his Majesty charged at the Battle of Oudenarde; when the Pretender, and the Princes of the blood of France fled before him.

That this episode was in reality seriously celebrated in one of Budgell's panegyrics on George is an indication of far more than Pope's personal dislike of his king. Played off thus against Horace's legitimate praise of Caesaris invicti (11), it reveals that George has totally perverted the king's role: praise of him can only be satire in disguise, as Pope will later say and demonstrate in the Epistle to Augustus.

Even Fortescue's next suggestion, that Pope turn from heroic panegyric to lyric and praise the royal family, shares this same condition: from seeming encomium it degenerates to actual insult. The muse's questionable "softer Art" falls into the opposite extreme from the "rumbling, rough, and fierce" verse of George's flatterers, but the difference is only verbal: they reflect exactly the same inanity and vacuity. The "tuneful Lay" promptly acquires the characteristics of a lesser Dulness and lulls even the muses themselves to sleep with Amelia's "liquid" name, before flowing diar-
rhetically on through the rest of the royal family. What is lacking from these lines is as important as what is present: there are no domestic virtues to celebrate, no filial love, and, in the face of Horace's praise of Augustus' civil achievements, no wise government, none of the arts of peace. To balance the dubious glory of George's exploit at Oudenarde, there is only the absolute emptiness of sweetly flowing verse. Pope's explicit reference to the laureate makes quite clear that this soporific nonsense is the only poetry Cibber can write, the only poetry the royal family can inspire.

Such satire is not a manifestation of Pope's personal animosity for the Hanoverians, but an integral part of the developing argument of the poem. As the first and briefest section of the poem's *confirmatio*, it constitutes a complete repudiation of the first and flimsiest of the charges brought against Pope. It is proof by demonstration that flattery under such a king is impossible and can only result in the very lowest form of satire—in fact, in libel itself. Heroic panegyric ends in a ridiculous farce, in which George is denigrated by simple juxtaposition to Augustus. Lyric panegyric of his private life cannot even be attempted, since he notoriously lacked the private virtues to an even greater extent than the public. An awkward attempt to substitute the praises of his family produces a stream of trivia worthy, Pope intimates, of Cibber. In such an inverted world, what Juvenal says of his Rome is perfectly applicable: *difficile est non saturam scribere*.

Throughout the poem, there is a constant recurrence to the theme of the total corruption of society under George. Fortescue raises the issue again when he says,

The fewer still you name, you wound the more;
*Bond* is but one, but *Harpax* is a Score,

(43–44)

which indicates a degree and extent of guilt that spreads far beyond the limits of the court. Pope's response covertly
POPE’S HORATIAN POEMS

develops this suggestion, while its surface statement accomplishes a correlative task:

Each Mortal has his Pleasure: None deny
Scarsdale his Bottle, Darty his Ham-Fye;
Ridotta sips and dances, till she see
The doubling Lustres dance as fast as she;
F—loves the Senate, Hockley-Hole his Brother
Like in all else, as one Egg to another.

(45-50)

The ostensible argument, in reply to Fortescue’s objection, is that if Scarsdale’s drunkenness, Dartineuf’s gluttony, and Ridotta’s profligacy are tolerated, the same courtesy should be extended to Pope’s more innocent pleasure, writing satire. Once again, however, Pope’s index guides—and the Horatian commentators—indicate a great deal beyond this.

The guides attach Pope’s phrase “Each Mortal has his Pleasure” to Horace’s two lines “Quid faciam? Saltat Milonius, ut semel icto/Accessit fervor capiti numerusque lucernis” (24-25), which it clearly does not even approximate. It is closer to Horace’s “quot capitum vivunt, totidem studiorum/Millia,” which occurs two lines later and which is bound by its own index guide to another dissimilar English phrase. The reason for this apparent confusion is that Pope is following up a lead provided by the commentators and is, I believe, using this displacement of the index guides to draw attention to it. In conformity with their habit of explaining Horatian passages by comparison to similar ones in other authors, many Renaissance editors noted at this point of the text Persius’ “Mille hominum species et rerum discolor usus;/ Velle suum cuique est nec voto vivitur uno.” This begins a passage that describes the ways in which most people waste their lives, as opposed to the philosopher’s devotion to truth and virtue. Persius then goes on to list several more or less vicious pursuits, including gluttony, sloth, politics, and profligacy. That
Pope's “Each Mortal has his Pleasure” resembles Persius' lines more closely than it does Horace's phrase is evident, and Pope's use of Persius' succeeding catalogue of vices rather than Horace's briefer and more innocent list of avocations makes the presence of the allusion certain. The relevance of this to Pope's context as a complement to Fortescue's remark is also apparent: many are offended by satire, because many are guilty of the offenses that satire lashes—idleness, gluttony, lechery, and so on. The passage simultaneously explains the widespread animus against satire and shows the absolute necessity of writing it. Needless to say, Pope's description a few lines later of the virtuous nature of his poems will stand out in bold contrast to this general corruption.

Still missing from this argument, however, is the link that ties this degeneracy to the court and locates there the cause of this universal immorality. This too is supplied by the ministrations of the commentators, who point out the similarity between Horace's description of Milonius and a passage from Juvenal's famous satire on women.

Quid enim Venus ebria curat?
Inguinis, & capitis quae sint discrimina, nescit;
Grandia quae mediis jam noctibus ostrea mordet,
Cum perfusa mero spumant unguenta Falerno,
Cum bibitur concha, cum jam vertigine tectum
Ambulat, & geminis exsurgit mensa lucernis.29

Juvenal supplies Pope's passage with a type-named dissolute woman, with the instance of objects apparently moving with the drunken dancer, and with specifically doubled lights in place of Horace's more general numerus. The significance of the English poet's use of this locus goes far beyond the graphic picture of female depravity it presents, and includes the whole Juvenalian context of which this is a small part. The larger concern of Juvenal's poem is the total corruption of the women of his age, who had in former
times been the repository and symbol of the old, solid, Roman virtues. The lines that Pope here makes use of occur, fortunately enough for his purposes, in a section of the poem wherein Juvenal explains the cause of this universal vice. Roman women, he claims, were chaste when Italy was poor and threatened by Hannibal; now, "We suffer all th'invet'rate ills of Peace . . . / Since Poverty, our Guardian-God, is gone" (Dryden’s translation). Juvenal is equally specific about the source of this sin:

Pride, Laziness, and all Luxurious Arts,
Pour like a Deluge in, from Foreign Parts:
Since Gold Obscene, and Silver found the way,
Strange Fashions with strange Bullion to convey,
And our plain simple Manners to betray. 30

The origin of corruption is laid squarely at the door of a protracted peace—an attribution that could not fail to suggest to English readers of the 1730’s the similar and much lamented effects of Walpole’s peace policies. Juvenal’s further tracing of this vice to foreign manners and foreign wealth would unequivocally pinpoint the Hanoverian king and court as the fountainhead of the depravity that Pope sees overwhelming England.

The same theme re-emerges when Pope explains the circumstances that force him to satire.

Satire's my Weapon, but I'm too discreet
To run a Muck, and tilt at all I meet;
I only wear it in a Land of Hectors,
Thieves, Supercargoes, Sharpers, and Directors.
Save but our Army! and let Jove incrust
Swords, Pikes, and Guns, with everlasting Rust!
Peace is my dear Delight—not Fleury's more:
But touch me, and no Minister so sore.

(69-76)
The "Land of Hectors,/ Thieves, Super­cargoes, Sharpers, and Directors" is clearly the corrupt and vice-ridden England that has obliged Pope to defend himself with this present satire. He cleverly adapts Horace's prayer for personal tranquillity to an ironic thrust at the controversy over the standing army and, once again, at Walpole's peace policy. His mention of Fleury's ardent desire for peace implies that such a policy benefits foreigners far more than Englishmen, and hammers home in the political realm the point that his allusion to Juvenal has established in the moral. The simple presence of the word "Minister" in line 76 fastens the satire directly upon Walpole, and emphasizes the fact that the court is principally responsible for the disorder of England and so indirectly responsible for Pope's compulsion to write satire.

All these political considerations are focused most clearly in Pope's final defense of his calling and character in lines 105-42. Herein Pope explains the virtuous intent of his satire, and points out that under other kings, satirists, not flatterers, had been rewarded with royal favor. Louis had pensioned Boileau; Charles and James made Dryden laureate. George has chosen Cibber for his laureate, and that is proof enough of where the corruption—in taste at least—originated. The morality of satire can have no honor at George's court, but there are rewards enough for the immorality of lying flattery. In such a world, Pope implies, it is inevitable that satiric honesty be miscalled libel. Fortescue directly substantiates this point when he warns the poet that, although his case is good, "Laws are explain'd by Men" (144). He hardly needs to add the instance of the tyrant king, Richard III (who was also, appropriately enough, a usurper), to make clear the target of the stroke (145). For these same reasons, when Pope seeks to demonstrate his social acceptability, he cannot show to any effect that he is esteemed by any of the court: he has already totally devaluated their opinion. Instead, he has recourse to displaying his friendship with statesmen and soldiers of...
the reign of Anne, which he has "mythologized" into a
golden age of virtue, justice, and order, in complete contrast
to the reign of George II. Indeed, the very fact that such
paragons as Bolingbroke and Peterborough are "Chiefs,
out of War, and Statesmen, out of Place" (126) is in itself
a commentary on those who have filled their posts under
George, and points once again to the degeneracy and cor-
ruption spreading outward from the king.

These political and social references serve as a carefully
channeled undercurrent in the flow of Pope's argument. As
he has demonstrated earlier in the poem, honest praise of
the Hanoverians is impossible: the panegyrics of the various
court poestasters are only disguised satires, or libels not
understood. The confrontation of the deeds of George and
Augustus proves that merely to tell the truth is satire
enough. In this way, Pope makes all his political asides
provide in themselves further justifications of his satire,
and paradoxically convicts the hireling court flatterers of
the libels with which he is charged.

IV

The interaction throughout the poem of the persona Pope
has assumed with the character he has assigned Fortescue
is also carefully manipulated to the end of exonerating Pope
entirely from the charges brought against him. He has cast
himself as a naïf, an innocent whose exaggerated shock
indicates that he cannot comprehend the outcry against
his poems:

There are (I scarce can think it, but am told)
There are to whom my Satire seems too bold.

(1-2)

He carefully describes himself as the exact opposite of the
aggressive, malicious libeler he has been called—"Tim'rous
by Nature, of the Rich in awe” (7)—and his approach to his friend for help is at once humble and ingratiating. Fortescue, on the other hand, is the voice of experience and authority in the poem, a legal expert who knows thoroughly the practical, day-to-day world. He represents that body of opinion that Pope must sway if he is to win his case, since, paradoxically, the ingenu Pope is also forced to become a lawyer delivering a set oration in his own defense, and the lawyer Fortescue simultaneously becomes a judge. It is in his capacity as the embodiment of the opinion of society that Fortescue raises the dichotomy of values between Pope’s implicit claim that he writes for his soul, and his own opinion that the poet could not do a worse thing for his life. It is as a practical man of the world that he advises Pope to praise George and tries to dissuade him from satire. These pragmatic judgments Pope has no difficulty in setting aside, by simply modulating his own voice from its ingenuous opening comments to the sterner and more idealistic tones of the *vir bonus*, whose devotion to virtue necessitates his writing satire.\(^{31}\)

Still, his skeptical *adversarius* reverts to the practical aspects of the case and warns him once again of the public disapproval of his attacks. This forces the poet to display yet another side of his persona, his innocent friendship with the great. This concludes his presentation of the case, but his counsel, still not entirely convinced, warns him yet again. This time Pope answers on legal rather than moral grounds by showing that the charge of libel is not applicable. Fortescue capitulates completely, and endorses Pope’s future satiric activities. What this really means is that Pope has manipulated the voice of public opinion so that by the end of the poem it is in complete agreement with him, and opposed to those who have carped at his poetry—a total reversal of Fortescue’s initial position. This is shown most clearly in Fortescue’s final statement, the closing lines of the poem, which indicate a shift in his viewpoint from the
practical world for which he has been spokesman to the theoretical, ideal world out of which Pope has acted.

*P.* Libels and Satires! lawless Things indeed!
But grave Epistles, bringing Vice to Light,
Such as a King might read, a Bishop write,
Such as Sir Robert would approve—

*F.* Indeed?
The Case is alter'd—you may then proceed.
In such a Cause the Plaintiff will be hiss'd.
My Lords the Judges laugh, and you're dismiss'd.

(150-56)

Pope's claim that he writes such poems as "a King might read, a Bishop write, Such as Sir Robert would approve" is clearly not based upon the reality of Georgian England—indeed, in that context the statement is heavily ironic and bitterly comic—but upon a conception of an ideally ordered world where kings and ministers do read satire and do not think it any reflection on themselves. Fortescue's acceptance of this argument involves his simultaneous acceptance of the larger world order that Pope has defended throughout the poem, the world wherein theoretic distinctions between genres and the theoretic roles of language and literature are meaningful and accurate indexes of the ultimate realities. Thus his final lines are also the conclusion of Pope's theory of satire: in the ideal world, the satiric butt is hissed off the stage, and satire does successfully wage war on vice with morally therapeutic laughter. In this manner, Pope's critics are vanquished, and adversarius is metamorphosed into coadjutor.

The ideally harmonic worlds of God's creation and man's rational state have been the underlying supports of Pope's poem. The poem itself, incorporating all those concords already noted, has attempted to reproduce this world by carefully balancing, in its dialectic, the extremes of flattery and libel against each other and picking a concordant
median path between them, by harmoniously mingling classical and Christian in a consistent and coherent literary and moral program. Thus the plan of the poem, as well as its subject matter, mirrors the ideal world upon which it depends, at once claiming its support and demonstrating its presence. So it is that the dialogue ends with Fortescue’s sudden corroboration of that world: the poem breaks through the petty quibbles of the phenomenal into the higher reality of the ideal; it closes with the burst of curative laughter that it is the end of true satire to produce. Thus, since it has been the whole purpose of the poem to prove that Pope does write true satire, the poem validates itself and proves its own argument. In the ideal world where God’s creation and man’s actions are equally rational and concordant, real satire is greeted, not with scorn or fear, but with appreciative laughter. It is the reality and validity of this world that Fortescue—and Pope’s poem—affirms.

1. Bathurst, 20, 86, and 123. This is a trick Pope learned from Horace, who does the same thing in line 22 of this satire, where he quotes a line from his earlier (Sat.I.viii) attack on Pantalobus and Nomentanus.

2. This Imitation is built around a carefully worked out rhetorical framework, and employs all the divisions of a formal oration except the two that would violate the decorum of its dialogue form, the exordium and the peroratio. The first fifteen lines of the poem present simultaneously a narratio and a partitio, a statement of the situation and its divisions. Pope lists the antithetical charges that will be the two main concerns of the poem, and Fortescue’s advice, coupled with Pope’s response, introduces the third problem, that of the satirist’s character. The confirmatio falls into three parts corresponding to these topics: lines 21–36 repudiate the charge of flattery; lines 37–100 deal with the question of libel; lines 101–42 are devoted to the defense of Pope’s character. The final rhetorical division of the poem is the refutatio, which extends from line 143 to the end. Here, Pope shows the legal charge of libel to be completely inapplicable, and accomplishes that final suasion of his audience that is the end of all rhetoric.

3. This expansion of Horace’s text is traceable to the commentators, who pointed out that consciousness of his own crime causes each guilty man to fear the satirist. See the commentaries of Acron and Christoforo Landino in Opera cum quatuor Commentariis et Figuris nuper additis (Venice, 1509), pp. 212 verso–213 recto. It is worth noting that these lines also provide Pope’s answer to the controversy over the propriety of particular satire, in which he had been directly involved through widespread misapplication of the Timon passage in the Epistle to Burlington.

[67]
4. Pope appears to have used at various times all three major versions of the Bible. For the sake of uniformity, I quote regularly from the King James, except for those books that, although apocryphal for Protestants, are canonical for Roman Catholics; for these, I quote from the Douai version.

5. See, for instance, Hugo de Sancto Charo, *Opera omnia in universum vetus, & novum Testamentum* (Venice, 1703), III, 152 verso, col. 1: “Et nota quod Filius dicitur speculum & imago Patris, cum tamen in rebus inferioribus imago sit in speculo, ad notandum quod idem est speculum & imago. Et sicut in rebus inferioribus in speculo videtur imago rei, & per imaginem res, sic in Filio, & per Filium videtur Pater. In Filio videtur, quia est speculum; per Filium, quia est imago. Item Filius non speculum simpliciter, sed speculum sine macula dicitur ad differentiam faciandam inter hoc speculum & alia specula. Tria siquidem sunt specula Dei. Unum est mens humana, facta ad similitudinem Dei, sed non est sine macula. Alid est quaelibet creatura, in qua relucet vestigium Trinitatis totius, ut dicit Aug. . . . De isto speculo dicitur 1 Cor. 13.d. Videmus nunc per speculum aenigmatum, etc. Sed nec illud speculum verum est. Speculum est Christus, & illud est sine macula omnino.”

6. See Cicero on the limits of the use of ridicule, *De Oratore*, II.lviii.237. For typical biblical pronouncements about the reservation of the wicked for judgment, see II Peter 2:4 and 2:9. The omission of “Vice too high” from the scope of satire is quite standard literary theory: see Mary Claire Randolph, “The Neo-Classic Theory of the Formal Verse Satire in England, 1700-1750,” p. 76 and pp. 260-61. The purpose of this concentration of diverse elements in Pope’s lines appears to be to show at once his rhetorical, satiric, and moral orthodoxy, and to place yet another prop beneath both his ethical and his literary program.

7. Phil. 4:5: “Let your moderation be known to all men.” This counsel was interpreted in such a manner that Pope could easily fit it into the context of the *golden mean* and *concordia discors*. “Now hence it follows, 1st, That Moderation can have only Place in Things which are not always evil in themselves, but become so, by exceeding that Rule, and Measure, which is praescrib’d for the due Management of them. . . . 2ndly, Hence it is demonstratively evident, that Moderation is always a Virtue, it being always virtuous to restrain the Excesses of our Passions, and Appetites, and the Exorbitances of our angry Passions, and to regulate our Words, and Actions, according to the Rule, and Measure, by which we ought to act.” Daniel Whitby, *A Paraphrase and Commentary on The New Testament* (London, 1727), II, 402, col. 2.

8. For basic information about the *concordia discors* theory, see Leo Spitzer, “Classical and Christian Ideas of World Harmony,” *Traditio*, II (1944), 409-64, and III (1945), 307-64. For its importance to Pope, see Maynard Mack’s introduction to TE, III, pt. i, xxxiv-xxxy, and E. R. Wasserman, *The Subtler Language* (Baltimore, 1959), pp. 101-68 passim. Edgar Wind concisely states the connection between *concordia discors* and the *golden mean*: “‘There is,’ as we may remember from Pico, ‘this diversity between God and man, that God contains in him all things because he is their source, whereas man contains in him all things because he is their centre.’ In the centre the opposites are held in balance, but in the source they coincide. In so far as man therefore approaches his own perfection, he distantly imitates the deity. Balance is but an echo of divine

9. This sort of poetic theory had an independent existence of its own in European literature, and can be traced as a minor current through the Middle Ages—notably in Hugh of St. Victor's Didascalicon—until it received fresh impetus from the neoplatonism of the Florentine Academy. The essential premise of this view is the Christian one that man is made in the image of God. Since God is the resolution of all contradictions and the allaying of all paradoxes, man's highest spiritual faculty resembles, in its humbler way, that divine harmony. Wisdom too mirrors the nature of the deity, and she manifests her presence in the human soul through and in the various arts. Finally, language is also a mirror, reflecting man's innermost nature: thus poetry itself becomes yet another reflection of the deity, revealing the divinely ordained pattern of creation. Cowley's ode "Of Wit" exemplifies and explains the concept:

What is it then, which like the Power Divine
We only can by Negatives define?
In a true piece of Wit all things must be,
Yet all things then agree.
As in the Ark, joynd without force or strife,
All Creatures dwelt; all Creatures that had Life.
Or as the Primitive Forms of all
(If we compare great things with small)
Which without Discord or Confusion lie,
In that strange Mirror of the Deitie.

10. The hint for all this is taken from Horace's lines 35-39, wherein he states that he is unsure whether he is an Apulian or a Lucanian, because his native Venusia borders on both. Needless to say, Pope's witty exploitation of this hint makes of it something very different from whatever Horace may have intended.

11. "Hard Words" mean not only vituperation, but also difficult words, thus adding another item to Pope's list of misuses of language. See DeWitt T. Starnes and Gertrude E. Noyes, The English Dictionary from Cawdrey to Johnson (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1946), pp. 190-92.

12. The index guides consist of a pair of matching numbers or letters, connecting ideological fragments of Horace's poem with their usually equivalent English versions. It occasionally happens, however, that a significant deviation of Pope's poem from its Horatian original is signaled by a displacement of these guides, or by their being attached to passages that only remotely, and sometimes not at all, translate or paraphrase each other. The guides were present in all editions during Pope's and Warburton's lifetimes. See the table of index guides in Appendix A.

13. Opera interpretatione et notis illustravit Ludovicus Desprez, p. 432, note to line 52. Desprez quotes in full the relevant portions of the Lucretian passage.

14. De Rerum Natura V, 1027-34. The text of Lucretius is that of Thomas Creech, 2nd ed. (London, 1717). Here is Rouse's translation (from the Loeb Classical Library edition) of this passage and its immediately preceding context: "Then also neighbours began eagerly to join friendship amongst themselves to do no hurt and suffer no violence, and asked protection for their children and women-kind, signifying by voice and gesture.
with stammering tongue that it was right for all to pity the weak. Never­
theless concord could not altogether be produced, but a good part, may the
most kept the covenant emblazoned, or else the race of mankind would
have been even then wholly destroyed, nor would birth and begetting have
been able to prolong their posterity.

"But the various sounds of the tongue nature drove them to utter, and
convenience pressed out of them names for things, not far otherwise than
very speechlessness is seen to drive children to the use of gesture, when
it makes them point with the finger at things that are before them. For each
feels to what purpose he is able to use his own powers. Before the budding
horns stand out on the calf's forehead, these are what he uses in anger to
butt with and pushes viciously."

15. The designation of "you who 'scape the Laws" as the targets of
satire is once again quite orthodox literary theory: see Randolph, pp. 260-61,
and such contemporary sources as Walter Harte's Essay on Satire; Wil­
liam Melmoth's The Letters of Sir Thomas Fitzosborne (pp. 234-35); and
Joseph Trapp's Lectures on Poetry, wherein the opinion of Vossius and
others is considered (p. 228).

16. This passage is from "The First Satyr of Aulus Persius Flaccus,"
lines 227-39, 239-40 (Kinsley) II, pp. 748-49; it corresponds to lines 114-19
of Persius' poem.

I.165-67.

18. The relevance of the passage from Persius was noted by Landino,
p. 213verso; Cruquius, p. 413, col. 1; Torrentius, pp. 518-19; and Dacier,
V, p. 466. Casaubon's edition of Persius (Satiorum Liber, cum . . . Isaaci
Casauboni notis [Leipzig, 1839]) cites the Horatian locus in his com­
mentary, p. 111. Giovanni Britannico, in his edition of Juvenal (Opus, inter­
prete Joanne Britannico [Venice, 1523]), refers to the same passage in
Persius, and Badius Ascensius' notes in the same volume refer to that in
Horace, p. 18verso, cols. 1 and 2.

19. Lines 39-41: "Sed hic stylus haud petit ultro/ Quenquam animantem;
& me veluti custodiet ensis/ Vagina tectus . . ."

20. For the importance of the rural retreat as a scene of ethical and
religious activity, see Maren Sophie Rostvig, The Happy Man (Oxford,
1954-58), II, 117-22, which have special reference to Pope. In this con­
nection, see also Atterbury's sermon "Of Religious Retirement," Sermons
and Discourses on Several Subjects and Occasions (London, 1740), I,
349-75.

21. Landino, in his commentary on line 66 of Horace's poem, quotes
Virgil's famous description of the Scipios as duo fulmina belli (Aeneid
VI.842), "two thunderbolts of war." This connection provides the rationale
for the presence of Peterborough's "Lightning" in line 129, and at the same
time furnishes him with an extremely handsome compliment through the
implied comparison to Scipio.

22. This irony has been seen in the original by at least one Horatian
commentator, Cruquius, p. 413, col. 2.

23. Lines 82-84; "'Si mala considerit in quem quis carmina jus est/
Judiciumque.' Esto, siquis mala; sed bona siquis/ Judice considerit laudatur
[70]
Caesare . . ." Horace's pun turns on the two possible meanings of mala, "evil and unlawful," or "of poor quality."

24. Pope says in effect the same thing in a letter to Swift, April 2, 1733, Correspondence, III, 365-66: "That I am an Author whose characters are thought of some weight, appears from the great noise and bustle that the Court and Town make about any I give; and I will not render them less important or interesting, by sparing Vice and Folly, or by betraying the cause of Truth and Virtue. I will take care they shall be such as no man can be angry at but the persons I would have angry . . . I have not the courage to be such a Satyrist as you, but I would be as much, or more, a Philosopher. You call your satires, libels; I would rather call my satires, Epistles: they will consist more of morality than wit, and grow graver, which you will call duller." The purpose of this equivocation seems to be to provide for all his satires the same sort of firm rhetorical structure he has employed in this poem, since the epistle was conceived of in the Renaissance as a miniature oration, governed by all the rules of formal rhetoric. See Jay Arnold Levine, "The Status of the Verse Epistle before Pope," SP, LIX (1962), 658-84, for the connection of rhetoric and the epistolary form. Pp. 667-68 are especially pertinent.

25. It links Sir Richard's name with Horace's "vires/ Deficiunt" (12-13).

26. See Dacier, V, 451, note to line 15.

27. Sat. V,52-53. The following Horatian commentators cite the Persius passage: Landino, p. 213recto; Cruquius, p. 411, col. 1; and Despres, p. 431. Schrevelius' edition of Persius (Leyden, 1648) reciprocates by quoting the Horatian passage to explain Persius (see page 610), attributing the comment to unnamed veteres scholastiae.

28. Here is the passage in Dryden's translation, "The Fifth Satyr of Aulus Persius Flaccus," 67-82, (Kinsley) II, 774:

Nature is ever various in her Frame:
Each has a different Will; and few the same:
The greedy Merchants, led by Lucre, run
To the parch'd Indies, and the rising Sun;
From thence hot Pepper, and rich Drugs they bear,
Dart'ring for Spices, their Italian Ware.
The lazy Glutton safe at home will keep;
Indulge his Sloth, and batten with his Sleep:
One bribes for high Preferments in the State,
A second shakes the Box, and sits up late:
Another shakes the Bed; dissolving there.
Till Knots upon his Gouty Joints appear,
And Chalk is in his crippled Fingers found;
Rots like a Doddard Oke, and piecemeal falls to ground.
Then, his lewd Follies he would late repent:
And his past years, that in a Mist were spent.

29. The text quoted is D. Junii Juvenalis Aquinatis Satyrae, ed. Henricus Christianus Henmius (Utrecht, 1685), Sat. VI. 300-305. Grangaer's notes, printed in this volume, cite the pertinent Horatian line (p. 156), as do Giovanni Britannico's in his edition, p. 73verso, col. 1. The following Horatian commentators note the correspondence with Juvenal's passage:
Landino, p. 213 recto; *Vetus Commentator* in Cruquius, p. 408, col. 1; Desprez, p. 431; and Torrentius, p. 516.

30. For the entire passage in Dryden's translation, see "The Sixth Satyr of Juvenal," 397-423, (Kinsley) II, 706-7.

31. Maynard Mack has already made some of these same points about the use of the poet's persona. See "The Muse of Satire," *Yale Review*, XLI (1941), 80-92.